

NEW COTA RTP POLICY	NEW SOA RTP POLICY
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 School of Art Mission and Vision The mission of the School of Art is to provide an instructional program of the highest quality to a diverse and varied group of student artists, designers, historians and educators; lower- and upper-division, as well as graduate students. The School of Art fosters the creative and scholarly activities of its faculty, believing that an engaged, professional faculty is essential to providing a high quality and challenging instructional experience.
1.2 Principles The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.	1.2 Principles The School of Art 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 School of Art concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.1. and adds the following: In view of its size and tradition of quality, and recognizing the number of undergraduate and graduate programs, including terminal degrees, it is particularly important for the School of Art to maintain the highest standards of teaching, currency in the field, substantive achievements in scholarly and creative activity, and service.
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. reappointment, tenure, or promotion are defined in section 5, and evaluative terms are defined in section 7.6.	1.2.2 The School of Art concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.2 and COTA RTP Policy 1.2.2. and adds the following: The School of Art encompasses multiple disciplines and comprises multiple sub-departmental organizational units (programs) connected to specific disciplines, specializations, degrees, practices, and/or curriculum sets that differ in their philosophy, methods and results of instruction, and in the productions that meet requirements for Scholarly and Creative activity. The RTP standards of the School of Art are tailored to respect the differences in these programs, while establishing a consistent level of excellence across the board.
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 School of Art 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 School of Art concurs with 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 School of Art concurs with COTA RTP Policy 1.2.4.
1.3 Values COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3	1.3 Values The School of Art concurs with 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.	1.3.1 The School of Art concurs with COTA RTP Policy 1.3.1.

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 School of Art concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.2.
1.3.3 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.3	1.3.3 The School of Art concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.3.
1.3.4 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.4	1.3.4 The School of Art concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.4.
1.3.5 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.5	1.3.5 The School of Art 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 School of Art concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.0 and COTA RTP Policy 2.0 and adds the following: Criteria set by the School of Art RTP policy establish the standards by which faculty, following diverse career paths, are evaluated. Colleagues in the School and on review committees play the central role in evaluating the quality of performance in each of the areas under review.
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 School of Art concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1 and COTA RTP Policy 2.1.

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 School of Art concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.1 and COTA RTP Policy 2.1.1. and adds the following: Professional learning may also include efforts to expand visual, historical, theoretical, and/or technical knowledge via continuing education. The record may include involvement in programs of the CSULB Faculty Center and Academic Technology Services, participation in teaching development seminars or conferences sponsored by the School, College, University, or professional organizations; giving or receiving of formal or informal pedagogical coaching and/or other activities which contribute to professional development of teaching effectiveness.
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 School of Art concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.2 and COTA 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 School of Art concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.3 and COTA RTP Policy 2.1.3 and adds the following: Faculty should make every effort to encourage students to participate in Student Perception of Teaching (SPOT) evaluations. In addition to providing copies of statistical summaries of course evaluation data, and additional summarization of course evaluation data in the PDS/Narrative, candidates are encouraged to provide commentary regarding course evaluation results, especially in cases of below-department-mean or anomalous results. Additional examples of instructional practices that foster learning are project descriptions, sample lectures, in-class demonstrations, course hand-outs and information packets.
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 evaluation by a faculty member of equal or higher rank, 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 School of Art concurs with COTA RTP Policy 2.1.4 and adds the following: Classroom Visitation Policy The School of Art does not require classroom visitations. Should a candidate feel that their evaluation would benefit from a classroom visitation they may request a visitation as per the COTA RTP Policy, 2.1.4. Policy for Classroom Visitations in the School of Art is as follows: Candidates must submit their request for visitations to the School of Art RTP Committee Chair prior to the Open Period. If a chair has not yet been selected, the request should be made to the Director of the School of Art. The classroom visits should be scheduled to take place sometime between the start of the Open Period and the date when the candidate’s file is due to the committee. As per the Collective Bargaining Agreement (Article 15.14), candidates are to be provided notice at least five (5) days prior to a classroom visitation, and there shall be consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual(s) who visits their class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and scheduling of such visits. Because visitations are solely at the candidate’s request in the School of Art, if a mutually agreeable date falls prior to five (5) days after the request, the two parties can choose to schedule it accordingly. Visitations will be performed by member(s) of the SoA RTP Committee, or by a combination of member(s) of the SoA RTP Committee. The signed report on the visitation, with the relevant course number, time and date of the visit, will be placed in the candidate’s file, with a copy to the candidate. The following are representative of criteria that may be used to evaluate the candidate. This list is not exhaustive and is not prioritized. • Instructional clarity • Interaction and communication with students • Student engagement • Presentation style and methods, including use of technology if applicable • Effective use of class time • Effective delivery of course content • Demonstrations of materials, if applicable • Management of the classroom
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	2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA) The School of Art concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.2 and COTA Policy 2.2 and adds the following clarifications:

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. 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”. No additional disclosures beyond what Faculty affairs requires is expected.	Faculty must maintain an ongoing program of research, scholarship, and/or creative activity (RSCA) that reflects intellectual and professional growth within their discipline. All faculty are expected to produce scholarly or creative work that contributes to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of their field (or interdisciplinary studies). This work must be disseminated to appropriate audiences and recognized by professional peers either before or after dissemination. Evaluation of RSCA within the field requires a qualitative assessment of peer review and validation. Invitations from recognized organizations, institutions, publishers, or other reputable entities may serve as a form of peer review and will be evaluated within the disciplinary context. RSCA may sometimes overlap with instruction, instructional activities, or service and may extend across disciplines. In such cases, candidates must clearly define categorical and disciplinary boundaries, ensuring that contributions are not counted in multiple categories. Given the emphasis on professional growth in the evaluation process, RSCA documentation should highlight progressive professional development. This principle should serve as the central focus of the candidate's narrative. For publications, manuscripts, and creative works, quality—particularly as assessed through peer review and validation—is the primary criterion. Joint authorship or participation in collaborative scholarly and creative projects is valuable but can be difficult to assess. Candidates must specify their individual contributions to jointly authored work. Candidates should include a statement of contribution for all co-authored or collaborative works, detailing their specific role (e.g., conceptual development, data collection, analysis, creative direction, writing, editing, supervision) to ensure transparency in evaluation. Collaborative, supervisory, or consultative roles in RSCA projects may also be considered. Candidates must clearly define their roles and responsibilities in such projects. Candidates are encouraged to provide evidence of the broader impact of their RSCA, including citations, reviews, audience engagement, policy influence, or contributions to professional practice. Reviews of a candidate's RSCA—whether solicited, unsolicited, published, or unpublished—if included in the file by the candidate or appropriately submitted during the Open Period, will be considered a form of peer review. In addition to traditional peer-reviewed publications and exhibitions, emerging forms of scholarly and creative dissemination—such as public scholarship, digital platforms, and community-engaged projects—shall be evaluated based on the standards of rigor and validation appropriate to the discipline. For all disciplines, the evaluation of ongoing or in-progress RSCA should account for the scale and duration of the project. Indicators of incremental progress, such as invitations to present or exhibit, preliminary reviews of drafts, or contracts, should be considered in the peer review process. RSCA must be thoroughly documented in the candidate's file.
	2.2.1 RSCA: Art Education 2.2.1 Art Education Candidates in the field of Art Education shall demonstrate consistent and ongoing records of peer-reviewed RSCA, including but not limited to any of the following non-prioritized examples. Written works may include • books • articles in professional journals • scholarly papers for presentation • software and electronically published documents • video curricula • and models for art programming. These works should be peer reviewed. Other RSCA may include: • curating • judging exhibitions pertinent to Art education • editorial assignments with recognized related professional publications, including journals, newsletters, or electronic media • grants or fellowships received • appointments to selection panels for grants, awards and related conference presentations • review of manuscripts for scholarly or textbook publishers • leadership role in professional organizations, especially those involving outcomes such as conferences or publications

	• and consultations with public/private schools and community projects, such as, educational institutions, alternative education programs, community outreach projects, community-based organizations and nonprofits, and social impact initiatives. This list is not exhaustive, not meant to be restrictive, and other expressions/titles for RSCA not listed here may be appropriate.
	2.2.2 RSCA: Art History Candidates in the field of Art History shall demonstrate consistent and ongoing records of peer reviewed RSCA, including but not limited to any of the following non-prioritized examples: • written works, usually peer reviewed (books, articles in professional journals, scholarly presentations, and software and electronically published documents) • curating exhibitions • writing exhibition catalogs or entries • jurying exhibitions • book or exhibition reviews • editorial assignments with recognized professional publications, including journals, newsletters, or electronic media • grants or fellowships received • manuscripts for books or articles submitted or under revision • appointment to selection panels for grants, awards, and conference presentations • reviews of manuscripts for scholarly or textbook publishers • scholarly digital humanities projects • scholarly public-facing web publications • media interviews about scholarship • public-facing educational talks • consultation on or other contributions to documentary films or videos • leadership roles in professional organizations, especially those involving outcomes such as conferences or publications This list is not exhaustive, not meant to be restrictive, and forms and manifestations of RSCA not listed here may be appropriate.
	2.2.3 RSCA: Studio Art Disciplines Candidates in studio art disciplines shall demonstrate consistent and ongoing records of peer-reviewed, professionally related research, scholarship, and creative activities (RSCA). This may include, but is not limited to, the following examples: • Exhibition of artworks, installations, performances, media and/or screenings in museums, galleries, public spaces, recognized community collectives, nonprofits and online venues. • Publication of work in catalogs, monographs, professional journals, magazines, and digital media. • Acquisition of works by public institutions, organizations, collectives, or recognized private collections. • Commissions of artwork, public or private. • Curatorial work or writing for catalogs, books, or digital media. • Presentation of artwork and/or research at recognized venues through lectures, conferences, collaborations, residencies, or projects. • Receipt of grants, fellowships, and awards from foundations, public and private organizations, in support of the individual's artistic practice. This list is not exhaustive, not meant to be restrictive, and forms and manifestations of RSCA not listed here may be appropriate.
	2.2.4 RSCA: Graphic Design/Illustration/Animation Candidates in Animation, Graphic Design, and Illustration shall demonstrate consistent and ongoing records of peer-reviewed professionally related research, scholarship and creative activities (RSCA). Any Faculty performance in the areas of advertising, graphic design, illustration and animation can be considered as RSCA, which will be assessed

	based on the nature and breadth of their roles and the projects. These may include, but are not limited to, the following examples: • Published, unpublished and/or experimental work for print, radio, screen-based media, video, multimedia, film, exhibition. • In such categories as books, comics/graphic novels, brochures, textiles, lifestyle, editorials, institutional, web or media design, mural painting, self-promotion, unpublished, pre-production, post-production, poster, branding, corporate identity, user-centered design (UX/UI, AR/VR, interaction design), packaging, experience design, and typography design. • Written works may include books, articles in professional journals, scholarly presentations, software and electronically published documents. • Exhibitions and/or curatorial roles, awards, grants, artist's residencies, conferences and/or public presentations, creative entrepreneurial projects, competitive jury participation, leadership roles in professional organizations, especially those involving outcomes, such as conferences, film festivals, award shows and publications (online or in print). • A candidate's involvement in a project may be represented by titles such as producer, director, art director, creative director, designer, illustrator, animator, layout artist, storyboard artist, background painter, typography designer, or any other creative role that is essential for the project. This list is not exhaustive, not meant to be restrictive, and other expressions/titles for RSCA not listed here may be appropriate.
	2.2.5 Foundation Faculty teaching in Foundation are often generalists and/or have extensive experience in discipline specific areas. Candidates in the Foundation shall demonstrate consistent and ongoing records of peer reviewed RSCA, including but not limited to any of the following non-prioritized examples: Their RSCA contributions can extend to include activities across subsections 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, and 2.2.4. • Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. teaching strategies, pedagogy, learning sciences, and curriculum design may also be included. • Furthermore, Foundation faculty may frequently combine studio-based creative output with research in pedagogy, learning sciences, and curriculum design. This union may result in instructional publications designed to assist learning goals in the Foundation classroom. Valuable contributions, however, must have been evaluated by expert scholars or practitioners in the field.
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 School of Art concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.3 and COTA RTP Policy 2.3 and adds the following: Faculty service contributions may take many forms, including formal roles, structured committees, or informal mentorship and advising. While this policy categorizes service into campus, community, and professional contributions, these categories are not mutually exclusive. The quality, significance, and impact of service contributions should be the primary criteria for evaluation. Types of Service Contributions Faculty service may include, but is not limited to: • Campus Service: Leadership and participation in department, college, or university committees; CSU system-wide service; oversight of departmental labs and facilities; mentoring and supervising student workers; faculty governance participation; service to student organizations; and contributions to faculty associations. • Community Engagement: Board memberships, consulting with agencies relevant to academic expertise, and public scholarship initiatives. • Service to the Profession: Peer review of scholarly publications and external grants; leadership roles in professional organizations; mentorship, coaching, and advising of colleagues and students in the discipline; and authorship of reports, policies, or best practices documents. Evaluation of Service

	The evaluation of service contributions shall be based on: 1. Quality and Impact: The extent to which the service activity supports the mission of the university, college, or profession. 2. Level of Engagement: The depth of involvement, leadership, and sustained contributions. As noted in COTA RTP Policy 2.3.1, Faculty should clearly document their service activities in their Professional Development Statement (PDS)/narrative, including: • A description of their role and contributions. • The significance and impact of their service activities. • Supporting documentation such as letters of invitation, acknowledgments, reports, printed programs, or other relevant materials. • Candidates must disclose and describe whenever activities include reassigned time or compensation, including details about the expectations or goals of the service activity.
2.3.1 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 School of Art concurs with COTA Policy 2.3.1 and adds the following: Faculty can enhance their service contributions by actively participating in committees at various levels within the University and the CSU system. Newer faculty may choose to focus on School committees and build to service at the College and University levels. The role of a SOA program head is an extensive one that requires multiple service tasks and should be considered a major contribution to the candidate's service record.
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 School of Art concurs with COTA Policy 2.3.2 and adds the following: In addition to engaging in campus governance, faculty members may contribute to community service through involvement with relevant professional organizations and participate in professionally relevant activities at the local, state, national, or international levels. These activities may include serving on committees, leading workshops, delivering speeches, participating in media interviews, writing articles or editorials, performing, organizing events, conferences and symposia, jurying film festivals, moderating panels/participating as a panelist at conferences or presenting displays. This list is not meant to be exhaustive or restrictive.
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 Service to the community may also encompass consultancies with public schools, local governments, and relevant service organizations, as well as arts advocacy. Whether paid or unpaid, service contributions from consultancies will be evaluated based on their alignment with the University's mission and their impact on the candidate’s Department/School or Program. For service to be considered meaningful, it must be directly connected to the faculty member’s academic expertise.
3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.0	3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS The School of Art concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.0 and COTA RTP Policy 3.0.
3.1 Candidate	3.1 Candidate The School of Art concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.1 and COTA RTP Policy 3.1.

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 <u>and</u> 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.	
3.1.1 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, 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, 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 School of Art concurs with 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 School of Art 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 School of Art concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.3 and COTA RTP Policy 3.3 and adds the following: The SoA RTP Committee shall normally be composed of five tenured faculty members of appropriate rank, elected by the Department faculty. Ideally, the committee constituency will represent the diversity of disciplines within the School of Art. Faculty members may serve consecutive terms on the committee, contingent upon election.

3.4 Department Chair The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.4.	3.4 Department Chair The School of Art concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.4 and COTA RTP Policy 3.4, and adds the following. The SoA Director (department chair equivalent for RTP purposes) has a number of responsibilities, particularly with regard to probationary faculty, that require the Director to be the primary source of information regarding SoA procedures and deadlines. The Director must also provide guidance to candidates as to SoA expectations. The Director must initiate collegial discussions with candidates about their overall career development and provide professional mentoring, as appropriate. The Director has responsibility of directing RTP candidates to the relevant policies and procedural documents.
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 School of Art 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 School of Art 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 School of Art 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 School of Art 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 School of Art defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.8.
3.9 President COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.9	3.9 President The School of Art 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 School of Art 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 School of Art 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 School of Art 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 School of Art 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,	5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA The School of Art defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.0 and COTA RTP Policy 5.0.

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 satisfactory, unsatisfactory, and excellent.	5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Tenure-track Faculty The School of Art 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 School of Art 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 School of Art 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 School of Art defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.4 and 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 College of the Arts 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 exceeded 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 School of Art 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 exceeded 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 School of Art 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 School of Art 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 School of Art defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.2.
6.3 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.3.	6.3 The School of Art 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 School of Art 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 School of Art 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 School of Art 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 School of Art defers to CSULB 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 School of Art 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 School of Art 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 School of Art 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 School of Art defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.1.
7.2 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.2.	7.2 The School of Art defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.2.
7.3 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.3.	7.3 The School of Art 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 rebuttals and/or replies in the same area as other prior evaluations.	7.4 The School of Art defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.4 and COTA RTP Policy 7.4.

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 School of Art defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.5 and adds the following. Consistent with the Academic Senate policy for external evaluation. School RTP Committees may seek the advice of colleagues at other universities if members do not feel qualified to evaluate the professional work of candidates or if candidates believe that such external evaluation would be desirable. Such an action must be taken in concurrence with the candidate,
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 School of Art concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 7.6 and COTA RTP Policy 7.6. and refers candidates and evaluators to CSULB, COTA, and SoA RTP Policies, section 2 and subsections.
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 School of Art 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 _____SCHOOL OF ART_____

Approved by the College Faculty
Council (Enter date below):

03/25/2025

Faculty Council Chair
Name & Signature:

Chris Miles

Date:

6/26/2025

Approved by the College Dean
(Enter date below):

04/15/2025

College Dean
Name & Signature:

Rayell Smith

Date

6/27/2025

Final Review by Faculty Affairs
(Enter date below):

05/14/25

Associate Vice President, Faculty Affairs
Name & Signature:

Patricia Pin

Date:

6/30/25

Provost Signature:

[Signature]

Date:

07/17/25