Bob Cole Conservatory of Music RTP Policy (April 2025)

COTA REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) February 2025	**BOB COLE CONSERVATORY OF MUSIC REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) 2025 (Supersedes all previous BCCM RTP policies)**
Designed to work in concert with the CSULB RTP Policy, the College of the Arts (COTA) policy on reappointment, tenure and promotion further defines, applies, and interprets the RTP process for the College of the Arts — specifically the departments of Art, Cinematic Arts, Dance, Design, Music, and Theatre Arts—and provides parameters within which departments may still further define, apply, and interpret the process as appropriate to specific disciplines. All references to CSULB RTP Policy numbers in this document are to sections and subsections of the 2024 CSULB RTP Policy (Academic Senate Policy Statement 23-24).	Designed to work in concert with the CSULB and COTA RTP Policies, the Bob Cole Conservatory of Music (BCCM) policy on reappointment, tenure and promotion further defines, applies, and interprets the RTP process in the BCCM. All references to CSULB RTP Policy numbers in this document are to sections and subsections of the CSULB Academic Senate Policy Statement 23-24.and COTA RTP Policies
1.0 MISSION, VISION, PRINCIPLES, AND VALUES **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 MISSION, VISION, PRINCIPLES, AND VALUES** **1.1 BCCM Mission and Vision** The Bob Cole Conservatory of Music's mission is to provide an exceptional education and world-class performance opportunities to a diverse community of students.
1.2 Principles The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.	**1.2 Principles** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.
1.2.1 The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.1.	**1.2.1** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.1.
1.2.2 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.2 and adds the following. Given the broad diversity of instructional approaches; research, scholarly, and creative activity (RSCA); and service contributions in a College that includes scholars and practitioners in diverse departments, RTP standards must establish a consistent level of expectation while allowing candidates to meet expectations in varied ways. Requirements for reappointment, tenure, or promotion are defined in section 5, and evaluative terms are defined in section 7.6.	**1.2.2** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.2 and COTA RTP Policy 1.2.2.
1.2.3 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.3 and adds the following. COTA expects sustained and substantive achievements and contributions over the specified period of review in: (1) instruction, (2) RSCA, and (3) service. COTA 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.	**1.2.3** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.3. and COTA RTP Policy 1.2.3.
1.2.4 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. The California Faculty Association is also a resource for faculty navigating the RTP process.	**1.2.4** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.4 and COTA RTP Policy 1.2.4.
1.2.5 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.	**1.2.5** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.5 and COTA RTP Policy 1.2.5.
1.3 Values COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3	**1.3 Values** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3
1.3.1 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.1 and adds the following. COTA recognizes that cultural taxation and identity taxation impact the morale, productivity, and well-being of some employees within our institution. Definitions of cultural and identify taxation continue to evolve, and in the absence of specific guidance from CSULB or the CSU, COTA adopts the following:	**1.3.1** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.1 and COTA RTP Policy 1.3.1.

Cultural taxation and identity taxation refer to extra responsibilities, pressures, and/or expectations placed on individuals from marginalized or underrepresented backgrounds. These may include: educating colleagues and/or students about their culture; representing an entire identity or group in discussions and/or demonstrating knowledge or expertise about said group; taking on diversity related tasks; serving/consulting on additional committees, or being expected to do so solely on the basis of their identity; serving as informal advisor for students and/or emotionally containing students who share the candidates' cultural and identity backgrounds; and/or withstanding other increased pressures or burdens. COTA recognizes that cultural taxation and identity taxation may result in forms of invisible labor that cannot be documented in the same way as other tasks and assignments. COTA supports candidates in addressing cultural taxation and identity taxation in their RTP file. If these matters are raised by a candidate, COTA stresses the necessity that evaluators at all levels of evaluation within the RTP process recognize and directly address the complexity, scope, and scale of related workload demands and contributions. COTA is committed to providing training and support to department chairs, candidates, and evaluators about ways to recognize, address, and diminish cultural taxation and identity taxation.	
1.3.2 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.2.	**1.3.2** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.2.
1.3.3 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.3	**1.3.3** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.3
1.3.4 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.4	**1.3.4** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.4
1.3.5 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.5	**1.3.5** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.5
2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.0 and adds the following. The criteria for evaluation for each of the three areas of review (instructional activities, RSCA, and service) describe the nature and level of performance required of all faculty in COTA. 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 COTA and on review committees play the central role in evaluating the quality and quantity of performance in each of these areas.	**2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.0 and COTA RTP Policy 2.0.
2.1 Instructional Activities COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1 and adds the following. Candidates are required to demonstrate via a combination of data, narrative, and documentation, a thorough account of the following: **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. **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. **Ongoing Professional Development** 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. Candidates shall demonstrate a challenging and current approach to course materials, incorporating the candidate's research, scholarly and creative activities and/or professional activities into the classroom, and teaching methods where appropriate. **Other Instructional Activities** The following are representative, but not exhaustive, examples of other activities to be considered in the area of instructional activities: academic advising (additional to assignment), student mentoring, recruitment and retention activities; supervision of student research projects and / or theses; curriculum development; innovative approaches	**2.1 Instructional Activities** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1 and COTA RTP Policy 2.1 and adds the following. We further define Instructional Activities to include private lesson instruction, ensemble leadership, supervision of student teachers, and thesis and project report supervision. Candidates shall be evaluated on their performance over the full period of review.

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 Continuous Professional Learning COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.1 and adds the following. In addition to formal training sessions suggested by this policy, candidates may show evidence of continuous professional learning through self-reflection in one's narrative; willingness to adapt and evolve in response to feedback; and changes to course material in order to remain current with one's discipline.	**2.1.1 Continuous Professional Learning** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.1 and COTA RTP Policy 2.1.1
2.1.2 Reflection & Instructional Adaptation: Formative Assessment COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.2.	**2.1.2 Reflection & Instructional Adaptation: Formative Assessment** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.2.
2.1.3 Instructional Practices that Foster Learning: Summative Assessment COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.3 and adds the following. Candidates must present a clear and complete case for their overall instructional effectiveness through multiple forms of evidence. Candidates should provide syllabi for all courses and SPOT summaries for all course sections taught during the period of review. In addition, candidates should curate a selection of documents that demonstrate the range and evolution of their teaching. Documents could include, but are not limited, to assignments prompts, rubrics, and student work.	**2.1.3 Instructional Practices that Foster Learning: Summative Assessment** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.3 and COTA RTP Policy 2.1.3 and adds the following. Evidence of effectiveness in ensemble leadership and private lesson instruction may include, but is not limited to: concert recordings and programs; successful placement of students in graduate programs or professional positions; student compositions or arrangements; invitations to perform at local, national, or international events; repertoire lists, lesson logs, exercises or other instructional materials; workshop and clinic invitations; and awards and recognition for individual students or ensembles.
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 in alignment with the CSU-CFA CBA 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 BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.4 and COTA RTP Policy 2.1.4 and adds the following. Up until reappointment, each candidate shall have a minimum of two classroom, rehearsal, or lesson visits, each from a different faculty member. Ideally, the two faculty will be members of the department RTP committee. However, if scheduling conflicts prevent the members of the department RTP committee from observing the candidate, a tenured colleague may be designated to observe and write a report. This designee must be selected in consultation with the candidate and the department chair. Visits must be scheduled in consultation with the candidate, with at least five (5) days' notice, according to CBA Article 15.14. Visitors must observe a substantial portion of the class meeting, rehearsal, or lesson. Any feedback, suggestions, or constructive criticism must be shared verbally and in writing with the candidate within one week of the observation. Candidates shall have the opportunity to contextualize or explain the methods used in the class, lesson, or rehearsal observed, particularly if feedback suggests room for improvement. Discussion of classroom observations and the candidate's response to feedback shall be incorporated into the committee's written evaluation. After reappointment, two further classroom observations, each by a different faculty member, will be conducted prior to the tenure file submission. The candidate and RTP committee should coordinate to ensure that observations and feedback are complete before the tenure file due date in September. Further observations may be conducted at the request of the candidate. Candidates may elect to have the BCCM Director, or Associate Director participate in the observation visit in lieu of the department RTP committee., and department RTP committee members must respect that request.

2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA) COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.2 and adds the following: Faculty are required to demonstrate and provide evidence of professional currency and an ongoing program of RSCA. Candidates must demonstrate via a combination of data, narrative, and documentation a clear pattern of RSCA being recognized through peer review or other indicators of reception and stature in the field as appropriate to the candidate's practice. COTA embraces the diversity of RSCA across our community of arts practitioners, educators, and scholars. For this reason, evidence for RSCA in COTA might look significantly different from one candidate to another. Examples of RSCA within COTA may include, but are not limited to: performances, exhibitions, films, scholarly presentations, books, journal articles, designs, choreography, digital humanities projects, community projects, clinical practices, contracts, and countless others. This list should not be construed as exhaustive in any way. COTA defers to the CSULB RTP Policy requirement that "candidates must disclose and describe any scholarly or creative activities for which they receive reassigned time or additional compensation" and limits the expectations of such disclosures to those required by Faculty Affairs RTP procedural memoranda or other relevant CSULB or CSU policies and protocols.	**2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)** BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.2 and COTA RTP Policy 2.2 and adds the following: The BCCM recognizes that each faculty member has different strengths so that successful candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion need not have achievements that are necessarily alike. Candidates who fulfill the requirements for advancement may have achievements in different areas depending upon their professional interest in composition, music education, history, or performance. Candidates should provide, and reviewers should be open to a range of evidence demonstrating their stature within a field. Thus, in addition to publications and conference presentations, the following may serve as examples of RSCA: concert recordings and programs; invitations or repeat invitations to perform; reviews of performances or works; compositions, arrangements, or manuscripts; workshops, presentations and adjudication for professional organizations; or reports to professional newsletters. This list should not be construed as exhaustive. The BCCM adopts an expansive understanding of "peer review" beyond the phrase's traditional associations with academic publishing. Candidates should highlight when and how their RSCA activities were evaluated by expert practitioners. This could include commissions for new compositions or gigs earned through competitive audition processes.
2.3 Service COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.3. and adds the following. While it is the responsibility of the candidate to actively seek opportunities for service, the College, Departments, and Chairs should work to equalize service opportunities, prevent service fatigue and potential cultural and identity taxation.	**2.3 Service** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.3 and COTA RTP Policy 2.3.
2.3.1 University Service: All faculty are expected to participate in substantial, reliable, collegial university service and more specifically in shared governance (as it pertains to decision-making and policy development). Examples of 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. COTA values community and professional service. However, these alone are insufficient for a satisfactory rating in the area of service. 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. Candidates must demonstrate a thorough account of sustained and significant service contributions spanning the full period under evaluation via a combination of data, narrative, and documentation. This shall go beyond simply listing services provided or committees upon which one has served. For each service activity, it is the candidate's responsibility to clearly detail the following, at minimum: role, duration, activities performed, time required, and specific outcomes and the impact of such work. COTA interprets the statement contained in CSULB RTP Policy section 2.3.1 that "it is the responsibility of every tenure-track and tenured faculty member to engage in service, and to do so in a way that potentially leads to equitable contributions that minimize cultural and identity taxation" not as a specific RTP requirement of or burden of proof for candidates but as a general statement about the need for all faculty to engage in service and to address service equitably within our university, college, and department structures and cultures. All levels of review shall provide a qualitative and quantitative context for the candidate's university service.	**2.3.1 University Service:** The BCCM concurs with COTA RTP Policy 2.3.1 and adds the following. Many BCCM faculty serve as Area Directors within the conservatory, performing some or all of the following tasks: hiring and evaluating lecturers; scheduling courses; updating student records; assigning students to private lesson studios; attending student juries and recitals; evaluating auditions and reading prospective student applications; recruiting new students; and managing the area's budget. Candidates are encouraged to describe this work in their narratives as part of their record of service to the department. Recruiting is essential to the conservatory's mission and the quality of its ensembles. As this activity can touch on all three areas of review, the BCCM offers the following guidance for candidate files. If the primary purpose of an activity is performance or adjudication, but it also serves as a recruitment tool, this should be categorized as RSCA. Such activities include conducting honor groups, performing at other institutions, and adjudicating music festivals. If the primary purpose of an activity is recruitment, such as school visitations and advising or auditioning prospective students, then this should be included as service to the department. Serving as Area Director does not exempt a colleague from department, college, or university committee work. This is especially true if the candidate receives assigned time for Area Director duties. Within their narratives, candidates must disclose and describe whenever activities include reassigned time or compensation, including details about the expectations or goals of the service activity.
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 BCCM concurs with COTA RTP Policy 2.3.2
2.3.3 Community Service: Candidate's files may include documentation of any community service or outreach activities that are aligned with their discipline or expertise.	**2.3.2 Community Service:** The BCCM concurs with COTA RTP Policy 2.3.3

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.0	**3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.0
3.1 Candidate COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.1 and adds the following. Tenure-track faculty with no service credit may elect to go through either a Professional Development Plan (PDP) or a periodic “mini” review in their first year. The decision to opt for a PDP or mini review must be made in consultation with the department chair. The PDP is not an option after the first year. For each subsequent year prior to tenure, candidates must submit a periodic “mini” or performance review. For all periodic reviews and performance reviews, COTA requires that candidates provide an up-to-date Professional Data Sheet (PDS) and Narrative as combined or separate documents. These 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 documents. The documents should contextualize the candidate’s accomplishments during the period of review and describe their significance. Candidates are encouraged toward concision, but not at the expense of thoroughness. COTA recognizes that the work done by both candidates and evaluators in the RTP process is demanding; however, the special actions that are taken in the RTP process necessitate that candidates produce RTP files that provide a thorough overview of performance via a combination of data, narrative, and documentation in order to facilitate a process that also necessitates that evaluators take the time and care essential to a thorough review and thoughtful deliberations in making recommendations of a highly consequential nature. The candidate’s file must, via a combination of data, narrative, and documentation, instill total confidence in evaluators and academic administrators in recommending or granting the renewal of a multiyear employment contract (reappointment), the establishment of a long-term commitment of the institution to an individual (tenure), or the elevation of a member of our faculty to a respected and coveted academic rank tied to a significant long-term increase in compensation (promotion to Associate Professor or to Professor). Simply put, in seeking reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the candidate must thoroughly make the case for the action they seek.	**3.1 Candidate** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.1 and COTA RTP Policy 3.1 and adds the following. The Professional Data Sheet (PDS) is comparable to, but separate from, a resume or a CV that a candidate might use professionally outside the university. It is an internal document whose audience is the departmental and college RTP committees, the dean, and ultimately the provost. It should allow these evaluators to efficiently peruse a list of the candidate’s accomplishments and contributions to the university. Aside from the candidate’s degrees, no work prior to their appointment at the university should be listed. The sole exception to this is for candidates who receive service credit at the time of initial appointment. All contributions and achievements should be categorized according to the model provided by Faculty Affairs and listed in reverse chronological order within those categories. For the periodic reviews prior to the initial reappointment review, the PDS must clearly delineate activities undertaken since the appointment, including years of service credit, if appropriate. For subsequent reviews, the PDS must clearly delineate activities for the period of review. To present achievements in the most coherent intellectual and professional context, candidates must present a written narrative describing their work in each of the categories to be evaluated (instructional activities, RSCA, and service). The narrative shall serve as a guide to reviewers in understanding the candidate’s professional goals and values as they relate to the mission of the department, college and university. All supporting materials should be referenced and clearly explained. The candidate shall discuss how any recommendations for growth and/or improvement noted in prior reviews have been addressed. The supplementary materials in the candidate’s file should provide evidence for the work listed in the PDS and discussed in the narrative.
3.1.1 General File Categorization Some activities straddle categories or could be placed in one or another category. Instructional Activities and RSCA, for instance, might overlap, or a candidate could have activity that might be considered either RSCA or service. 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 multiple areas. In other words, candidates must not take full credit for an activity in more than one category. For all instances in which a candidate has received assigned time or additional compensation, the candidate must account for what purpose the assigned time was granted, and what work was accomplished utilizing the assigned time.	**3.1.1 General File Categorization** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.1.1 and COTA RTP Policy 3.1.1.
3.2 Department RTP Policy COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.2 and adds the following. Department policies shall 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) instructional activities, (2) RSCA, and (3) service. The department RTP policy shall provide clear examples of forms of evidence a candidate may present to substantiate and provide context for instructional activities, RSCA and related peer review, and service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession. Department RTP policy documents shall be updated by the department chair and an appropriate faculty advisory committee and shall be reviewed and approved by the Dean and Provost.	**3.2 Department RTP Policy** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.2 and COTA RTP Policy 3.2.
3.3 Department RTP Committee COTA 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 BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.3 and COTA RTP Policy 3.3 and adds the following. The BCCM department RTP committee is elected each fall by a majority of tenured and tenure-track faculty. Depending on the number of reviews or actions in a given year and at the chair’s discretion, the committee may consist of three or five tenured members. The committee may divide the labor of reviewing candidates according to rank and expertise. The department chair shall ensure that committee members have no personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest that would affect evaluation of an individual candidate. If a conflict of interest

	exists, the committee member(s) involved must recuse themselves from all discussions and decisions concerning the candidate. Candidates with concerns about conflicts of interest should consult the department chair. Ballot results of RTP committee elections shall be kept on file. In the event that a committee member needs to be removed for any reason, the faculty member who received the next largest number of votes in the election shall be appointed to replace the departing member.
3.4 Department Chair The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.4.	**3.4 Department Chair** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.4.
3.5 College RTP Policy COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.5 and adds the following. The COTA 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.	**3.4 College RTP Policy** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.5 and COTA RTP Policy 3.5.
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 including but not limited to timeline, action steps, and processes for evaluation. 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 BCCM concurs with COTA RTP Policy 3.5.1.
3.6 College RTP Committee COTA 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 BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.6 and COTA RTP Policy 3.6.
3.7 Dean of the College COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.7 and adds the following. Evaluations at the department and college levels function like discipline-specific executive summaries of the candidate's record and are provided for the Dean's consideration in reaching an independent evaluation.	**3.7 Dean of the College** The BCCM defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.7 and concurs with COTA RTP Policy 3.7.
3.8 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.8.	**3.8 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs** The BCCM defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.8.
3.9 President COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.9	**3.9 President** The BCCM defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.9
4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.0, and to all RTP deadlines established by Faculty Affairs.	**4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS** The BCCM defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.0, and to all RTP deadlines established by Faculty Affairs.
4.1 Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty for Reappointment COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.1.	**4.1 Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty for Reappointment** The BCCM defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.1.
4.2 Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty for Tenure and Promotion COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.2.	**4.2 Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty for Tenure and Promotion** The BCCM defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.2.
4.3 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.3.	**4.3 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion** The BCCM defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.3.
5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.0 and adds the following. Throughout the following subsections of this COTA RTP Policy (5.1 through 5.5.2) reference is made to each level of evaluation within the college. These levels are:	**5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA** The BCCM defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.0 and COTA RTP Policy 5.0.

department RTP committee evaluation, department chair (optional) evaluation, college RTP committee evaluation, college dean's evaluation. Candidates and evaluators are advised that the criteria for each of the possible actions under consideration in the RTP process (see sections 5.1-5.5.2) are distinct from one another and necessitate careful reading of their specifics.	
5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Tenure-track Faculty COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.1 and adds the following. At each level of evaluation within the college, in order to recommend a candidate for reappointment, evaluators must determine, and clearly and specifically state in the evaluation report, that the candidate has met all university and college RTP standards, protocols, documentation requirements, and deadlines, and that the candidate's record during the period under evaluation indicates significant performance and likely ongoing performance at a level that at minimum is satisfactory in each of the three areas of evaluation: (1) instruction, (2) RSCA, and (3) service. See COTA RTP Policy 7.6 for definitions of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and excellent.	**5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Tenure-track Faculty** The BCCM defers to the CSULB RTP Policy 5.1 and concurs with COTA RTP Policy 5.1.
5.2 Awarding of Tenure COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.2 and adds the following. At each level of evaluation within the college, in order to recommend a candidate for tenure, evaluators must determine, and clearly and specifically state in the evaluation report, that the candidate has met all university and college RTP standards, protocols, documentation requirements, and deadlines, and that the candidate's record during the period under evaluation indicates significant and likely ongoing performance that is excellent in one area and satisfactory in the other two areas. These are the COTA criteria for tenure alone. See section 5.3 for criteria for appointment/promotion to Associate Professor and section 5.4 for criteria for appointment/promotion to Professor. See COTA RTP Policy 7.6 for definitions of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and excellent.	**5.2 Awarding of Tenure** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 5.2 and COTA RTP Policy 5.2.
5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.3 and adds the following. At each level of evaluation within the college, in order to recommend a candidate for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, evaluators must determine, and clearly and specifically state in the evaluation report, that the candidate has met all university and college RTP standards, protocols, documentation requirements, and deadlines, and that the candidate's record during the period under evaluation indicates significant, sustained, and ongoing performance that is excellent in one area and satisfactory in the other two areas. See COTA RTP Policy 7.6 for definitions of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and excellent.	**5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor** The BCCM defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.3 and concurs with COTA RTP Policy 5.3.
5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.4 and adds the following. At each level of evaluation within the college, in order to recommend a candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor, evaluators must determine, and clearly and specifically state in the evaluation report, that the candidate has met all relevant university and college RTP standards, protocols, documentation requirements, and deadlines, and that and that the candidate's record during the period under evaluation indicates significant, sustained and ongoing performance that is excellent in two areas and satisfactory in the remaining area. See COTA RTP Policy 7.6 for definitions of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and excellent.	**5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor** The BCCM defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.4 and concurs with COTA RTP Policy 5.4
5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.	**5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion** The BCCM defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.5
5.5.1 Early Tenure COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.1 and adds the following. At each level of evaluation within the college, in order to recommend a candidate for early tenure, evaluators must determine, and clearly and specifically state in the evaluation report, that the candidate has met all relevant university and college RTP standards, protocols, documentation requirements, and deadlines, and that the candidate's record during the period under evaluation indicates sustained performance and likely ongoing performance at a level that is excellent in each of the three areas of evaluation: (1) instruction, (2) RSCA, and (3) service. Early tenure will not be recommended based upon a record of less than three complete academic years since the candidate's appointment to their CSULB tenure-track faculty position inclusive of any years of service credit from a prior institutional appointment, and will not be recommended if the candidate has been employed at CSULB for less than one academic year, and requires excellent performance across all three areas of evaluation for the full duration of the period under evaluation. See COTA RTP Policy 7.6 for definitions of satisfactory, unsatisfactory, and excellent.	**5.5.1 Early Tenure** The BCCM defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.1, concurs with COTA RTP Policy 5.5.1 and adds the following: Early tenure is to be granted only in exceptional cases. The candidate must demonstrate a record of excellence in all three areas, along with evidence that their pattern of strong overall performance will continue.

5.5.2 Early Promotion COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.2 and adds the following. The following applies only to candidates seeking early promotion to either the rank of Associate Professor or the rank of Professor. At each level of evaluation within the college, in order to recommend a candidate for early tenure, evaluators must determine, and clearly and specifically state in the evaluation report, that the candidate has met all relevant university and college RTP standards, protocols, documentation requirements, and deadlines, and that the candidate's record during the period under evaluation indicates sustained performance and likely ongoing performance at a level that is excellent in each of the three areas of evaluation: (1) instruction, (2) RSCA, and (3) service. Early promotion will not be recommended based upon a record of less than three complete academic years since the candidate's appointment to their CSULB tenure-track faculty position inclusive of any years of service credit from a prior institutional appointment, or since the candidate's tenure or last promotion, whichever is most recent, and will not be recommended if the candidate has been employed at CSULB for less than one academic year, and requires excellent performance across all three areas of evaluation for the full duration of the period under evaluation. See COTA RTP Policy 7.6-7.6.1 for definitions of satisfactory, unsatisfactory, and excellent.	**5.5.2 Early Promotion** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.2 and COTA RTP Policy 5.5.2.
6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.0 and 6.1 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.	**6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS** The BCCM defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.0 and 6.1 and COTA RTP Policy 6.0.
6.2 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.2.	**6.2** The BCCM defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.2.
6.3 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.3.	**6.3** The BCCM defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.3.
6.4 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.4 and adds the following. Department RTP committee chair must notify candidate when supplementary materials collected during the Open Period are compiled and added to the candidate's file.	**6.4** The BCCM defers to COTA RTP Policy 6.4 and COTA RTP Policy 6.4.
6.5 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.5.	**6.5** The BCCM defers to COTA RTP Policy 6.5.
6.6 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.6 and adds the following. The department RTP committee must conclude its evaluation report by clearly stating whether the committee recommends or does not recommend the candidate for each RTP action under consideration.	**6.6** The BCCM defers to COTA RTP Policy 6.6 and COTA RTP Policy 6.6.
6.7 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.7 and adds the following. If completing an optional independent written evaluation, the department chair must conclude the written evaluation by clearly stating whether the chair recommends or does not recommend the candidate for each RTP action under consideration.	**6.7** The BCCM defers to COTA RTP Policy 6.7 and COTA RTP Policy 6.7.
6.8 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.8 and adds the following. The college RTP committee must conclude its evaluation report by clearly stating whether the committee recommends or does not recommend the candidate for each RTP action under consideration.	**6.8** The BCCM defers to COTA RTP Policy 6.8 and COTA RTP Policy 6.8.
6.9 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.9 and adds the following. The dean must conclude their written evaluation by clearly stating whether the dean recommends or does not recommend the candidate for each RTP action under consideration.	**6.9** The BCCM defers to COTA RTP Policy 6.9 and COTA RTP Policy 6.9.
6.10 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.10.	**6.10** The BCCM defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.10.
7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES **7.1** COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.1.	**7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES** 7.1 The BCCM defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.1**.**
7.2 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.2.	**7.2** The BCCM defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.2.
7.3 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.3.	**7.3** The BCCM defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.3.
7.4 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 7.4 and adds the following. 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. Any submitted written reply shall become part of the candidate's file. In subsequent RTP submissions, the candidate must provide the	**7.4** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 7.4 and COTA RTP Policy 7.4.

rebuttals and/or replies in the same area as other prior evaluations. Additionally, official documentation of modifications to the RTP timeline and/or the date of the next RTP evaluation must be included. These items must be clearly named so they are easy for evaluators to locate.	
7.5 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 7.5.	**7.5** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 7.5.
7.6 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 7.6 and adds the following. In keeping with the example language used in CSULB RTP Policy 7.6, COTA adopts and requires the use of the following terms as summary evaluative descriptors for rating a candidate's performance in each of the three areas of evaluation: Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Excellent. At each level of evaluation within the college (department RTP committee evaluation, department chair optional evaluation, college RTP committee evaluation, college dean's evaluation) for each area of evaluation (instruction, RSCA, service), the evaluator or evaluating committee must conclude the evaluation of the candidate's performance in each of the three areas of evaluation by rating the candidate's performance using one of the three summary evaluative descriptors. For the purposes of RTP evaluation, COTA defines the summary evaluative descriptors as follows. Unsatisfactory: Candidate fails to clearly and demonstrably meet expectations in the area of evaluation (instruction, RSCA, service) as described in the COTA RTP policy (section 2.0 and subsections) and further delineated in the department-level RTP policy. Satisfactory: Candidate clearly and demonstrably meets expectations in the area of evaluation (instruction, RSCA, service) as described in the COTA RTP policy (section 2.0 and subsections) and further delineated in the department-level RTP policy. A satisfactory evaluation should not be interpreted as a pejorative, nor confused with the designation of excellent for candidates who truly exceed expectation. Excellent: Candidate clearly, demonstrably, and significantly exceeds expectations in the area of evaluation (instruction, RSCA, service) as described in the COTA RTP policy (section 2.0 and subsections) and further delineated in the department-level RTP policy. Designation of excellent is a particular honor and should be used selectively when merited.	**7.6** The BCCM concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 7.6 and COTA RTP Policy 7.6.
8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY COTA 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 changes procedural changes made by campus administrators to accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs.	**8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY** BCCM 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.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS

Department RTP Policy Document Approval

Effective Date: **Fall 2025**

Department of MUSIC

Approved by the College Faculty Council (Enter date below):	Faculty Council Chair Name & Signature:	Date:
03/25/25	Chris Miles	5/20/2025

Approved by the College Dean (Enter date below):	College Dean Name & Signature:	Date
04/15/2025		5/14/2025

Final Review by Faculty Affairs (Enter date below):	Associate Vice President, Faculty Affairs Name & Signature:	Date:
5/12/25	Patricia Perez	5/20/2025

Provost Signature:	Date:
	05/21/25

1250 BE LFLOWER BOULEVARD · LONG BEACH, CA IFORNIA 90840 · 562 | 985 | 52 2 · FAX 562 | 985| 1680