CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH **REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP)** **PS 9612** The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) policy for California State University, Long Beach establishes the mission, vision, and guiding principles for the evaluation of tenured and probationary faculty members (including coaches, librarians, and Counseling and Psychological Services faculty) eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.1 The university RTP policy also specifies the process by which faculty work shall be evaluated.	**CSULB COLLEGE OF THE ARTS REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP)** 2010 (Supersedes all previous COTA RTP policies) Designed to work in concert with the CSULB RTP Policy, the COTA policy on reappointment, tenure and promotion further defines and guides the RTP process specifically for the College of the Arts, and provides parameters within which departments may still further define and guide the process as appropriate to specific disciplines. All references to CSULB RTP Policy numbers in this document are to sections and subsections of the 2009 CSULB RTP Policy (Academic Senate Policy Statement 09-10).	**CSULB DEPARTMENT OF FILM & ELECTRONIC ARTS REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY** Designed to work in concert with the University and College of the Arts' Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) policies and guiding principles, the FEA Department RTP policy articulates the department standards for the successful reappointment, tenure and promotion of its faculty and the criteria by which the faculty shall be evaluated. The policy provides guidance and specificity for the candidate in the three requisite areas of: Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities; Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities; and Service.
1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES **1.1 University Mission and Vision** California State University, Long Beach is a diverse, student-centered, globally-engaged public university committed to providing highly-valued undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities through superior teaching; research, scholarly and creative activities (RSCA); and service for the people of California and the world. CSULB envisions changing lives by expanding educational opportunities, championing creativity, and preparing leaders for a changing world.	**1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES** **1.1 COTA Mission and Vision** The mission of the College of the Arts is to provide a dynamic, contemporary learning environment that honors tradition, embraces diversity, inspires innovation, and strives for excellence. Our faculty of artists, educators, and scholars is committed to challenging students intellectually, creatively, and professionally, while encouraging them to find their individual artistic voices. The College produces and brings the highest level of art, teaching, and scholarship to our community in the form of concerts, exhibitions and installations, films, performances, publications, and emerging media.	**1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES** **1.1 The FEA Department Mission** Film and Electronic Arts is an innovative program that emphasizes both theory and practice. Focusing on the integration of moving images, culture, and technology, the curriculum is designed to develop storytelling and production skills while providing a foundational education in the arts and humanities.
1.2 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) 1.2.1 A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarship, creativity, and service is essential to accomplishing the university's articulated mission and vision. CSULB faculty members integrate the results of their RSCA into their teaching, thereby invigorating and enhancing student learning. Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions to the department, college, university, community, and the profession.	**1.2 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)** 1.2.1 The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.1.	**1.2 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)** 1.2.1. The FEA Department concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.1 and COTA RTP Policy 1.2.1 and recognizes that the professional engagement and active involvement of its faculty in the field of film and electronic arts is essential to providing a high quality and rigorous instructional experience. The FEA Department expects its faculty to maintain currency appropriate to their discipline(s) and specialization(s).

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
1.2.2 Decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) are among the most important made by our university community. RTP decisions must be clear, fair, and unbiased at all levels of review. Faculty achievements may vary from those of colleagues yet still meet the standards for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The RTP process must ensure that excellence will be rewarded and that faculty members who meet department, college, and university standards and expectations will have an opportunity for advancement.	1.2.2 The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.2 and adds the following. Because of the broad diversity of instructional approaches and instructionally related activity; research, scholarly, and creative activity (RSCA); and service contributions in a college whose departments—Art, Dance, Design, Film and Electronic Arts, Music, and Theatre Arts—include faculty in arts criticism, arts education, arts history, arts practice, and arts theory, RTP standards must establish a consistent level of expectation while allowing candidates to meet expectations in varied ways.	1.2.2 The FEA Department concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.2 and COTA RTP Policy 1.2.2 and adds the following. The FEA Department encompasses both theory and practice and comprises multiple sub-departmental organizational units (tracks) connected to specific degrees, disciplines, specializations, and/or curriculum sets that differ in their philosophy, methods, and results of instruction, and in the productions that meet requirements for Scholarly and Creative activity. Some faculty positions may bridge multiple tracks. The RTP standards of the Department are thus tailored to respect the differences in these tracks, while establishing a consistent level of excellence across the board.
1.2.3 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) RSCA; 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession. All faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of all three areas.	1.2.3 The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.3 and adds the following. The College of the Arts expects sustained and substantive achievements and contributions over the specified period of review in: (1) instruction and instructionally related activities, (2) RSCA, and (3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession.	1.2.3 The FEA Department concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.3 and COTA RTP Policy 1.2.3.
1.2.4 This policy should not be construed to prevent innovation or adjustment in workload (with respect to teaching, RSCA, or service) based upon faculty expertise and accomplishment; department and college needs; and university mission.	1.2.4 The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.4 and adds the following. The College of the Arts recognizes that every candidate is unique, and that the specifics of a position, a discipline, a program, and a department will result in candidate files with differing balances and overall levels of achievement and contribution in the three areas of (1) instruction and instructionally related activities, (2) RSCA, and (3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession.	1.2.4 The FEA Department concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.4 and COTA RTP Policy 1.2.4 – 1.2.6 and adds the following. In evaluating the performance of faculty, the FEA Department recognizes that each member has different strengths so that successful candidates for reappointment, tenure, or promotion need not have achievements that are necessarily alike. Candidates may demonstrate their achievements in very different areas, depending on their specialization(s).

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
	1.2.5 The integrity of the RTP process depends upon the accuracy, honesty, thoroughness, consistency, discretion, and strict confidence of all individuals involved in the process. Concerns about actions that violate this core principle should be reported immediately to the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs.	
	1.2.6 The RTP process is governed and guided by the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA); university, college, and department RTP policies; related policies of the Academic Senate; and procedural documents issued by the university (Faculty Affairs), the college, and departments. Concerns about actions in violation of the CBA, RTP policies, Academic Senate policy, or procedural documents should be reported immediately to the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs.	
2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION Colleges, departments, and other academic units are responsible for defining the standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in their various disciplines, consistent with the mission and needs of the university. RTP standards and criteria shall articulate expectations for faculty accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation: 1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession.	**2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION** The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.0 and adds the following. The criteria for evaluation for each of the three areas of professional review (instruction and instructionally related activities, RSCA, and service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession) describe the nature and level of performance required of all faculty in the College of The Arts. Criteria set by college and department RTP policies establish the standards by which faculty, following diverse career paths, are evaluated. Colleagues in each department of the College of The Arts and on review committees play the central role in evaluating the quality of performance in each of these areas.	**2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION** The FEA Department concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.0 and COTA RTP Policy 2.0.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
2.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities Faculty members are expected to demonstrate that they are effective teachers. Instruction and instructionally-related activities include teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom. Instructionally-related activities include, but are not limited to, curriculum development, academic and departmental advising, supervision of student research and fieldwork, direction of student performances and exhibitions, and related activities involving student learning and student engagement. Additional instructional activities may include, but are not limited to, student mentoring, study abroad, and thesis and project supervision.	**2.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities** The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1 and adds the following. The category of Instructionally Related Activities includes all activities directly related to teaching in the classroom setting, the development of curriculum, student evaluation, supervision of student research and fieldwork, advising, and related activities involving students.	**2.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities** The FEA Department concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1 and COTA RTP Policy 2.1.
2.1.1 Instructional Philosophy and Practice Effective teaching requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching practices and assess their impact on student learning. Thoughtful, deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness, which may result in adopting new teaching methodologies, are expected of all faculty members. Effective teaching also requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with classroom and non-classroom assignments. Teaching methods should be consistent with course/curriculum goals and should accommodate student differences.	**2.1.1 Instructional Philosophy and Practice** The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.1 and adds the following (COTA RTP Policy 2.1.1 – 2.1.1.5. Teaching effectiveness shall be evaluated via RTP committee evaluation of instruction and related activities during the period subject to RTP review in 5 areas: (1) Pedagogy and Method; (2) Course Preparation; (3) Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher; (4) Integration of Ongoing Professional Development in the Discipline into Teaching; and (5) Other Criteria as appropriate by department.	**2.1.1 Instructional Philosophy and Practice** The FEA Department concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.1 and COTA RTP Policy 2.1.1.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
	2.1.1.1 Pedagogy and Method Pedagogy and Method shall be assessed by the candidate's ability: (1) to impart information in a clear and effective manner; (2) to facilitate class productivity appropriate to the level and purpose of the course; (3) to establish an environment conducive to exploration, critical thinking and the development of creativity; (4) to establish grading practices compatible with department, college, and university guidelines; (5) to maintain high academic standards; (6) to use appropriate methods for assessing student performance; and (7) to effectively critique/evaluate student work.	**2.1.1.1 Pedagogy and Method** The FEA Department concurs with COTA RTP Policy 2.1.1.1.
	2.1.1.2 Course Preparation Course syllabi shall be organized, complete, clear about expectations of students and student learning outcomes, consistent with work produced in class, and consistent with university standards. Where appropriate, course preparation shall utilize current resource materials and technology to maximize teaching effectiveness.	**2.1.1.2 Course Preparation** The FEA Department concurs with COTA RTP Policy 2.1.1.2.
	2.1.1.3 Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher The candidate shall show evidence of ongoing evaluation of pedagogy as it relates to the candidate's teaching philosophy, and efforts to enrich the candidate's teaching and student performance.	**2.1.1.3 Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher** The FEA Department concurs with COTA RTP Policy 2.1.1.3 and adds the following. Thoughtful, deliberate effort towards continued growth and improvement in teaching effectiveness is expected of all candidates. This effort may include regular and ongoing interactions with colleagues such as discussion of pedagogical issues; classroom visits; consultations on course development; revision of course materials based on research into current pedagogy and best teaching practices; and efforts to expand historical, theoretical, and/or technical knowledge via continuing education. This development may also include involvement in training and enrichment programs presented by the CSULB Faculty Center for Professional Development; participation in teaching development seminars sponsored by the Department, College, University, or professional organizations; giving or receiving of formal or

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
		2.1.1.3 Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher (Continued) informal pedagogical coaching; and/or other activities that contribute to professional development of teaching effectiveness.
	2.1.1.4 Integration of Ongoing Professional Development in the Discipline into Teaching Candidates shall maintain a challenging and current approach to the presentation of course materials, incorporating the candidate's research, scholarly and creative activities and/or professional activities into the classroom, course materials, and teaching methods where appropriate.	**2.1.1.4 Integration of Ongoing Professional Development in the Discipline into Teaching** The FEA Department concurs with COTA RTP Policy 2.1.1.4.
	2.1.1.5 Other Instructionally Related Activity The following are representative, but not exhaustive, examples of other activities to be considered in the area of instructionally related activity: academic advising (additional to assignment), student mentoring, recruitment and retention activities; supervision of student research projects and / or theses; curriculum development; innovative approaches to teaching, and exemplary ways of fostering student performance; teaching seminars or pedagogical workshops; participating in and assisting with student activities such as field trips or sponsorship of student organizations.	**2.1.1.5 Other Instructionally Related Activity** The FEA Department concurs with COTA RTP Policy 2.1.1.5.
2.1.2 Student Learning Outcomes Effective teaching requires that faculty members provide evidence of student learning. Instructional practices and course materials should clearly convey to students expected student outcomes and learning goals. Assessment methods should align with instructional practices.	**2.1.2 Student Learning Outcomes** The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.2 and adds the following. Narrative, sample syllabi, and other course-related materials submitted, as well as evidence of activity in curriculum development, shall demonstrate that the candidate understands the role of Student Learning Outcome goals in teaching. This understanding shall be reflected in instructional materials, course assignments, exams, and other demonstrations of competence required in the candidate's courses.	**2.1.2 Student Learning Outcomes** The FEA Department concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.2 and COTA RTP Policy 2.1.2.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction In addition to evidence of teaching effectiveness as defined by department and college RTP policy documents, student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student response to instruction. Student course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. Utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of presenting student response to learning and teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any single item on this form—or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information—does not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness.	**2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction** The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.3 and adds the following. In the combined PDS and Narrative, candidates must accurately summarize, in table form, the numerical averages given for all questions on statistical summaries of all courses evaluated. Candidates may choose to allow the numbers to "speak for themselves," or to provide additional commentary. In the event that a course that should have been evaluated per university and/or department policy was not evaluated, the candidate must explain the reasons/circumstances that led to the course not being evaluated.	**2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction** The FEA Department concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.3 and COTA RTP Policy 2.1.3 and adds the following. Student evaluation ratings ideally reflect a fair and reasonable student perception of an instructor's ability to convey knowledge and to demonstrate teaching effectiveness with regard to commitment, availability, organization, and clarity. Due to the subjective and contextual nature of student responses, the FEA Department considers them as a tool in the overall assessment of a pattern of teaching effectiveness, rather than as the primary, singular metric. Candidates are encouraged to provide commentary regarding course evaluation results, especially if the student rating of instruction for a particular course is missing or is considerably below the Department, College, and University mean.
	2.1.4 Classroom Visitation Departments may require that all RTP candidates be observed and evaluated by department RTP committee members visiting the classroom while the candidate is teaching. In departments that do not require classroom visitation, candidates may request visitation, and such requests shall be granted. Departments shall clearly define procedures for classroom visitation with the goal of fairness and flexibility toward the candidate, objectivity of the process, and appropriate and consistent incorporation of classroom visitation, observation, and evaluation into the RTP process.	**2.1.4 Classroom Visitation** ~~The FEA Department RTP Committee shall be responsible for peer evaluation of the candidate's classroom teaching. For the purpose of reappointment, tenure, or promotion, each candidate shall have a minimum of one classroom visit by each member of the Department RTP Committee.~~ When evaluating a candidate for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the FEA Department RTP Committee shall be responsible for peer evaluation of teaching, and each member of the committee shall observe the candidate's classroom teaching. Classroom visits shall be scheduled at least one week in advance, in consultation with the candidate.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA) Departments and colleges shall develop their own definitions, standards, and criteria for the evaluation of RSCA. The University RTP policy provides a guiding framework for this charge. Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions of substance in RSCA throughout their careers. All faculty members are expected to produce quality RSCA achievements that contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary studies. Academic disciplines vary in the meaning, scope, and practice of RSCA. Evidence of research, scholarly and creative activities and accomplishments includes, but is not limited to, publications of merit reviewed by professional peers, scholarly presentations, fellowships, grants, contracts, scholarship of engagement, and artistic exhibits and performances. These achievements must be reviewed by professional peers and disseminated to appropriate audiences.	**2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)** The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.2 and adds the following. Faculty are required to maintain professional currency by being engaged in an ongoing program of research, scholarship and/or creative activity in the discipline. All faculty are required to produce research, scholarly and/or creative achievements that contribute to the advancement of their discipline(s), as recognized by professional peer review. Research, scholarly and/or creative achievement is demonstrated by a substantial record of peer reviewed and recognized professional activities and products. Such activities and products may include books, articles in professional journals or newsletters, scholarly presentations, software and electronically published documents, works, exhibits, designs, performances, commissions, and awards. Candidates should consult their department RTP policy for examples of RSCA and peer review that are appropriate to their area or areas of expertise. The focus of evaluation of RSCA shall be upon peer review and validation of RSCA within the present context of the field.	**2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)** The FEA Department concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.2 and COTA Policy 2.2, and adds the following. Faculty are required to remain engaged in an ongoing program of research, scholarship and/or creative activity that demonstrates sustained intellectual and professional accomplishment in the discipline over time. All faculty are expected to produce research, scholarly and/or creative achievements that contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline (or interdisciplinary studies), which are disseminated to appropriate audiences, receiving recognition from professional peers prior or subsequent to dissemination. Evaluation of peer review and validation of RSCA within the present context of the field shall involve a qualitative analysis of the level and nature of peer review as evidenced in the candidate's file. Documented invitation to engage in RSCA from an organization, institution, publisher, or other entity recognized in the field may be construed as a form of peer review, and shall be evaluated accordingly within the context of the discipline. In some instances, RSCA may overlap with instruction and instructionally related activity, and/or service. RSCA may also bridge from one discipline to another. It is the candidate's responsibility to clearly delineate categorical and disciplinary boundaries in such instances. Consistent with the emphasis on sustained professional accomplishment that underlies the evaluation process, the candidate's documentation of RSCA included in the file, and the evaluation of RSCA, shall focus on ongoing professional development. Professional development should be the central organizing element of the candidate's narrative.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
		2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA) (Continued) 　Joint authorship or collaboration in scholarly and creative activities is normally valuable and creditable, but is often difficult to evaluate. Candidates shall identify the specific extent of their participation in collaborative activities. 　Activities in which a candidate has had a collaborative, supervisory, or consultative role may be considered within the category of RSCA. It is imperative that candidates provide clarification regarding the specifics of roles and activities associated with any project in which a candidate has had a collaborative, supervisory, or consultative role. If activities include currently enrolled students, the candidate should clarify the nature and scope of student involvement. Reviews of the candidate's RSCA—whether solicited, unsolicited, published, or unpublished—if included in the file by the candidate or submitted appropriately during the open period, shall be evaluated. With regard to candidates in all disciplines and specializations, the evaluation of ongoing, or in-progress RSCA, shall account for the scale and/or duration of the project, and shall take into account peer review indicators of incremental progress such as invitations to present or exhibit; preliminary reviews of drafts; awarding of contracts, grants, or funding, etc. 　RSCA shall be thoroughly documented in the candidate's file.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)

	.	2.2.1 Given the rapidly changing technologies and interdisciplinary nature of media production, media writing, and media scholarship, acceptable and appropriate RSCA endeavors cannot be restricted to a simple, all-inclusive list. The following sections 2.2.1.1 - 2.2.1.3 are meant to provide suggested guidelines and commonplace examples for peer review. Candidates ~~may~~ must demonstrate achievements in ~~more than one~~ one or more of the following three sections.
		
		2.2.1.1 Media Production
		The FEA Department recognizes that creative work in moving-image production consists of products whose forms have a greater variety in length than is found in printed materials. The length of a finished work is significant but not indicative of the effort required to complete it. Additionally, various roles on collaborative media productions typically require different time commitments. Job titles alone do not explain the scope of an individual's contributions to a production. It is therefore imperative that the candidate's narrative clarify and contextualize their work and roles on media productions. It is the candidate's responsibility to explain how their production credit has been determined and justified.
		    If faculty use a creative project as an opportunity to mentor students, it will not be considered a "professional" creative activity if a majority of the cast and primary crew positions are occupied by currently enrolled students. (It could, however, be included in Instructionally-Related Activities.)
		    The FEA Department also recognizes that media production is inherently expensive. It is not uncommon for candidates to seek funding for media productions, which can be a time-consuming but necessary process. The candidate's narrative for media production projects should therefore explain and contextualize their fundraising efforts and acknowledge any grants or funds received.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)

		2.2.1.1 Media Production
		(Continued)
		    Because media production timelines rarely align with academic timelines, it is the candidate's responsibility to explain and document their work and role on productions that have not been distributed or only partially distributed, and provide contextual information regarding the production timeline and distribution plans. The evaluation of ongoing, or in-progress RSCA, shall account for the scale and/or duration of the project, and shall take into account peer review indicators of incremental progress such as invitations to present or exhibit; preliminary reviews of drafts or contracts; awarding of grants or start-up funding, etc.
		    Criteria for creative media production include achievements that are typically subjected to peer review, such as the following non-prioritized examples: juried screenings or presentations; acceptance at competitive film/media festivals; dissemination through and/or exhibition at outlets/venues of recognized merit; productions in which the candidate can document a major creative or managerial role; productions in which the candidate can document a primary craft role; accepted proposals for external funding; judging works submitted for acceptance or award consideration for film/media festivals, industry/guild awards, or conferences; selection for competitive residencies, fellowships, awards, or grants; and/or invitations to speak at scholarly/professional conferences, panels, or events.
		    In their narrative, candidates shall explain, contextualize, and substantiate the quality and distinction of their achievements. For example, film festivals can be of local, regional, national, or international importance, and selection of a film at a festival with a prestigious reputation can be indicative of the quality of the work. Because the reputation of festivals is not static, it is imperative that the candidate provide supporting context about the festival, explain the festival's selection process, and substantiate its distinction.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)

		2.2.1.2 Media Writing
		The FEA Department recognizes that media writing (such as screenplays and other forms of dramatic writing for moving-image productions) has intrinsic value and can receive positive peer review without ever being produced. Scripts selected for production might be chosen for their own merit, but it is equally possible for a script to be produced, optioned, or shelved for reasons pertaining to market forces, changes in industry personnel, etc. A script might also be re-written by someone other than the original writer before it is produced. Furthermore, the timelines of commercial productions are seldom aligned with the schedules of the academic world. Thus the fate of a screenplay is not necessarily a reflection of its quality or the skill with which it was written. Screenplays can nevertheless be disseminated and subjected to peer review as part of the RTP process.
		   Possibilities for the dissemination of faculty media writing projects for peer review include but are not limited to the following non-prioritized examples: awards or honors at juried screenplay competitions; optioning or actual production of scripts by recognized professional production companies (optioning indicates sufficient merit in a script to warrant a commitment); readings by local or regional groups, provided selection of the material is based on jury or panel decision rather than mere proximity to the writer; publication of scripts in whole or in part; and/or selection for competitive writing residencies, writing fellowships, writing awards or grants.
		   The length and number of scripts produced by a candidate often is not indicative of the effort, care, and talent required to write and disseminate them for peer review.
		   Being hired by a recognized professional production company to write an original screenplay or an adaptation from another medium, or to re-write, revise, or consult on a story or script originally written by someone else, also constitutes peer review, whether or not the project is produced.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
		2.2.1.2 Media Writing (continued) (For example, it is common practice for professional screenwriters to receive payment for editorial consultation or "script doctoring" services without receiving screen credit.) In all instances, it is imperative that the candidate's narrative explain, contextualize, and substantiate the quality and distinction of their achievements.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
		2.2.1.3 Media Studies Dissemination and peer review of media studies scholarship is usually accomplished by means of publication; typically, books and articles. The value and importance of a particular book can be determined by the prestige of the publisher, the prepublication comments of peer reviewers, and post-publication reviews in scholarly journals or periodicals devoted to the discipline. Articles are often judged on the reputation of the journal in which they appear; refereed journals are given more weight than non-refereed journals. Journals, refereed or not, are judged on the basis of their reputations, the reputations of their editors and peer evaluators, and their acceptance rate. Invitations to a faculty member to write a journal article or book chapter can be viewed as recognition of that faculty member's status within a specialization. Criteria for media studies include achievements that are typically subjected to peer review such as the following non-prioritized examples: printed or electronically published works (books, book chapters, articles in scholarly or professional journals, and software); delivery of papers or presentations at scholarly/professional conferences, panels, or events; invitations to speak at scholarly/professional conferences, panels, or events; editing a book anthology; editorial assignments with recognized scholarly/professional publications including journals, newsletters, or electronic media; manuscripts for books or articles submitted or under revision; published reviews of books, films, or related moving-image media; reviews of manuscripts for scholarly or textbook publishers; curating or organizing film/media festivals or screenings, writing festival publications or entries, and/or jurying film/media festivals or competitions; appointment to selection panels for external grants, awards, and conference presentations; receiving external grants or fellowships; and

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
		2.2.1.3 Media Studies (Continued) leadership roles in professional organizations that involve outcomes such as conferences or publications. In their narrative, candidates shall explain, contextualize, and substantiate the quality and distinction of their achievements.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
2.3 Service Quality service contributions and activities are necessary to ensure and enhance the quality of programs and activities at the university, in the community, and in the profession. All faculty members are expected to participate in the collegial processes of faculty governance and to maintain active engagement within the university, community, and profession through quality service contributions and activities throughout their career. Meaningful service should be related to the academic expertise and rank of the faculty member. Departments and colleges shall develop their own standards and criteria for the evaluation of quality service. These standards and criteria shall be based in a comparative evaluation of responsibility and commitment across service obligations at the department, college, and university levels. Departments and colleges shall then make clear to the candidate what types of service are appropriate to faculty rank and experience. Examples of service contributions may include, but are not limited to, leadership roles in faculty governance activities and committees; authorship of reports and other materials pertinent to university, college, or department policies and procedures; ongoing advising of student groups; service or leadership activities for professional organizations or boards; conducting external evaluations; and consulting in public schools, local government, and community organizations.	**2.3 Service** The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.3 and adds the following (COTA RTP Policy 2.3 – 2.3.3). Candidates are expected to provide substantive service through engagement in activities necessary to ensure and support the caliber of programs and activities at the university, in the community and in the profession. Departments shall develop their own standards and criteria within university and college guidelines for the evaluation of substantive service. Department policy shall make clear to the candidate what types of service are consistent with the candidate's rank and academic experience, as well as the mission of the department and its instructional programs.	**2.3 Service** The FEA Department concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.3 and COTA RTP Policy 2.3 and adds the following. Service may be contributed to the University, College, Department, or community~~, but it must directly involve the academic expertise of the faculty member~~. The emphases in the evaluation of service shall be on: 1) the quality and significance of the activity, as measured by the degree to which the activity contributes to the mission of the University; and 2) the extent and level of the candidate's involvement. Authorship of documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the University, College, or Department missions or procedures may comprise a service contribution. Sponsoring student organizations and participating in educational equity programs are also service contributions.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
	2.3.1. University Service Faculty service at all levels within the university shall reflect active, reliable, and collegial participation. Examples of substantive university service may include, but are not limited to, leadership roles and participation in faculty governance, serving on committees, supervising and sponsoring student groups; authorship of policies, procedures and protocols, proposals, and other pertinent documents. Service shall be appropriate for the candidate's academic experience and rank. Each candidate's balance of university, college, and department service shall be considered within the context of the candidate's department. It is the candidate's responsibility to clearly account for service contributions in the combined PDS/Narrative. This shall go beyond simply listing committees upon which one has served; specifics as to the role the candidate has played, and the duration and extent of contributions shall be discussed. The candidate's account of service must be clearly substantiated by supplemental documentation. All levels of review shall provide a qualitative context for the candidate's university service.	**2.3.1. University Service** The FEA Department concurs with COTA Policy 2.3.1 and adds the following. Faculty may enhance their service achievements with active involvement on committees at all levels of the University and the CSU system, with emphasis on the department and college levels for assistant professors.
	2.3.2. Professional Service Candidate's service shall demonstrate qualitative contributions to professional organizations and institutions that are appropriate to the candidate's discipline. Examples of substantive professional service may include, but are not limited to participating in professional organizations or boards; serving on juries, conducting external evaluations, interviews, adjudications, speeches and workshops.	**2.3.2 Professional Service** The FEA Department concurs with COTA Policy 2.3.2 and adds the following. In addition to campus governance activities, faculty members may participate in community service to professional arts/media organizations and in professionally related activities (e.g., local, state, national, and/or international levels) through such program-oriented activities as committees; workshops; mentoring; speeches; media interviews, articles, and/or editorials; screenings; and/or displays.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
	2.3.3 Community Service Candidate's service shall be aligned with their discipline and be affiliated with the appropriate community organizations and/or activities.	**2.3.3 Community Service** The FEA Department concurs with COTA Policy 2.3.3 and adds the following. Service to the community may also include consultancies to K-14 schools, local government, and arts community service organizations; and arts advocacy or media literacy initiatives or organizations. Service contributions based on consultancies, whether paid or unpaid, shall be evaluated on the basis of their contributions to the mission of the University and particularly to the candidate's Department. Meaningful service must be clearly related to the academic expertise of the faculty member. **2.3.4 Service Documentation** Specifics and extent of service contributions shall be clearly described and contextualized in the candidate's narrative, and substantiated with supplemental documentation that may include, but shall not be limited to, letters of invitation; letters or memoranda acknowledging the quality of the contribution; and/or copies of reports, policies, printed programs, or other printed materials. When the accomplishment involves additional contributors, a clear explanation and verification of the candidate's specific contribution should be included.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS Participants in the RTP process include the candidate, the department,2 RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, the dean, the Provost, and the President. In addition, there may be external reviewers participating in the RTP process. For details on conducting external evaluations, see the Academic Senate policy on external evaluations. The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) allows faculty, students, academic administrators, and the President to provide information concerning the candidate during the open period. Deliberations on reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be confidential. Access to materials and recommendations pertaining to the candidate shall be limited to the RTP candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, the dean, the Provost, Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel (as an appropriate administrator), and the President (see CBA). In addition, external reviewers, if any, will have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.	**3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS** The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.0 and adds the following. The CSULB RTP Policy specifically defines responsibilities of the candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, the dean, the Provost, and the President in the RTP process. The COTA RTP Policy further defines responsibilities of the candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, and the dean. Within parameters established by the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), the CSULB RTP Policy, and Academic Senate policy on the use of external evaluation in the RTP process, the COTA RTP policy further defines and guides the use of external evaluation within the College of the Arts. For candidates who request consideration for early tenure and/or early promotion, external review shall be requested at the first level (department committee) of RTP review.	**3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS** The FEA Department concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.0 and COTA RTP Policy 3.0.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
3.1 Candidate A candidate for RTP should make every effort to seek advice and guidance from the department chair, particularly regarding the RTP process and procedures and how criteria and standards are applied. The candidate has the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting the evidence of her/his accomplishments. The candidate's documentation must include all required information and supporting materials. Candidate should clearly reference and explain all supporting materials. The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes his or her goals and accomplishments during the period of review, including a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service to the university, community, and/or profession. The candidate shall provide all required supplemental documentation, including summary sheets from student evaluations and an index of all supplementary materials. The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations over the full review period, including candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any.	**3.1 Candidate** The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.1 and adds the following (COTA RTP Policy 3.1 – 3.1.1). For all years when not under a performance review, a probationary faculty member must go through a periodic "mini" review, the only exception being that probationary faculty who are in the first year of appointment, and who received no years of service credit may either go through a periodic review or develop a Professional Development Plan (PDP) in consultation with the Department Chair and Dean. The PDP is not an option under any other circumstances. A department may establish a policy (1) allowing all eligible candidates to choose, in consultation with department chair, to do a periodic review or PDP, or (2) requiring all to do a periodic review, or (3) requiring all to do a PDP. For all periodic reviews <u>and</u> performance reviews (reappointment, tenure, promotion), COTA requires that candidates provide an up-to-date Combined Professional Data Sheet (PDS) and Narrative. The Combined PDS and Narrative shall follow the sequencing established in the most current guidelines for the PDS provided by Faculty Affairs, and shall integrate narrative commentary with lists, bulleted or numbered points within sections of the document. Clarity, organization, and ease of navigation are crucial in the Combined PDS and Narrative, and candidates are encouraged toward concision, but not at the expense of thoroughness. Some activities straddle categories, or could be placed in one or another category. Instructionally related activity and RSCA, for instance, might overlap, or a candidate could have activity that might be considered either RSCA or service. (Continued on next page)	**3.1 Candidate** The FEA Department concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.1 and COTA RTP Policy 3.1 – 3.1.1., and adds the following. Candidates should make every effort to seek advice and guidelines on the RTP process so they understand how criteria and standards are applied. Regular discussions with the Department Chair and experienced colleagues are necessary if candidates are to understand the process and participate in it effectively. .

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
	3.1 Candidate (Continued) While the process should be flexible and open enough to consider both hybrid activity and activity that is not easily categorized, the candidate must make every effort to properly categorize and contextualize activity—decidedly and reasonably placing activity in one category or another, or clearly detailing why an activity might warrant partial consideration in one category as well as partial consideration in another, without in essence taking full credit for an activity in each of more than one categories. For all instances in which a candidate has received assigned time, the candidate must account for what purpose the assigned time was granted, and what work was accomplished utilizing the assigned time. The College of the Arts requires materials specific to the circumstances of candidates' periodic or performance review as specified in the COTA RTP Procedures Document. Departments may require materials as approved by the Dean of the College of the Arts.	
	3.1.1 Committee Request for Clarification of the File If content in a candidate's file is not clearly substantiated, the RTP committee at either level may ask for written clarification from the candidate. If a candidate is asked to provide further documentation/clarification at any point in the review process, the candidate must provide precisely what is requested and may not use this request as an opportunity to expand the file contents beyond the specific request. If request for clarification is made at the college level, the department RTP committee shall be notified of both the request and the candidate's response, and the file shall be returned to the department RTP committee for review, evaluation, and comment before the college committee resumes its review process.	

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
3.2 Department RTP Policy The department shall develop and articulate specific standards and criteria to be applied in the evaluation of candidates in all three areas of evaluation. Department standards shall not be lower than college-level standards. The department RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary department faculty members and to approval by the college faculty council, the dean, and the Provost. Department RTP policies shall be subject to regular review by the department's tenured and probationary faculty.	**3.2 Department RTP Policy** The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.2 and adds the following. Each department within the College of the Arts shall develop a department-level RTP policy. Department policies must align with university and college RTP policies, and comply with the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). The department RTP policy shall define clear standards for achievement and contribution in the three areas of (1) instruction and instructionally related activities, (2) RSCA, and (3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession. The department RTP policy shall provide clear examples of forms of evidence a candidate may present to substantiate and provide context for instruction and instructionally related activities, RSCA and related peer review, and service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession.	**3.2 Department RTP Policy** The FEA Department concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.2 and COTA RTP Policy 3.2.
	3.2.1 Department RTP Procedures Document Each department shall create a document detailing specific departmental RTP procedures. These procedures may not supersede or impede upon the RTP process as defined in university and college RTP policy and university and college RTP procedures documents, and may not conflict with Academic Senate policy or the CBA. Department RTP Procedures documents shall be reviewed regularly and updated by the department chair and an appropriate faculty advisory committee, and shall be approved by the Dean.	**3.2.1 Department RTP Policy** The FEA Department concurs with COTA RTP Policy 3.2.1.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
3.3 Department RTP Committee The department RTP committee has the primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's work and makes the initial recommendation to the college RTP committee regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Department RTP committee members are responsible for analyzing critically the candidate's performance by applying the criteria of the department. The tenured and probationary faculty of a department elect representatives to the department's RTP committee. The Collective Bargaining Agreement restricts membership on RTP committees to tenured, full-time faculty members. The CBA also states that faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on RTP committees if requested by the majority vote of tenured and probationary faculty members of the department and approved by the President. However, RTP committees may not be made up solely of faculty participating in the FERP. No one individual may participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.	**3.3 Department RTP Committee** The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.3 and adds the following. All candidates shall be reviewed by a committee of three or five members of appropriate rank; a full-time tenured faculty member is eligible to serve on RTP committees, provided that, in promotion reviews, the faculty member is of a rank equal to or higher than the candidate's sought rank. As necessary, departments may elect RTP committee members from other departments within the university, but only after every effort has been made to fill roles on the department committee and fulfill the obligation to provide a representative to the COTA RTP committee with faculty from the department.	**3.3 Department RTP Committee** The FEA Department concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.3 and COTA RTP Policy 3.3, and adds the following. Faculty may, if elected, serve on the Department RTP Committee for consecutive terms.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
3.4 Department Chair The department chair is responsible for communicating the department, college, and university policies to candidates. The chair also provides ongoing guidance to candidates as to whether their performance is consistent with department expectations. The chair, in collaboration with college or department mentors, is responsible for talking with candidates about their overall career development and providing professional mentoring. The chair shall meet with the department RTP committee prior to the beginning of the department evaluation process to review the department, college, and university processes and procedures. Department chairs may write independent evaluations of all RTP candidates unless the department chair is elected to the department RTP committee. However, in promotion considerations, a department chair must have a higher rank than the candidate being considered for promotion in order to contribute a review or participate on a review committee. In no case may a department chair participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.	**3.4 Department Chair** The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.4.	**3.4 Department Chair** The FEA Department defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.4.
3.5 College RTP Policy The college RTP policy shall specify in writing the standards to be applied in evaluating candidates in all three areas of evaluation, consistent with university and college missions. The college RTP policy shall ensure consistency of standards across the college. Colleges have the responsibility for setting forth the standards appropriate to the breadth of disciplines in the college. College RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary college faculty members and to approval by the dean and the Provost. College RTP policy shall be subject to regular review by the tenured and probationary faculty of the college.	**3.5 College RTP Policy** The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.5 and adds the following. The College of the Arts RTP Policy is intended to uphold university standards and processes, and set general college standards and processes while providing a framework within which departments may establish standards and processes that reasonably fit their disciplines and departmental cultures.	**3.5 College RTP Policy** The FEA Department concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.5 and COTA RTP Policy 3.5.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
	3.5.1 College RTP Procedures Document The Dean, in consultation with faculty as represented by the COTA Faculty Council and COTA Executive Committee (Department Chairs), shall create a document detailing specific college RTP procedures. These procedures may not supersede or impede upon the RTP process as defined in university RTP policy and procedures documents, and may not conflict with Academic Senate policy or the CBA. The COTA RTP Procedures Document shall be reviewed regularly and updated by the Dean, in consultation with the Faculty Council and Executive Committee.	**3.5.1 College RTP Procedures Document** The FEA Department concurs with COTA RTP Policy 3.5.1.
3.6 College RTP Committee The college RTP committee reviews the materials submitted by the candidate as well as the department RTP committee and department chair evaluations and recommendations. The college RTP committee evaluates the candidate's file in accordance with standards established in the department, college, and university RTP policies. The college RTP committee shall ensure that fair and consistent evaluation occurs at the department and college levels according to the standards set by the department and college RTP documents. The college RTP committee shall take into serious account the department's specific standards for evaluating the candidate. The college committee prepares and forwards an independent recommendation to the college dean.	**3.6 College RTP Committee** The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.6 and adds the following. A full-time tenured faculty member is eligible to serve on RTP committees, provided that, in promotion reviews, the faculty member is of a rank equal to or higher than the candidate's sought rank. The COTA RTP Committee shall (1) whenever possible include one representative from every department in the college, and (2) whenever possible be comprised entirely of faculty eligible to review all files under review. These two goals supersede any other obligations for faculty to serve in the RTP review process except when a department has only one faculty member eligible to review all candidates in the department.	**3.6 College RTP Committee** The FEA Department concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.6 and COTA RTP Policy 3.6.
3.7 Dean of the College The dean has a unique role to play in providing oversight and guidance in the RTP process within the college. The dean mentors department chairs regarding their role in the RTP process, encourages departments to develop and clarify their expectations for faculty performance, provides clear guidance to the college RTP committee, and ensures that all evaluations are carried out in accordance with department, college, and university policies. The dean ensures that standards across the college are maintained.	**3.7 Dean of the College** The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.7.	**3.7 Dean of the College** The FEA Department defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.7.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
3.8 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs The Provost provides oversight for the university's RTP process, establishes the annual calendar of the RTP cycle, provides training for committees, chairs, and deans, and distributes relevant information to prospective candidates, chairs, deans, and members of college and department RTP committees. The Provost shall review the candidate's file, including all prior evaluations, and make a final recommendation.	**3.8 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs** The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.8.	**3.8 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs** The FEA Department defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.8.
3.9 President The President has the authority to make final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President may delegate this authority to the Provost.	**3.9 President** The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.9	**3.9 President** The FEA Department defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.9.
4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS All tenured and probationary faculties undergo performance review and evaluation.3 Probationary faculty members are evaluated each year. During years when the candidate is not being reviewed for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, the candidate will undergo periodic review. Tenured faculty members are evaluated every five (5) years. The following timelines apply to candidates who are appointed at the rank of assistant professor with no service credit; actual timelines may vary according to level of appointment and service credit.	**4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS** The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.0 – 4.3, and to all RTP deadlines established by Faculty Affairs.	**4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS** The FEA Department defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.0 – 4.3, and to all RTP deadlines established by Faculty Affairs.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
4.1 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Reappointment In the first year and second years of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic review. The periodic review provides the candidate with feedback on progress toward tenure. The periodic review is conducted by the department RTP committee, the department chair, and the college dean. In the third year of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a reappointment review. Successful candidates are reappointed for one, two, or three years.		
4.2 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Tenure and Promotion In the first and second years of reappointment (or fourth and fifth years of continuous service), the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic or reappointment review, as appropriate. In the third year of reappointment (or the sixth year of continuous service) the annual evaluation takes the form of a tenure review, which may also be a review for promotion. A probationary faculty member may request consideration for early tenure and promotion prior to the scheduled sixth year review. This process is discussed under Section 5.5.		
4.3 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion An associate professor becomes eligible for promotion review to full professor in the fifth year at the associate rank. A tenured associate professor may seek early promotion to full professor prior to the fifth year in rank. This process is discussed further under Section 5.5. A tenured faculty member may choose not to be evaluated for promotion in a given year; however, the faculty member will still be required to undergo the five-year periodic evaluation of tenured faculty as outlined in a separate Academic Senate policy document.		

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will be evaluated in all three areas: 1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service.	**5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA** The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.0.	**5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA** The FEA Department concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 5.0 – 5.5.2 and COTA RTP Policy 5.0 – 5.5.2.
5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty The candidate must have completed at least one periodic evaluation and must demonstrate that he/she is making significant progress towards tenure. Based upon criteria established by the department and the college, a candidate for reappointment must show evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation. The candidate for reappointment is expected to demonstrate effective teaching responsive to the learning needs of CSULB's diverse students and to the university's educational mission. The candidate is expected to show progress in his or her program of ongoing RSCA and to have produced initial scholarly and creative achievements. The candidate is expected to have made service contributions primarily at the departmental or program level and consistent with departmental and college service expectations.	**5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty** The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.1 and adds the following. At any level of RTP review in the College of the Arts, in order to recommend a candidate for reappointment, reviewers must determine that the candidate has met all university and college standards, and that the candidate has met department-defined standards in each of the three areas of review: (1) instruction and instructionally related activities, (2) RSCA, and (3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession.	

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
5.2 Awarding of Tenure The awarding of tenure represents the university's long-term commitment to a faculty member and is granted when the candidate has demonstrated the ability to make ongoing and increasingly distinguished professional contributions to the university and to the profession. Tenure is based on a candidate demonstrating a sustained record of high quality over multiple years and evidence leading to the belief that a candidate will continue being productive. Tenure is not based solely on the quantity of scholarly output, courses taught, or committees on which one has served. The candidate must present evidence of meeting the required tenure criteria in all three areas of evaluation as established in the RTP policies of the department, college, and the university. For review of an assistant professor, tenure and promotion to associate professor normally are awarded together.	**5.2 Awarding of Tenure** The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.2 and adds the following. At any level of RTP review in the College of the Arts, in order to recommend a candidate for tenure, reviewers must determine that the candidate has met all university and college standards, has demonstrated superior performance in at least one of the three areas of review, and has met department-defined standards in all remaining areas of review.	
5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor An associate professor is expected to be an excellent teacher who is highly effective in the classroom, fosters quality learning experiences, and is responsive to the needs of CSULB's diverse students and to the university's educational mission. At this rank, the faculty member is expected to have a successful and ongoing program of RSCA. The candidate is expected to have produced high-quality peer-reviewed work, which contributes to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is expected to have made high-quality service contributions to the university or the expanded community.	**5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor** The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.3 and adds the following. At any level of RTP review in the College of the Arts, in order to recommend a candidate for promotion to Associate Professor, reviewers must determine that the candidate has met all university and college standards, has demonstrated superior performance in at least the area of instruction and instructionally related activities, and has met department-defined standards in all remaining areas of review.	

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor Standards for promotion to full professor shall be higher than standards for promotion to associate professor. A full professor is expected to demonstrate a consistent record of excellence in teaching, student engagement, and curricular development. The successful candidate will have a proven program of RSCA that includes high quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is expected to have disseminated a substantial body of peer-reviewed work at the national or international levels. In addition, a full professor shall have provided significant service and leadership at the university and in the community or the profession.	**5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor** The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.4 and adds the following. At any level of RTP review in the College of the Arts, in order to recommend a candidate for promotion to full Professor, reviewers must determine that the candidate has met all university and college standards, has demonstrated superior performance in the area of instruction and instructionally related activities, and superior performance in at least one additional area of review, and has met department-defined standards in any remaining area of review.	
5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion A potential candidate should receive initial guidance from the department chair and dean regarding the criteria and expectations for early tenure and early promotion. Early tenure and early promotion are granted only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons. Assistant professors may apply for early promotion, early tenure, or both. A candidate applying for early tenure is expected to meet all criteria for early promotion to associate professor. 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.	**5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion** The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.	

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
5.5.1 Early Tenure Early tenure may be granted in rare cases when a candidate demonstrates a record of distinction in all three areas and superior accomplishments significantly beyond what is expected for tenure on the standard six-year timeline. The candidate's record must establish compelling evidence of distinction in all areas and must inspire confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue. In addition, candidates for early tenure are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the Academic Senate policy on external evaluation.	**5.5.1 Early Tenure** The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.1. .	
5.5.2 Early Promotion In order to receive a favorable recommendation for early promotion to associate professor or full professor, a candidate must achieve a record of distinction in all three areas of evaluation that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements established in the department and college policies. In addition, candidates for early promotion are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the Academic Senate policy on external evaluation. 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.	**5.5.2 Early Promotion** The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.2. .	

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS 6.1 The Division of Academic Affairs determines the timelines for the RTP process, including deadlines for the submission of the candidate's materials, dates for the open period, completion of all RTP reviews by all review levels, and final decision notification to the candidate. The deadlines for notification of final actions shall be consistent with the requirements of the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).	**6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS** The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.0 – 6.9, and to all RTP deadlines established by Faculty Affairs. Departments may develop steps that are clearly defined, reasonable, relevant, appropriate, and timely, and that do not supersede or impede steps defined in the CSULB RTP Policy. Candidate rebuttal documents shall be limited to a written reply to the committee and shall not involve the addition of other materials or documents, or information not immediately relevant to those parts of the committee report being rebutted.	**6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS** The FEA Department defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.0 – 6.9, and to all RTP deadlines established by Faculty Affairs.
6.2 The Division of Academic Affairs notifies all faculty members of their eligibility for review and specifies items required to be provided by all candidates.		
6.3 Departments shall post in the department office a list of candidates being considered for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, following timelines and guidelines for the open period provided by the Office of Academic Affairs and consistent with the requirements of the CBA. A copy of all information submitted shall be provided to the candidate. The department RTP committee chair prepares an index of the materials submitted during the open period to be included in the candidate's file.		
6.4 Candidates prepare materials for review and deliver them to the department RTP committee by the deadline.		
6.5 The department RTP committee reviews the candidate's materials and, using the standard university form, provides a written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.		
6.6 The department chair, if eligible and if not an elected member of the department RTP committee, reviews the candidate's materials and may provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.		

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
6.7 The college RTP committee reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.		
6.8 The dean reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the Provost by the deadline.		
6.9 The Provost reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the President. The President has the authority to make final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President (or Provost as designee) notifies the candidate of the final decision regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion by the deadline.		
7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES 7.1 Prior to the final decision, candidates for promotion may withdraw without prejudice from consideration at any level of review (see CBA). This provision also applies to candidates for early tenure.	**7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES** 7.1 The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.1.	**7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES** 7.1 The FEA Department defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.1 – 7.4.
7.2 If, at any time during the review process, the absence of required evaluation documents is discovered, the RTP package shall be returned to the level at which the requisite documentation should have been provided. Such materials shall be provided in a timely manner.	7.2 The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.2.	
7.3 At each level of review, the candidate shall be given a copy of the recommendation, which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation, before the recommendation is forwarded to the next review level. The candidate shall have the right to provide a rebuttal/response in writing no later than ten (10) calendar days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all of the candidate's rebuttal/responses shall accompany the RTP package and also be sent to any previous review levels.	7.3 The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.3.	

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
7.4 The candidate or evaluators at each level of review may request an external evaluation, consistent with Academic Senate policy on external evaluations.	7.4 The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.4.	

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY Changes to CSULB RTP procedures may occur as a result of changes to the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Additionally, campus administrators may make certain procedural changes to accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs. In general, changes to procedures do not require a vote by the faculty. The tenured and probationary faculty of CSULB, voting by secret ballot (with pro and con arguments attached), may amend the policy and evaluation criteria section of this document. Amendments may be proposed either by the following: (1) A direct faculty action via petition from ten percent (10%) of the tenured and tenure- track faculty to the chair of the Academic Senate. (2) By action of the Academic Senate. Proposed amendments shall be submitted for discussion at a public hearing for the faculty called within fifteen (15) instructional days following their receipt and shall be distributed by the chair of the Academic Senate to the faculty at least five (5) instructional days before the public hearing. Amendments to this document shall become effective when they have received a favorable vote of a majority of the tenured and probationary faculty voting in a secret ballot conducted by the Academic Senate within twenty (20) instructional days of the public hearing and they have the concurrence of the University President. Effective: Fall 2009 NOTES: 1 Every effort has been made to ensure compliance with the Unit 3 (Faculty) Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). However, this document should not be considered as a substitute for those parts of the Agreement that affect RTP matters..	**8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY** The College of the Arts defers to any and all changes to CSULB RTP procedures that may occur as a result of changes to the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), as well as procedural changes made by campus administrators to accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs.	**8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY** The FEA Department defers to any and all changes to CSULB RTP procedures that may occur as a result of changes to the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), as well as procedural changes made by campus administrators to accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY (Continued) 2 Throughout this document, the designation 'department' applies also to 'program' or an equivalent unit in a non-instructional area whose employees are considered to be faculty under the provisions of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement. Thus, unit heads and directors are the equivalent of department chairs. 3 Evaluation of lecturers is not covered in this policy; see the Academic Personnel website and the Policy on Range Elevation for Lecturers. The dean of the college shall review the candidate's file, including all prior evaluations, and provide an independent recommendation to the Provost based upon the three areas of evaluation listed earlier.		

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
	8.0.1 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE COTA RTP POLICY The tenured and probationary faculty of the College of the Arts, voting by secret ballot (with pro and con arguments attached), may amend the policy and evaluation criteria section of this document. Amendments may be proposed either by the following: (1) A direct faculty action via petition from ten percent (10%) of the tenured and tenure- track faculty of the college to the Dean of the College of the Arts. (2) By action of the COTA Faculty Council. Proposed amendments shall be submitted for discussion at a public hearing for the faculty called within fifteen (15) instructional days following their receipt and shall be distributed by the chair of the Faculty Council to the faculty at least five (5) instructional days before the public hearing. Amendments to this document shall become effective when they have received a favorable vote of a majority of the tenured and probationary COTA faculty voting in a secret ballot conducted by the Faculty Council within twenty (20) instructional days of the public hearing and they have the concurrence of the COTA Dean and University President or designee.	**8.0.1 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE COTA RTP POLICY** The FEA Department concurs with COTA Policy 8.0.1.

CSULB RTP POLICY	COTA RTP POLICY (final 2010-03-23)	FEA Department RTP Policy (rev 2017-05-10)
	8.0.2 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT RTP POLICY The faculty of each department in the COTA shall develop a departmental procedure for amending their document to be included in the departmental RTP document. The procedure, and any amendments, must be approved by the COTA Faculty Council, the Dean and the President or designee.	**8.0.2 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT RTP POLICY** The FEA Department concurs with COTA Policy 8.0.2, and adds the following. Proposed amendments to the FEA Department RTP document shall be submitted for discussion at a faculty meeting of tenured and probationary Department faculty. To become effective, the proposed amendment must receive a favorable vote, by secret ballot, of a majority of Department tenured and probationary faculty, and must be approved by the COTA Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost.
Effective: Fall 2009	Effective: Fall 2010	Effective: Fall 2017