Side-by-Side RTP Policy-Development Document – DESN Template

NEW 2024 COTA RTP POLICY	NEW DRAFT DESIGN RTP POLICY
CSULB COLLEGE OF THE ARTS REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) **2024 (Supersedes all previous COTA 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 interpret the RTP process for the College of the Arts —specifically departments of Art, Cinematic Arts, Dance, Design, Music, and Theatre Arts—and provides parameters within which departments may still further define, applies, and interprets 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).	**CSULB DEPARTMENT OF DESIGN** **REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP)** **2025 (Supersedes all previous Department of Design RTP policies)** (RSCA). Designed to work in concert with the CSULB RTP and the COTA RTP policies, the Department of Design Policy identifies standards by which the work and contributions of the faculty in the department shall be evaluated.
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 Department of Design Mission and Vision** The mission of the Department of Design is to provide instructional programs that prepare the student designer for the global marketplace or for educational opportunities at the graduate level.
1.2 Principles The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.	**1.2 Principles** The Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 1.2 and COTA RTP Policy 1.2.
1.2.1 The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.1.	**1.2.1** The Department of Design concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.1 and COTA Policy 1.2.1 and adds the following. The Department of Design recognizes that the professional engagement (active involvement) of its faculty is essential to providing a high quality and challenging instructional experience and expects its faculty to maintain currency appropriate to their discipline(s) and specialization(s).
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 Department of Design concurs with the CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.2 and the COTA RTP Policy 1.2.2 and adds the following. The Department of Design offers a variety of programs including professional and liberal arts programs that differ in their philosophy, methods and results of instruction. Faculty with expertise in Design, Interior Design, Industrial Design, Design History and Theory, Environmental Communication Design, Display and Exhibition Design, Lighting Design, Furniture Design, Entertainment Design, and other areas of design, may also differ in how they meet departmental standards. The RTP standards of the Department of Design establish a consistent level of engagement for all faculty while allowing them to achieve these standards in varied ways.
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 Department of Design defers to the CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.3 and the COTA 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 Department of Design concurs with COTA RTP Policy 1.2.4. and adds the following. In evaluating the performance of faculty, the Department of Design recognizes that each faculty member has different strengths. Candidates for recommended reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion need not have engagement or achievements that are necessarily alike. Candidates may demonstrate their engagement and achievements in different areas depending upon their professional expertise. These varied achievements shall be evaluated for their contribution to the Department, College and/or University as a whole.
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 Department of Design defers to COTA RTP Policy 1.2.5.

NEW 2024 COTA RTP POLICY	NEW DRAFT DESIGN RTP POLICY
1.3 Values COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3	**1.3 Values** The Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 1.3 and COTA 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: 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.	**1.3.1** The Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.1 and COTA RTP Policy 1.3.1.
1.3.2 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.2.	**1.3.2** The Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.2. and COTA RTP Policy 1.3.2.
1.3.3 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.3	**1.3.3** The Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.3 and COTA RTP Policy 1.3.3.
1.3.4 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.4	**1.3.4** The Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.4 and COTA RTP Policy 1.3.4.
1.3.5 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.5	**1.3.5** The Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.5 and COTA 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 Department of Design concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.0 and COTA RTP Policy 2.0 and adds the following. Examples of appropriate engagement are defined by the Department of Design for each of the three areas of evaluation instructional activities; Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA); and service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession). Examples are organized into "Satisfactory" and "Excellent" categories to aid the candidate and evaluators regarding the expectations of the department. Engagements that do not meet these expectations shall be considered as "Unsatisfactory." Candidates, following diverse career paths, are expected to pursue excellence in each area, but are not expected by the department to accomplish every item on every list. Colleagues on the Department of Design RTP Committee play the central role in evaluating the pattern and significance of engagement in each of the areas under review. Evaluation by the committee shall include, but is not limited to: 1. Written reports of observations of the candidate's teaching by the department RTP Committee, if applicable (see **2.1.4 Classroom Visitation**). 2. Evaluation of the course instructional materials and samples of student work as evidence of student learning outcomes from the period of review submitted by the candidate. 3. Evaluation of the combined PDS and Narrative submitted by the candidate (as described in Design RTP Policy 3.1 Candidate). 4. An assessment of signed, written comments received during the open letter period or included by the candidate as evidence in their supplemental documentation.

NEW 2024 COTA RTP POLICY	NEW DRAFT DESIGN RTP POLICY
	5. An assessment of scores on student evaluations Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPOT) evaluations. An assessment of comments on SPOT evaluations, if submitted.
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 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 Instructional Activities** The Department of Design concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1 and COTA RTP Policy 2.1 and adds the following. This category includes all activities directly related to teaching in formal and informal contexts, the development of curriculum, student assessment, supervision of student research and/or design projects, advising, and related activities involving students inside or outside of class sessions. Representative samples of activities considered to be "Satisfactory" or "Excellent" are provided to aid candidates and reviewers. **A. Pedagogy and Method** Using concise, simple language, candidates shall articulate in their Narrative, their strategies and techniques for all seven (7) pedagogy and method criteria identified in COTA RTP Policy 2.1. **Satisfactory Pedagogy and Method** The following are representative but non-exhaustive and non-prioritized examples of satisfactory pedagogy and methodology that may be used by the department committee to evaluate the candidate. Items are numbered for reference only. 1. Demonstrates ability to communicate concepts and procedures to students. 2. Facilitates the creation of student work that is consistent with student learning outcomes identified on the course syllabus. 3. Extends student's thinking and learning skills. 4. Demonstrates skill in written communication. 5. Demonstrates skill in oral presentation. 6. Demonstrates abilities of leadership and guidance. 7. Shows skill in the management of courses. 8. Clearly states course requirements, assignments, schedule and grading standards. 9. Maintains accurate grading and attendance records. 10. Utilizes appropriate grading practices as outlined in university policy. 11. Employs written and verbal methods of student evaluation. 12. Other recognized discipline-specific items that demonstrate satisfactory pedagogy and methodology. **Excellent Pedagogy and Method** The following are representative but non-exhaustive and non-prioritized examples of excellent pedagogy and methodology that may be used by the department committee to evaluate the candidate. Items are numbered for reference only. 1. Receives recognition, outside the Department of Design, for student-produced projects. 2. Incorporates design competitions into teaching curriculum that bring significant recognition to the department, program and/or students. 3. Creates and/or participates in academic, industry and/or public events that showcase department, program and/or student achievement. 4. Creates collaborative projects that involve faculty and students from other disciplines outside design or collaborates with industry partners. 5. Other recognized discipline-specific items that demonstrate a level of excellence that exceeds the satisfactory level of pedagogy and methodology.

NEW 2024 COTA RTP POLICY	NEW DRAFT DESIGN RTP POLICY
	B. Course Preparation Course syllabi shall contain all components of the university standard syllabi template and follow university policy. The material presented shall be appropriately relevant and up-to-date. Course materials shall have value in facilitating learning. **Satisfactory Course Preparation** The following are representative but non-exhaustive and non-prioritized examples of satisfactory course preparation that may be used by the department committee to evaluate the candidate. Items are numbered for reference only. 1. Clearly states Student Learning Outcomes in course documents. 2. Exhibits ongoing development and improvement of class content. 3. Prepares, uses and maintains up-to- date materials that are current with the industry. 4. Utilizes outside professional resources. 5. Integrates ongoing research activities and/or professional experience into courses. 6. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate satisfactory course preparation. **Excellent Course Preparation** The following are representative but non-exhaustive and non-prioritized examples of excellent course preparation that may be used by the department committee to evaluate the candidate. Items are numbered for reference only. 1. Develops innovative course materials and/or teaching approaches. 2. Arranges field trips to design firms or participation in professional design events such as seminars, workshops, and presentations. 3. Arranges for professional designers to interact with students in class sessions. 4. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate a level of excellence that exceeds the satisfactory level of course preparation. **C. Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher** Candidates shall describe in their combined Narrative and PDS the specific actions taken to, 1) maintain currency as a teacher, 2) implement improvements in instruction, and 3) engage students in contemporary approaches to learning that support the Student Learning Outcomes in the courses they teach. Candidates shall include evidence of these three principles in their supplemental documentation. **Satisfactory Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher** The following are representative but non-exhaustive and non-prioritized examples of satisfactory professional development as a teacher that may be used by the department committee to evaluate the candidate. Items are numbered for reference only. 1. Demonstrates active and vital knowledge of the discipline. 2. Maintains dialogue with colleagues regarding pedagogical issues. 3. Consults on course and curriculum development. 4. Visits other classrooms to observe. 5. Provides self-assessment of teaching effectiveness. 6. Is knowledgeable and utilizes appropriate technology in instructional applications. 7. Attends and/or participates in professional development programs, seminars, conferences, trainings, workshops, and/or continuing education. 8. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate satisfactory ongoing professional development as a teacher. **Excellent Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher** The following are representative but non-exhaustive and non-prioritized examples of excellent ongoing professional development as a teacher that may be used by the department committee to evaluate the candidate. Items are numbered for reference only.

NEW 2024 COTA RTP POLICY	NEW DRAFT DESIGN RTP POLICY
	1. Creates significant new curricula for classes and/or study-abroad programs. 2. Improves teaching methodology through reading, research, and/or travel. 3. Participates on department, college and university committees concerned with pedagogical issues. 4. Participates in programs of the CSULB Faculty Center 5. Participates in teaching development seminars or conferences sponsored by the department, college, university, or professional organizations. 6. Teaches seminars or pedagogical workshops to students and/or faculty outside of a scheduled course. 7. Presents scholarly and/or creative activities at teaching methodology seminars and conferences. 8. Receives instructionally related awards and/or recognition for outstanding performance at the University. 9. Authors a design reference book or textbook that is published. 10. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate a level of excellence that exceeds the satisfactory level of ongoing professional development as a teacher. **D. Other Instructional Activities** The Department of Design recognizes the importance of student participation in activities outside of class sessions such as but not limited to exhibitions, conferences, professional design organizations, and other activities where learning occurs. Candidates shall describe in their combined Narrative and PDS any other instructional activities they facilitated that support student learning and include evidence of them in their supplemental documentation. The Department of Design considers the facilitation of student participation in these other instructional activities as excellent. **Excellent Other Instructional Activities** The following are representative but non-exhaustive and non-prioritized examples of excellent other instructional activities that may be used by the department committee to evaluate the candidate. Items are numbered for reference only. 1. Develops innovative approaches to teaching or exemplary ways of fostering student learning outside the classroom. 2. Mentors and supports new faculty by providing course syllabi and project examples. 3. Organizes, mentors and is significantly involved in, student exhibits and events. 4. Advises, mentors and places students in professional internships. 5. Provides leadership and support of student organizations (such as DSA) or professional student chapters. 6. Provides personal supervision of student research and/or design project(s) outside of an assigned course. 7. Participates in academic advising, student mentoring, and recruitment and retention activities off campus. 8. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate a level of excellence that exceeds the satisfactory level of other instructional activities.
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; changes to course material in order to remain current with one's discipline.	**2.1.1 Continuous Professional Learning** The Department of Design concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.1 and COTA RTP Policy 2.1.1 and adds the following. **2.1.1.1 Ongoing Professional Development in the Discipline** The candidate shall remain aware of new developments in their discipline(s) and specialization(s). Candidates shall list and describe in their combined Narrative and PDS actions taken to maintain currency in their professional discipline(s) and specialization(s). Evidence of these actions shall be included in supplemental materials. **Satisfactory Ongoing Professional Development in the Discipline** The following are representative but non- exhaustive and non-prioritized examples of satisfactory professional development in the discipline that may be used by the department committee to evaluate the candidate. Items are numbered for reference only. 1. Maintains awareness of current developments in the discipline. 2. Reviews discipline specific books, journals and/or electronic media. 3. Interacts with practitioners in the field. 4. Consistently incorporates professional experience, research and/or service into instruction.

NEW 2024 COTA RTP POLICY	NEW DRAFT DESIGN RTP POLICY
	5. Seeks out and incorporates the use of new applications and technologies in the classroom. 6. Attends and/or participates in academic development programs, seminars, conferences, trainings, workshops, and/or continuing education. 7. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate satisfactory ongoing professional development in the discipline. **Excellent Ongoing Professional Development in the Discipline** The following are representative but non-exhaustive and non-prioritized examples of excellent professional development in the discipline that may be used by the department committee to evaluate the candidate. Items are numbered for reference only. 1. Pursues continuing education by attending discipline specific seminars, conventions and lectures. 2. Holds a leadership position in discipline- related organizations. (Such as SEGD, IIDA, IDSA, AIA or AIGA). 3. Maintains an active and significant relationship with a professional consultancy, design firm, in-house design department and/or freelance clients. 4. Develops ongoing relationships with industry that provide active classroom involvement and sponsored projects. 5. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate a level of excellence that exceeds the satisfactory level of ongoing professional development in the discipline, as appropriate.
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 Department of Design concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.2 and COTA RTP Policy 2.1.2 and adds the following. Candidates shall submit sufficient samples of student work to document the achievement of all Student Learning Outcomes for each course (not each class section) taught during the period of review. Candidates are not required to submit samples from every assignment in every class section taught during the period of review. To streamline the amount of documentation required from the candidate, they may choose to submit samples from the last section of each course taught during the period of review. To demonstrate improvement in instructional effectiveness that has occurred over time, they may choose to submit samples from the same course taught in different semesters during the period of review and address the improvements in their Narrative. All samples must be from the period of review.
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 Department of Design concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.3 and COTA RTP Policy 2.1.3 and adds the following. Candidates, in their combined Narrative and PDS, shall address efforts to improve instructional effectiveness and any inconsistencies or anomalies in their SPOT summaries. To aid reviewers in properly identifying documentation, all evidence shall be organized, labeled, dated, and specifically referenced within the combined Narrative and PDS. Candidates shall include evidence of the following in their supplemental documentation for the last section of each course taught during the period of review. • Syllabus • Teaching materials such as but not limited to recorded lectures, assignment instructions, presentations, demonstrations, or other instructional content. • Samples of student work demonstrating the achievement of the course Student Learning Outcomes. • Methods of assessments such as but not limited to rubrics and grading criteria.

NEW 2024 COTA RTP POLICY	NEW DRAFT DESIGN RTP POLICY
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 and evaluation by a faculty member of equal or higher rank, 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 Department of Design concurs with COTA RTP 2.1.4 and adds the following. The Department of Design requires classroom or class session visitation by at least one member of the department RTP committee for Reappointment, Tenure, or Promotion reviews. The department RTP committee shall select the observing member(s). More than one visitation may be requested by the candidate to accommodate differences in instructional delivery or course structure. Observation shall occur on a mutually agreeable date suggested by the candidate during the departmental evaluation period. The observation shall be documented using a rubric designed to give a well-rounded view of a candidate's performance in the classroom or class session(s) that includes the following categories and questions: 1. **Instructional Skills** • *Clarity of Explanation:* Does the candidate explain concepts clearly? Do they simplify complex ideas? • *Integration of Technology/Equipment:* Does the candidate use technology or relevant equipment to enhance learning and engage students? 2. **Class Management** • *Behavioral Expectations:* Does the candidate establish clear, consistent, and fair expectations for student behavior? • *Pacing and Time Management:* Does the candidate manage time effectively during lessons to cover key material and provide opportunities for questions and practice? 3. **Content Relevance** • *Connecting Content to Real-World Applications:* Does the candidate relate course content to real-world examples, helping students see its relevance? 4. **Differentiation of Learning Needs** • *Use of Effective Teaching Strategies:* Does the candidate employ a variety of instructional strategies that cater to different learning styles (e.g., visual, auditory, kinesthetic)? 5. **Professionalism** • *Preparedness:* Does the candidate come to class prepared, with well-organized lessons and materials? • *Delivery:* Does the candidate demonstrate professionalism in their behavior, interactions, and decision-making? 6. **Facilitating Participation** • *Engagement with Students:* Does the candidate engage students during lessons? Are students actively involved? • *Positive Learning Environment:* Does the candidate create a respectful, inclusive, and supportive classroom atmosphere? This framework allows evaluators to assess multiple aspects of teaching that contribute to student success and the overall effectiveness of the educational environment created by the candidate. The observing committee member(s) shall determine in each category if the candidate is "Excellent," "Satisfactory," or "Unsatisfactory" and detail a justification for their evaluation in each category of the rubric. The observing department RTP committee member(s) shall share the results of each visitation with the entire department RTP committee for discussion and evaluation. The committee shall integrate the assessment of the visitation(s) into their report and indicate to the candidate any recommendations for improving instructional effectiveness.
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 and further described in each department's policies. 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.	**2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)** The Department of Design concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.2 and COTA Policy 2.2 and adds the following. The Department of Design believes that faculty research, scholarly and creative activities (RSCA) are essential parts of its educational programs. Expertise in current design practice, acquired by active engagement in the design profession, is important for effective teaching. The Department of Design expects faculty to engage in creative projects, professional practice, and/or research on an ongoing basis. Candidates shall provide evidence of active and ongoing engagement in their discipline(s) (including peer review if applicable).

NEW 2024 COTA RTP POLICY	NEW DRAFT DESIGN RTP POLICY
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. 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.” No additional disclosures beyond what Faculty Affairs requires is expected.	Faculty in the Department of Design consider their peers to include clients, agencies, and/or professionals acting as representatives of a recognized, professional organization, in addition to academic colleagues. Evidence of active and ongoing engagement may vary by candidate and include professional design practice, academic-related achievement, or both. Since professional practice and academic-related achievement vary in meaning and scope, items in this category are divided into two subcategories of equivalent distinction: *Professional Achievement* and *Academic Achievement*. Items in either of these two subcategories are based on engagement in individual or group discipline-related research, scholarly, or creative activity. Candidates shall address the meaning, scope, and significance of RSCA activities in their narrative. **2.2.1 Satisfactory Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)** The following are representative but non-exhaustive and non-prioritized examples of satisfactory activities that may be used by the department committee to evaluate the candidate. Items are numbered for reference only. Professional Achievement (includes items related to design practice): 1. Contribution to the design profession by preparation of proposals for a community-based or local client (individual, corporation, non-profit organization, government, etc.) and/or with local impact in the industry or society. 2. Selected for a professionally related contract, bid, proposal, and/or commission for a community-based or local client (individual, corporation, non-profit organization, government, etc.) and/or with local impact in the industry or society. 3. Printed and/or digital work and/or interviews related to work in community-based or local trade magazines or digital publications (including blogs, podcasts, or other digital distribution) (excludes candidate-paid advertising). 4. Production of designs, works, and/or exhibits for a community-based or local client or audience. 5. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate satisfactory design practice. Academic Achievement (includes items related to design research or scholarly activity): 1. Published discipline-related academic papers in journals, conference proceedings, and/or electronic documents for community or chapter level institutions, events, or audiences. 2. Presentation of design research at professional or academic conferences, meetings, and/or organizations for community or chapter level institutions, events, or audiences. 3. Selected as curator or co-curator for discipline-related exhibitions for audiences at the local or community level. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate satisfactory design research or scholarly activities. **2.2.2 Excellent Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)** Items in this category are based on merit and/or significance in meaning or scope of practice. Candidates shall address the excellent nature of their RSCA activity in their narrative for this category. The following are representative but non-exhaustive and non-prioritized examples of excellent activities that may be used by the department committee to evaluate the candidate. Items are numbered for reference only. Professional Achievement (includes items related to design practice): 1. Winning a discipline-related award from a professional organization and/or corporation. 2. Selected for a professionally related contract, bid, proposal, and/or commission for a regionally, nationally, or internationally known client (individual, corporation, non-profit organization, government, etc.), with a substantial role or scope, and/or with substantial impact in the industry or society regionally, nationally, or internationally. 3. Printed and/or digital work and/or interviews related to work in regional, national, or international trade magazines or digital publications (including blogs, podcasts, or other digital distribution) (excludes candidate-paid advertising). 4. Production of designs, works, and/or exhibits for a regionally, nationally, or internationally known client (individual, corporation, non-profit organization, government, etc.), with a substantial role or scope, and/or with

NEW 2024 COTA RTP POLICY	NEW DRAFT DESIGN RTP POLICY
	substantial impact in the industry or society regionally, nationally, or internationally. 5. Invited speaking engagements or presentations at professional conferences, meetings and/or organizations. 6. Invited reviewer or juror (professional competitions). 7. Invited participation in the development of industry standards of practice (software, codes, statutes). 8. Formal recognition by members of the profession. 9. Attains or renews professional certification, accreditation, or licensing through a recognized testing process. 10. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate a level of excellence that exceeds the satisfactory level of design practice. Academic Achievement (includes items related to design research): 1. Winning a discipline-related award from an academic organization (prize, grant, scholarship, fellowship). 2. Published discipline-related, peer- reviewed academic papers in journals, conference proceedings, and/or electronic documents for regional, national, or international audiences. 3. Presentation of design research at recognized professional or academic conferences, meetings, and/or organizations for regional, national, or international level institutions, events, or audiences. 4. Published books as single and/or multiple author(s) (paper or electronic). 5. Invited speaking engagements or presentations at academic conferences, meetings, and/or organizations. 6. Invited reviewer or juror (academic papers, works, competitions). 7. Invited editor (academic journals, books, electronic publications). 8. Selected as curator or co-curator of a discipline-related exhibition for audiences at the regional, national, or international level. 9. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate a level of excellence that exceeds the satisfactory level of design research or scholarly activities.
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 Department of Design defers to 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.	**2.3.1. University Service:** The Department of Design concurs with the COTA RTP Policy 2.3.1 and adds the following. Candidates for Reappointment shall have satisfactory service experience at the program and department level. Candidates for tenure or promotion to Associate Professor shall have standard service experience at the college level, in addition to service at the program and department level. Candidates for promotion to Professor shall have satisfactory service experience at the university and/ or community levels in addition to service at the program, department and college levels. **2.3.1.1 Satisfactory University Service** The following are representative, but non- exhaustive and non-prioritized examples of satisfactory service that may be used by the department committee to evaluate the candidate. Items are numbered for reference only. *Program Level:* 1. Organizes program/class specific events such as field trips, conferences and/or guest lecturers. 2. Mentors adjunct instructors. 3. Recruits qualified faculty. 4. Serves as a guest critic or reviewer for a course, portfolio, and/or exhibit within the candidate's program. 5. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate program-level satisfactory university service. *Department Level:* 1. Committee participation. 2. Serves as a guest critic or reviewer for a course, portfolio and/or exhibit within the department, but outside of the candidate's program assignment.

NEW 2024 COTA RTP POLICY	NEW DRAFT DESIGN RTP POLICY
	3. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate department-level satisfactory university service. *College Level:* 1. Committee participation. 2. Attendance at a college level workshop or scholarly event. 3. Serve as a guest critic or reviewer for an event (course, portfolio, exhibit, etc.) within the COTA, yet outside of the department of design. 4. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate college level satisfactory university service. *University Level:* 1. Committee Participation. 2. Serves as a guest critic or reviewer for an event (course, portfolio, exhibit, etc.) outside of COTA. 3. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate university-level satisfactory university service. **2.3.1.2 Excellent University Service** The following are representative but non-exhaustive and non-prioritized examples of excellent service that may be used by the department committee to evaluate the candidate. Items are numbered for reference only. *Program Level:* 1. Serves as program coordinator, unless assigned time is provided. 2. Prepares a grant proposal/request on behalf of a program. 3. Organizes program specific events for all major-related students, such as field trips, conferences and guest lecturers. 4. Authors documents, reports and/or other materials pertinent to a program. 5. Secures external funds or goods for the benefit of a program. 6. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate a level of excellence that exceeds the satisfactory level of university service to the program(s). *Department Level:* 1. Serves as committee chair. 2. Serves as Department Chair. 3. Organizes and supervises students or student groups in study-abroad activities 4. Curates a non-course specific exhibit. 5. Serves as a guest critic for a program at another, comparable institution. 6. Active in department development for fund raising and facilities upgrades. 7. Authors documents, reports and other materials pertinent to the department. 8. Prepares grant proposals/requests on behalf of the department. 9. Organizes program/department specific events for all design students, such as field trips, conferences and guest lecturers. 10. Secures external funds or goods for the benefit of the department. 11. Supports diverse student populations through organization of or participation in formal department level student enrichment activities and events including guest speaker or organizing events for department level activities for the purpose of community building and engagement across multiple degree areas or disciplines that promote student success. 12. Consistently and over a semester or more, create or publish content for the department or design discipline areas on the web or social media that support student success and highlight department activities and achievements to the public. 13. Maintaining alumni and institutional relationships for the department or program areas that are outside of instructional activities. 14. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate a level of excellence that exceeds the satisfactory level of university service to the department.

NEW 2024 COTA RTP POLICY	NEW DRAFT DESIGN RTP POLICY
	College Level: 1. Serves as committee chair. 2. Promotes and participates in collaboration with other departments within the COTA. 3. Authors documents, reports and other materials pertinent to the COTA. 4. Presents at college level workshops or scholarly events. 5. Organizes or supervises various COTA students or student groups in study- abroad activities. 6. Secures external funds or goods for the benefit of the COTA. 7. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate a level of excellence that exceeds the satisfactory level of university service to the college. *University Level:* 1. Serves as committee chair. 2. Promotes and participates in collaboration with departments outside of COTA. 3. Authors documents, reports and other materials pertinent to the university. 4. Secures external funds or goods for the benefit of the university. 5. Presents at university level workshops or scholarly events. 6. Organizes and supervises students or student groups from multiple colleges or universities on study-abroad activities. 7. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate a level of excellence that exceeds the satisfactory level of university service to the university.
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 Department of Design concurs with the COTA Policy 2.3.2 and adds the following. In addition to campus governance activities, faculty members shall participate in service to professional design organizations and professionally related activities. **2.3.2.1 Satisfactory Professional Service** The following are representative but non-exhaustive and non-prioritized examples of satisfactory service that may be used by the department committee to evaluate the candidate. Items are numbered for reference only. 1. Active membership and participation in a professional organization, professional union or guild. 2. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate satisfactory service to the candidate's profession. **2.3.2.2 Excellent Professional Service** The following are representative but non-exhaustive and non-prioritized examples of excellent service that may be used by the department committee to evaluate the candidate. Items are numbered for reference only. 1. Active in a local, regional, national and/or international professional organization. 2. Holds a non-paid position within the organization and is responsible for organizing or shows active participation in a related event. 3. Holds leadership position in discipline- related professional organizations. 4. Receives recognition for leadership in a professional organization. 5. Curator of a professional exhibit related to a professional organization. 6. Provides pro-bono professional services to the university, community, and/or governmental organization. 7. Other recognized, discipline-specific items that demonstrate a level of excellence that exceeds satisfactory professional service.
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.	**2.3.3 Community Service:** The Department of Design concurs with the COTA Policy 2.3.3 and adds the following. Meaningful service must be clearly related to the academic expertise of the faculty member. The Department shall 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.

NEW 2024 COTA RTP POLICY	NEW DRAFT DESIGN RTP POLICY
3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.0	**3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS** The Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.0 and COTA 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 ~~and decisions~~ 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 Department of Design concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.1 and COTA RTP Policy 3.1 and adds the following. Candidates shall make every effort to seek advice and guidelines on the RTP process so that 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. The Department of Design requires candidates to submit a combined Narrative and PDS of twenty (20) pages or less that is thoughtfully organized in sequence with RTP Policy sections (and subsections) 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3. Candidates shall use general language in describing their achievements and contributions to aid reviewers outside of their discipline who may not share knowledge of discipline-specific terminology. It is the responsibility of the candidate to collect, retain, organize, and include dated evidence of all claims described or listed. When a single piece of evidence is more than one page, candidates shall highlight the most relevant portion(s) of the documentation to aid reviewers in verifying the specific claim described or listed. The Department of Design discourages faculty from soliciting letters from current students. The candidate may notify colleagues and professionals in and outside of the department about the opportunity to submit letters during the Open Period, however, these letters shall not be recognized as a substitute for required evidence or supplemental documentation.
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 candidates 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, candidate 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 Department of Design defers to 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 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.	**3.2 Department RTP Policy** The Department of Design defers to 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 Department of Design concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.3 and COTA RTP Policy 3.3 and adds the following. The Department RTP Committee shall normally consist of three full-time, tenured faculty members of appropriate rank, duly elected by the tenured and probationary department faculty. Members of the Department RTP Committee shall be from the Department of Design unless the department has insufficient numbers of faculty to meet the requirements. If there are insufficient numbers of eligible faculty within the Department of Design, then the department chair and/or dean may ask for nominations from other departments within the college and/or university. These external nominations shall be

NEW 2024 COTA RTP POLICY	NEW DRAFT DESIGN RTP POLICY
	sent directly to the dean or their designee. The dean or designee shall contact the nominees and prepare a list of preferably at least four (4) total nominees from inside and/or outside the department who are willing to serve on the Design Department RTP Committee. This list shall be made accessible to the voting faculty a minimum of five (5) calendar days prior to a faculty vote. The tenured and probationary department faculty shall vote by secret ballot for three of the nominees on the ballot. The three nominees with the highest number of votes will serve. In case of a tie, another vote between those candidates shall be conducted until one nominee receives a majority of the votes cast. This committee has the primary responsibility for evaluating the file submitted by the candidate and making the initial recommendation to the college regarding reappointment, tenure and/or promotion. Committee members, therefore, have the very serious responsibility of applying the standards of the department to the performance of their colleagues in the RTP process. The department committee is 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. When possible, the members of the committee shall serve two-year, staggered terms, so there will always be members with experience in the process to mentor new members to the committee.
3.4 Department Chair The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.4.	**3.4 Department Chair** The Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.4 and COTA 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.	**3.5 College RTP Policy** The Department of Design defers to 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 Department of Design defers to 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 Department of Design defers to 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~~ level~~s~~ function ~~like~~ provide 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 Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.7 and 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 Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.8.
3.9 President COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.9	**3.9 President** The Department of Design 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 Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.0, and to all RTP deadlines established by Faculty Affairs.

NEW 2024 COTA RTP POLICY	NEW DRAFT DESIGN RTP POLICY
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 Department of Design 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 Probationary Faculty for Tenure and Promotion** The Department of Design 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 Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.1.
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: 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.	**5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA** The Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.0 and COTA RTP Policy 5.0.
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 Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.1 and 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 Department of Design defers to 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 Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.3 and 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 7.6-7.6.1 for definitions of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and excellent.	**5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor** The Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.4 and COTA RTP Policy 5.4.

NEW 2024 COTA RTP POLICY	NEW DRAFT DESIGN RTP POLICY
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 Department of Design 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 7.6-7.6.1 for definitions of satisfactory, unsatisfactory, and excellent.	**5.5.1 Early Tenure** The Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.1 and COTA RTP Policy 5.5.1.
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 Department of Design defers to 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 6.1and 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 Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.1 and COTA RTP Policy 6.1.
6.2 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.2.	**6.2** The Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.2.
6.3 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.3.	**6.3** The Department of Design 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 Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.4 and COTA RTP Policy 6.4.
6.5 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.5.	**6.5** The Department of Design defers to CSULB 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 Department of Design defers to CSULB 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 Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.7 and COTA RTP Policy 6.7.

NEW 2024 COTA RTP POLICY	NEW DRAFT DESIGN RTP POLICY
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 Department of Design defers to CSULB 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 Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.9 and COTA RTP Policy 6.9.
6.10 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.10.	**6.10** The Department of Design 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 Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.1.
7.2 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.2.	**7.2** The Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.2.
7.3 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.3.	**7.3** The Department of Design 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 history. In subsequent RTP submissions, the candidate must provide the 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.	**7.4** The Department of Design defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.4 and COTA RTP Policy 7.4.
7.5 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 7.5	**7.5** The Department of Design defers to 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 Department of Design defers to 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** The Department of Design defers to CSULB Policy 8.0 and COTA Policy 8.0.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS

Department RTP Policy Document Approval

Effective Date: **Fall 2025**

Department of DESIGN

Approved by the College Faculty Council (Enter date below):	Faculty Council Chair Name & Signature:	Date:
04/22/2025	Chris Miles	5/20/2025

Approved by the College Dean (Enter date below):	College Dean Name & Signature:	Date
05/05/2025	Royce Smith	5/14/2025

Final Review by Faculty Affairs (Enter date below):	Associate Vice President, Faculty Affairs Name & Signature:	Date:
5/9/25	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