

POLICY ON RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION
A COLLEGE OF THE ARTS
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

I. PREAMBLE

The mission of the College of the Arts is to provide and applied/scholarly instructional program of the highest quality to foster intellectual and creative development, technique and aesthetics for its students in the arts, and pedagogy for those preparing for teaching careers. Recognized professional artists and scholars engaged in scholarly and creative work to enhance their excellence in teaching are necessary to fulfill that commitment. The College encourages faculty in mutually supportive departments to value all aspects of faculty involvement in the College and its mission.

This document defines the standards for teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service by which the RTP candidate will be judged. This document specifies both the essential and enhancing criteria that are expected for a positive recommendation at the College level of the RTP process. Colleagues within the departments have the primary responsibility for evaluating the work of College faculty and for making the expected standards clear to those being evaluated.

The College of the Arts considers one of its primary strengths to be a faculty which is made up of highly skilled practicing artists and scholars. This document is designed to embrace the diversity of areas of specialization and teaching assignments found within the College, and to support the work of each faculty member within the context of his/her position, as well as within traditional and non-traditional definitions of 'scholarly and creative' activity.

II. RESPONSIBILITIES AND PROCEDURES

A. General Responsibilities

1. At all levels of review, those responsible for evaluating faculty and recommending actions shall provide a thoughtful and constructive assessment in RTP evaluations and recommendations of the Working RTP Personnel Action File. Each candidate shall be evaluated with clear and specific reference to RTP Policies and Procedures, and provided with acknowledgment of areas of superior performance, areas of deficiencies, and in retention cases, clear expectations for performance necessary for positive future personnel decisions. Recommendations at each level of review, and the decision, shall be supported by and include that level's written evaluation.
2. Personnel evaluations, recommendations, and decisions shall be based solely on information in the candidate's Working RTP Personnel Action File. Evaluations and recommendations at all levels of review, as well as final decisions, shall be based upon the same information, with no additions nor subtractions between levels of review. If the file is incomplete, and additional information is requested at any level of review, the file shall be returned to the Department level for additions to the file, and shall be reviewed and evaluated at every level, affording the opportunity for revising, amending or substituting recommendations.
3. At every level of review, evaluation and recommendations shall be forwarded within the established deadlines. Should deadlines pass prior to evaluation and recommendation at any level, the Working RTP Personnel Action File shall be automatically transferred to the next level of review.

B. Candidate

The Candidate has the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting the evidence of her/his accomplishments to those charged with the responsibility of reviewing and evaluating the faculty member. Candidates should make every effort to seek advice and guidance on the RTP process. Regular discussions with department chairs and experienced colleagues are necessary so that candidates will understand the process and participate in it effectively.

1. Candidate Responses and Rebuttals

- a. The candidate shall have the opportunity (seven days, as provided by the Collective Bargaining Agreement) to include in the Working RTP Personnel Action File a written response/rebuttal to the evaluations and recommendations by the Department Chairperson and/or by the Department RTP Committee prior to forwarding the file to the College-level review.
- b. The candidate shall have the opportunity (seven days, as provided by the CBA) to include in the Working RTP Personnel Action File a written response/rebuttal to the evaluations and recommendations by the Dean and/or by the College RTP Committee prior to forwarding the file to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

2. Working RTP Personnel Action File

The candidate shall, with Department assistance, assemble a Working RTP Personnel Action File that meets the requirements of RTP Policies and Procedures within the established deadlines.

a. The Working RTP Personnel Action File shall include:

- (1) Copies of the RTP Policies and Procedures.
- (2) In Tenure Cases, all evaluations, recommendations, and decisions from all levels of review for all previous periodic evaluations and performance reviews within the period of evaluation. The candidate may include a statement that explains how the candidate has addressed deficiencies or weaknesses noted in previous evaluations and reviews.
- (3) In Promotion Cases, all evaluations, recommendations, and decisions from all levels of review for all previous periodic evaluations and performance reviews since the last promotion. The candidate may include a statement that explains how the candidate has addressed deficiencies or weaknesses noted in previous evaluations.
- (4) A Professional Data Sheet (PDS). For retention or tenure decisions, the PDS must clearly delineate materials chronologically since the beginning of the probationary period, including any years of prior service credit. For promotion decisions, the PDS must clearly delineate material chronologically since the last promotion to (or appointment at) current rank. The PDS must show the years when all higher degrees were granted, the year of appointment (starting semester) to a tenure-track position at CSULB, effective date of tenure at CSULB if any, and effective date of promotion at CSULB if any.
- (5) Video tapes, programs, catalogues and/or all other appropriate documentation of creative activities, and copies of all publications listed in the PDS, clearly delineating those that are professionally reviewed and/or peer-reviewed and those that are not.
- (6) Appropriate documentation of all creative activities in progress and copies of all working papers, manuscripts, and other unpublished scholarly papers listed in the PDS.
- (7) Copies of course syllabi; examples of assignments, tests, other student assessment material, and other course material listed in the PDS.

- (8) Tabulated summary of student evaluations of all courses taught since last review, or since first semester of teaching in the case of probationary faculty.
- (9) Distributions of student evaluation scores for the candidate, Department, and College for the period subject to RTP review. These distributions shall be compiled chronologically and by course level. This information is to be supplied by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- (10) Grade distributions for the candidate, Department, and College for the period subject to RTP review. These distributions shall be compiled chronologically and by course level. This information is to be supplied by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- (11) Copies of additional evidence that the candidate wishes to be considered. (For example, other teaching assessment by students. The method of collecting, designing, and approving such teaching assessments, if any, shall be included in the Department RTP Document and/or candidate's statement.)
- (12) Evidence collected and entered into the file during the open period.
- (13) The previous RTP evaluations, recommendations, and reasons for the recommendations from the higher levels of review.
- (14) The candidate's written narrative(s), as specified in section III.B.b. of the University Policy on RTP.

C. Department

The Department is responsible for defining in writing its mission and goals as they relate to faculty contributions so that candidates understand what is expected of them as members of that faculty. Within the context of University and College policies, Departments must determine and articulate the criteria and standards which they wish to have applied in the evaluation of candidates. They should also be prepared to advise and support candidates in their efforts to develop as teachers, scholars, artists, and members of the University community. The Department is responsible for maintaining the open file as specified in the Memorandum of Understanding, and for forwarding its contents to the Department Committee, and a copy of its contents to the candidate.

Department RTP Documents. Department Documents shall specify those activities considered appropriate as "scholarly and creative" activities for the discipline, and shall stipulate the standards to be applied in evaluating these activities at each step of the RTP process. Department RTP Documents shall also stipulate procedures for peer review.

Department RTP Documents are subject to ratification by a majority of tenured and probationary department faculty members voting, and to approval by the College Faculty Council and College Dean. Department RTP Documents shall be subject to regular review by the department faculty in order to keep them consistent with the department's mission and the current state of the discipline.

1. The Department RTP Committee

- a. The Department RTP Committee has the primary responsibility for evaluating the work of the candidates in all areas and makes the initial recommendation to the University regarding retention, tenure and promotion. Committee members, therefore, have the very serious responsibility of applying the criteria and standards of the department to the performance of their colleagues in the RTP process. Department Committees are also the primary means by which the professional standards and practices of individual academic disciplines are communicated to other levels of review outside of the department.

- b. Although the candidate has the basic responsibility for providing the evidence of her/his performance to be evaluated, the Department Committee may request additional information from the candidate to assist in its evaluation. Department Committees may also seek the advice of colleagues at other universities if members do not feel qualified to evaluate the professional work of candidates or if candidates believe that such consultation would be desirable. Such an action must be taken in consultation with the candidate, consistent with the University Procedure for External Evaluators.
 - c. Department committee shall be responsible for peer evaluation of classroom teaching. The Department RTP Document shall specify the Department's standards for classroom visits. If a Department has not specified such procedures, the following procedure shall be used. Each year during the candidate's probationary term and during the semester that the candidate is being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion, each candidate shall have a minimum of two classroom visits from at least two members of the Department RTP Committee. The results of the class observations will be incorporated in the Department RTP Committee's evaluation of the candidate.
2. Committee Membership
- a. Each Department shall elect an RTP Committee of at least three members who are full-time tenure-track faculty of the Department with the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, excluding candidates for promotion, elected by a majority vote from among the tenure-track faculty.
 - b. Faculty ineligible to serve on a Department RTP Committee include those in the following categories: members of the College RTP Committee, faculty on full-time leave in any semester, and those participating the Faculty Early Retirement Program and Faculty Early Retirement Program and Pre-Retirement Reduction in Time Base Program.
 - c. Members of the Department RTP Committee who participate in promotion decisions must have higher rank than the candidate. All members of the Department RTP Committee must participate in decision-making.
 - d. All recommendations for retention, tenure, or promotion to a given rank shall be considered by only one Department RTP Committee in a given year.
 - e. Members of Department RTP Committees shall normally be from that Department, unless the Department has insufficient numbers of faculty to meet the requirements of the above paragraphs. If insufficient numbers of eligible faculty are elected, the College RTP Committee, in consultation with the Department faculty, shall nominate additional members from related disciplines, and the Department shall elect sufficient numbers in accordance with the above paragraphs.
3. The Department Chair has a number of responsibilities, particularly with regard to probationary faculty, that require him/her to be the primary source of information regarding department procedures and deadlines. But the Chair must also provide guidance to candidates over time as to whether their performance is consistent with department expectations. The Chair must initiate collegial discussions with candidates about their overall career development and provide professional mentoring, as appropriate. At a minimum, Chairs must meet probationary faculty members, and candidates for tenure and promotion at least once a year to discuss performance. Chairs have the responsibility for providing all faculty, and newly hired faculty upon appointment, copies of the University, College and Department RTP Documents.

Chairs also have the option of writing an independent evaluation of RTP candidates under the provisions of the current Memorandum of Understanding. They should consult the University document for the appropriate procedures to be followed. If a Department Chair chooses to write an independent evaluation for any candidate, he/she may not serve on either the Department or College RTP Committee.

D. The College

1. College RTP Committees

The College RTP Committee reviews the materials submitted by the candidate and, considering the Department recommendations and applying the standards of the College RTP Document to the candidate's file, forwards its own independent recommendation via the College Dean to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Note: Currently (Spring 1997), in cases of promotion and reappointment, the file does not go to the Vice President unless there are conflicting recommendations. The final determination is made by the Dean when all recommendations are in agreement. It is the committee's responsibility to apply the criteria and standards of the College RTP Document to all department recommendations and to ensure consistency of standards across the College as a whole. College Committees may also seek the advice of external evaluators, consistent with the University Policy on External Evaluators.

2. College RTP Committee Membership

- a. The College RTP Committee will be elected during the previous spring semester.
- b. There shall be one tenured, full professor from each department. Members will serve staggered two-year terms and may not be re-elected for consecutive terms. Members of the College RTP Committee shall be elected by secret ballot in each department and must receive a majority of votes cast in the department. Nominations shall be made at a duly convened department meeting called by the chair.
- c. If committee member(s) resign or otherwise leave vacant an unexpired term of office, elections shall be held as in the original elections for the committee.
- d. A convening chair shall be appointed by the Dean immediately upon completion of elections. A chairperson shall be elected by the committee.
- e. The College RTP Committee shall inform departments regarding deadlines, dossiers, and other matters.
- f. Faculty who serve on the College RTP Committee must have the rank of professor, be full time and have tenure. A member may not serve on both the College and Department Committees concurrently.

3. The Dean

- a. The Dean of the College performs an evaluative role parallel to that of the College Committee and forwards an independent recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Dean may also seek the advice of external evaluators consistent with the University Policy on External Evaluators. Note: Currently (Spring 1977), in cases of promotion and reappointment, the file does not go to the Vice President unless there are conflicting recommendations. The final determination is made by the Dean when all recommendations are in agreement.
- b. The Dean shall confer with the College RTP Committee prior to making a recommendation that differs with the recommendation of the College RTP Committee in order to examine and discuss the evidence in the RTP File and the reasons for the recommendation.

- c. The Dean has additional responsibilities associated with her/his leadership of the College. The Dean shall provide general oversight of the RTP process within the College, assisting and instructing Department Chairs in their role, and encouraging departments to develop and clarify their expectations for faculty performance. The Dean should also discuss the process and its requirements with candidates early in their careers and at regular intervals thereafter.

III. CRITERIA AND EVALUATION

A. Criteria. The criteria for evaluation for each of the three areas of professional review (Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Professional Service) are divided into two distinct categories: Essential Criteria and Enhancing Criteria. Essential Criteria describe the nature and level of performance required of all faculty in the College of The Arts. Enhancing Criteria establish standards by which faculty, following diverse career paths, are evaluated beyond the Essential Criteria. 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.

1. Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities. This category 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.
 - a. Essential Criteria: Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated by peer evaluation of instruction and related activities during the period subject to RTP review in 6 areas: (1) Pedagogy and Method; (2) Course Preparation; (3) Expertise, Education and Experience; (4) Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher; (5) Ongoing Professional Development in the Discipline; and (6) Other Criteria as appropriate per department.
 - (1) Pedagogy and Method shall be assessed by the candidate's ability:
 - (a) To impart information in a clear and effective manner;
 - (b) To facilitate class productivity appropriate to the level and purpose of the course;
 - (c) To establish an environment conducive to exploration, critical thinking and the development of creativity;
 - (d) To establish grading practices compatible with department, College, and university guidelines;
 - (e) To maintain high academic standards;
 - (f) To use appropriate methods of assessment;
 - (g) To critique/evaluate student work.
 - (2) Course Preparation:
 - (a) Course syllabi should be organized, complete and consistent with work produced in class;
 - (b) Course requirements should include a reasonable amount of work consistent with course goals and objectives;
 - (c) Examinations should be fair, thorough, and evaluate knowledge and skills of the student;
 - (d) Course preparation should demonstrate the implementation of current resource materials and technology where appropriate;
 - (e) Course assignments should be well-structured.
 - (3) Expertise, education and experience relevant to courses taught shall be reflected in the Professional Data Sheet (PDS). For retention or tenure, the PDS must clearly delineate material chronologically since the beginning of the probationary

period, including any years of prior service credit. For promotion decisions, the PDS must clearly delineate material chronologically since the last promotion.

- (4) Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher. The candidate should show evidence of a continuous pattern of successful teaching and student learning.
 - (5) Ongoing Professional Development in the Discipline. Candidates should maintain a challenging and current approach to the presentation of course materials, incorporating the candidate's scholarly and creative activities into the classroom, course materials, and teaching methods where appropriate.
 - (6) Other Criteria as appropriate per department.
- b. Enhancing Criteria. Faculty may demonstrate numerous ways to enhance their teaching effectiveness. The following are representative but not exhaustive, examples:
- (1) Student Activities such as field trips or sponsorship of student organizations;
 - (2) Academic advising (additional to assignment), student mentoring, recruitment and retention activities;
 - (3) Supervision of student research projects and/or theses;
 - (4) Curriculum Development;
 - (5) Innovative approaches to teaching, and exemplary ways of fostering student
 - (6) Teaching seminars or pedagogical workshops.
- c. Sources of Evidence. The working RTP Personnel File shall include:
- (1) Essential Criteria
 - (a) Candidates should address the criteria in narrative form as with brevity and clarity, appropriate and as specified in section III.B.1.b. of the University Policy on RTP.
 - (b) Candidates should include course syllabi, a summary of grading practices and other relevant course materials, and student evaluations for all classes taught during the period of evaluation.
 - (c) Peer review should be an integral part of the retention, tenure and promotion process and shall address clarity, communication with students, student interaction, effective use of class time, and appropriateness of course materials. Teaching should be evaluated in the context of the course objectives in the syllabus and the candidate's written narrative.
 - (d) While all available sources of evidence will be considered in all areas, assessment will be based on the following: effective teaching as evaluated by peer review, student evaluations, course preparation, and materials; expertise, education and experience as evidenced in the candidate's PDS; ongoing professional development as a teacher and in the discipline as demonstrated by appropriate narratives.
 - (2) Enhancing Criteria
Candidates should address these criteria in the narrative as appropriate, including relevant supporting evidence.
2. Scholarly and Creative Activities.
- a. Essential Criteria: Faculty are required to maintain professional currency by being engaged in an ongoing program of scholarship and/or creative activity in the discipline. All faculty are required to produce scholarly and/or creative achievements which contribute to the advancement of the discipline (or interdisciplinary studies), as recognized by professional peer review.
 - b. Enhancing Criteria: Faculty may enhance their scholarly and creative achievement with substantial records 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, and products, exhibits, designs, and performances.

The College of the Arts also strongly encourages appropriate members to be faculty whose teaching assignments are in the area of their creative activity.

Other activities may be judged to enhance faculty scholarly and creative achievement so long as these are peer reviewed and recognized, are disseminated to appropriate professional audiences, are appropriate to the mission of the department and College, and make significant contributions to the discipline or to interdisciplinary studies.

3. Professional Service

Professional service may be contributed to the University, to the community, or to the discipline, and must directly relate to the teaching expertise of the faculty member. It must be consistent with the mission of the College as well as the candidate's department or program.

Some activities may be difficult to classify as either "Professional Service" or "Creative and Scholarly Activity." In such cases, the candidate should define the expertise required for that activity. (For example, presenting a paper or a workshop at a professional conference would be considered Scholarly and/or Creative Activity, while serving as an organizer of that conference would normally be considered professional service.)

At various times during a candidate's career, the balance of Professional Service to Teaching and to Scholarly and Creative Activity may change. The process of evaluation at all levels of review should take into consideration the candidate's pursuit of new interests as well as the candidate's departmental mission.

a. Essential Criteria:

All faculty are expected to participate regularly and actively in the collegial process of faculty governance, as well as in appropriate professional organizations and/or activities.

b. Enhancing Criteria:

Faculty may enhance their service achievements with active involvement on committees at all levels of the University and the University system, with emphasis upon the departmental and school levels for assistant and associate professors. Whatever the level of the service within the University, the quality of that service is the primary consideration. Authorship of documents, reports and other materials pertinent to the University, college, or department missions or procedures may comprise a service contribution. Sponsoring student groups and participating in educational equity programs are also service contributions.

In addition to campus governance activities, faculty members may participate in community service to professional organizations and in professionally-related activities (e.g. , local, state, national, and/or international levels) through such discipline-oriented activities as committees; workshops; speeches; media interviews, articles, and/or editorials; performances; and/or displays. Service to the community may also include consultantships to public schools, local

government, and community service 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 or program. Meaningful service must be clearly related to the academic expertise of the faculty member. The Department must make clear to the candidate what types of service, whether paid or unpaid, are consistent with the mission of the Department and its instructional program.

B. Evaluation

I. General Principles

- a. The quality of faculty performance is the most important element to consider in evaluating individual achievement. Both essential and enhancing criteria are evaluated in the context of the mission of the department and the College, and of the individual professional interests of the faculty member.
- b. In order to clearly present their achievements, candidates are urged to submit a succinct written narrative or outline describing their accomplishments in each of the categories to be evaluated. The narrative is intended to serve as a guide to reviewers in understanding the faculty member's professional goals and values as they relate to the essential and enhancing criteria and the mission of the department, College, and University. All supporting materials should be referenced and clearly explained.
- c. The College realizes that faculty develop skills and competencies over their careers. In each of the three review areas, candidates are urged to identify examples which they believe represent their best efforts and to explain why these may be regarded as significant contributions. Reviewers shall give particular consideration to the quality of these best examples.
- d. In evaluating the performance of faculty, the College recognizes that each faculty member has different strengths so that successful candidates for retention, tenure, or promotion need not have achievements which are necessarily alike. Candidates who meet the standard for advancement may enhance their achievements in very different areas depending upon their professional interests. Reviewers should be aware of these variations and understand how they benefit the College as a whole.
- e. Computers and network technology provide alternative modes of professional activity and new media for dissemination. Such contributions must be evaluated even though the methods for evaluation are still evolving. The following guidelines are suggested: (1) appropriate methods of evaluation must be identified on a case by case basis; (2) external evaluators, used in compliance with university policy, may prove to be particularly effective for these assignments; (3) technology-related work may be considered to be either essential or enhancing, depending on its relation to the criteria in Section A. Of the University Policy; (4) the training effort involved in technology-related professional activity needs to be credited appropriately; and (5) categorization of such work as research or instructionally related activities may need to be done on an individualized basis.

The candidate bears the responsibility for explaining the significance of activities that employ new technology. The candidate must identify methods of evaluation. Faculty

involved in technology-related work should consult frequently with mentors and other colleagues concerning the significance and direction of the work. Such discussions should be specific, involving the issues of training time, media of dissemination, potential methods of evaluation, and the boundaries between research and instructionally related activities.

2. Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

- a. The focus in the evaluation of teaching should be upon the overall teaching performance of the candidate over time rather than her/his performance in a few classes or over a brief period.
- b. Instructional activities that involve supervision of students, such as thesis or field work, should be appropriately evaluated as part of the teaching assignment.
- c. If formal, scheduled student advising is part of the candidate's assigned workload, such advising shall be considered as part of teaching, and the file should include appropriate documentation, including the extent, nature, and quality of such advising activity.

3. Scholarly and Creative Activities

- a. In the evaluation of scholarly and creative activities, departments should make clear to candidates, from the outset, what constitutes appropriate accomplishments/ standards in this area. Definitions of appropriate scholarly and creative activity may vary somewhat among departments, but all must reflect the mission of the College.
- b. The candidate's documentation of scholarly and creative activities and the evaluation of that documentation should focus on the concept of progressive professional development. The candidate's narrative should be organized around this focus.
- c. In addition to the candidate's narrative essay, the documentation of scholarly and creative activities should include all works produced during the period of evaluation, with clear notation of the most significant.
- d. In the evaluation of publications, manuscripts, and other creative works, quality is the primary criterion.
- e. Joint authorship or participation in scholarly and creative activities is normally valuable and creditable, but is often difficult to evaluate. Candidates must identify the specific extent of their participation in jointly unauthored activities.
- f. Consistent with the objective of obtaining the best and most thorough evaluation possible of the candidate's scholarly and creative achievements, external evaluations of the candidate's contributions to his or her academic field should always be considered.
 - (1) Unsolicited evaluations in the form of published reviews of the candidate's work (or unpublished unsolicited evaluations if they are included in the file) may be considered. It is also appropriate to consider the quality of the journal or other context within which the work is published or otherwise disseminated to the scholarly and creative community, as well as citations to the candidate's work in other publications.
 - (2) The solicitation of external evaluations of a candidate's contributions is encouraged, particularly in circumstances such as small departments and/or interdisciplinary

programs where there may be few peers who are well enough qualified to evaluate the candidate's scholarly and creative achievements.

4. Professional Service
 - a. The emphases in the evaluation of professional 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 College and/or the University; and (2) the extent and level of the candidate's involvement.
 - b. Assessment of the service to both the College (and/or University) and the community shall be based on the information described in the narrative, as well as on supporting evidence which may include, but shall not be limited to, letters of invitation, memoranda acknowledging the quality of the contribution, printed programs, and other appropriate documentation.

IV. RETENTION, TENURE, LEVELS OF APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

- A. Retention is awarded to probationary faculty upon the completion of a performance review. The successful candidate will have performed satisfactorily in each area to be evaluated, although consideration will be given to the limited opportunities new appointees have for professional service. Probationary faculty should show evidence of a strong commitment to teaching and instructionally related activities and to a program of scholarly and creative activity.
- B. Tenure is awarded to probationary faculty who have met the essential criteria in instruction and instructionally related activities, scholarly and creative activities, and professional service. In addition, they shall have demonstrated fulfillment of some of the 'enhancing criteria.'
- C. Early Tenure and/or Promotion are granted only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons.
 1. Early Tenure and/or Early Promotion. To receive a favorable recommendation for early tenure and/or early promotion, a candidate must achieve a record of accomplishment which meets the essential criteria at a superior level in all three areas of review at an early point in time. In addition, the candidate must present a record of significant enhancing achievements. The length of the candidate's record must be sufficient to provide confidence that the pattern of achievement will continue.
- D. Assistant Professor: The appointee ordinarily shall hold the doctorate or recognized terminal degree in the field of specialization. Due to the applied nature of programs within the College of the Arts, it is essential that members of the faculty have in-depth professional experience in the field. In order to meet this need, the College of the Arts may appoint and consider for tenure and promotion to all ranks, highly qualified faculty members who have exceptional professional experience in lieu of and deemed equivalent to terminal degrees. The appointee should also show potential for excellence in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and professional service as defined in this document and consistent with the mission of the department, College, and University.
- E. Associate Professor: In addition to having the qualifications of an Assistant Professor, the candidate ordinarily shall have had outstanding experience in teaching and scholarly/creative activities. Meeting essential criteria is necessary, though not sufficient, for promotion or appointment to the rank of Associate Professor. In addition to meeting the essential criteria, there should be evidence of progressive professional development in the areas of instruction and

instructionally related activities, scholarly and creative activities, and professional service, and demonstrated fulfillment of some of the "enhancing elements" in each of these areas.

- F. Professor: In addition to having the qualifications of an Associate Professor, there shall be substantiation of exceptional professional growth in instruction and instructionally related activities and evidence of relevant and effective professional service. The candidate ordinarily shall have established a record of sustained and exceptional scholarly or creative activity, reflecting intellectual, artistic, and professional growth and demonstrating fulfillment of several of the "enhancing elements."
- G. Joint Appointments: All information in this document applies to faculty appointed jointly to two or more departments. However, it is particularly important for the involved departments to maintain a clear set of requirements for tenure and advancement as applied to the joint appointee. These requirements must be worked out through a process of consultation and collaboration with the departments and the candidate, with the approval of the dean(s) of the affected college (s).
- H. The period of evaluation (review) shall be considered to be, in the case of review for tenure, the entire probationary period (including years of prior service credit), or in the case of promotion, the period since promotion (or appointment) to the current rank.

V. AMENDMENTS

- A. Amendments to the College RTP Document

The faculty of COTA, voting by secret mail ballot, may amend this document. Amendments may be proposed either by:

 - A. Direct faculty action via petition from ten percent (10%) of the faculty to the
 - B. By action of the COTA Faculty Advisory Council

Proposed amendments shall be submitted to discussion at a COTA faculty meeting, called within 30 days following their receipt, and shall be distributed in writing by the Faculty Advisory Council to the College faculty at least five instructional days before this meeting. To become effective, proposed amendments must receive a favorable vote of a majority of the COTA tenured and probationary faculty voting in a secret mail ballot conducted by the Faculty Advisory Council within 14 instructional days of the meeting, and must be approved by the Dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- B. Amendments to the Department RTP Document
 1. 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.
 3. The procedure, and any amendments must be approved by the COTA Faculty Advisory Council, the Dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Approved by College of the Arts Faculty: 5/02/97

Amended by College of the Arts Faculty: 5/16/97

Approved by College of the Arts Dean: 5/16/97