

DANCE Department
Screen Reader Accessible Version of RTP Document

**REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP)
PS 9612**

University Policy

The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) policy for California State University, Long Beach establishes the mission, vision, and guiding principles for the evaluation of tenured and probationary faculty members (including coaches, librarians, and Counseling and Psychological Services faculty) eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.¹ The university RTP policy also specifies the process by which faculty work shall be evaluated.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1.1 University Mission and Vision

California State University, Long Beach is a diverse, student-centered, globally-engaged public university committed to providing highly-valued undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities through superior teaching; research, scholarly and creative activities (RSCA); and service for the people of California and the world. CSULB envisions changing lives by expanding educational opportunities, championing creativity, and preparing leaders for a changing world.

1.2 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)

1.2.1 A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarship, creativity, and service is essential to accomplishing the university's articulated mission and vision. CSULB faculty members integrate the results of their RSCA into their teaching, thereby invigorating and enhancing student learning. Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions to the department, college, university, community, and the profession.

1.2.2 Decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) are among the most important made by our university community. RTP decisions must be clear, fair, and unbiased at all levels of review. Faculty achievements may vary from those of colleagues yet still meet the standards for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The RTP process must ensure that excellence will be rewarded and that faculty members who meet department, college, and university standards and expectations will have an opportunity for advancement.

1.2.3 Faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the impact of their contributions over the period of review in: 1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession. All faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of all three areas.

1.2.4 This policy should not be construed to prevent innovation or adjustment in workload (with respect to teaching, RSCA, or service) based upon faculty expertise and accomplishment; department and college needs; and university mission.

College of the Arts Policy

Designed to work in concert with the CSULB RTP Policy, the COTA policy on reappointment, tenure and promotion further defines and guides the RTP process specifically for the College of the Arts, and provides parameters within which departments may still further define and guide the process as appropriate to specific disciplines.

All references to CSULB RTP Policy numbers in this document are to sections and subsections of the 2009 CSULB RTP Policy (Academic Senate Policy Statement 09-10).

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1.1 COTA Mission and Vision

The mission of the College of the Arts is to provide a dynamic, contemporary learning environment that honors tradition, embraces diversity, inspires innovation, and strives for excellence. Our faculty of artists, educators, and scholars is committed to challenging students intellectually, creatively, and professionally, while encouraging them to find their individual artistic voices. The College produces and brings the highest level of art, teaching, and scholarship to our community in the form of concerts, exhibitions and installations, films, performances, publications, and emerging media.

1.2 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)

1.2.1 The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.1.

1.2.2 The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.2 and adds the following.

Because of the broad diversity of instructional approaches and instructionally related activity; research, scholarly, and creative activity (RSCA); and service contributions in a college whose departments—Art, Dance, Design, Film and Electronic Arts, Music, and Theatre Arts—include faculty in arts criticism, arts education, arts history, arts practice, and arts theory, RTP standards must establish a consistent level of expectation while allowing candidates to meet expectations in varied ways.

1.2.3 The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.3 and adds the following.

The College of the Arts expects sustained and substantive achievements and contributions over the specified period of review in: (1) instruction and instructionally related activities, (2) RSCA, and (3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession.

1.2.4 The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.4 and adds the following.

The College of the Arts recognizes that every candidate is unique, and that the specifics of a position, a discipline, a program, and a department will result in candidate files with differing balances and overall levels of achievement and contribution in the three areas of (1) instruction and instructionally related activities, (2) RSCA, and (3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession.

1.2.5 The integrity of the RTP process depends upon the accuracy, honesty, thoroughness, consistency, discretion, and strict confidence of all individuals involved in the process. Concerns about actions that violate this core principle should be reported immediately to the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

1.2.6 The RTP process is governed and guided by the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA); university, college, and department RTP policies; related policies of the Academic Senate; and procedural documents issued by the university (Faculty Affairs), the college, and departments. Concerns about actions in violation of the CBA, RTP policies, Academic Senate policy, or procedural documents should be reported immediately to the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

DANCE Department Policy

Designed to work in concert with the University and College of the Arts' Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) policies and guiding principles, the Department of Dance RTP policy articulates the expected professional standards by which the work and contributions of the faculty in the department shall be evaluated. The policy provides guidance and specificity for the candidate in the three requisite areas of: Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities; Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities; and Service.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1.1 The Department of Dance Mission and Vision

The Department of Dance at CSULB is a rigorous program that provides training in dance with a strong foundation in modern and ballet technique and choreography. Physical practice interfaces with theoretical study, placing dance in a historical, pedagogical, scientific, and cultural context. The varied degrees offered in the Department of Dance (BA, BFA, BA with Option in Dance Science, MA and MFA) challenge students to grow and contribute to society as artists and individuals.

1.2 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)

1.2.1 The Department of Dance recognizes that the professional engagement and active involvement of its faculty in the field of dance is essential to providing a high quality and challenging instructional experience and expects its faculty to maintain currency appropriate to their discipline

1.2.2 The Department of Dance offers a variety of programs including three undergraduate tracks (BA in Dance, and BA in Dance with option in Dance Science, BFA) and two graduate programs (MA, MFA) that differ in content and philosophy.

Faculty positions are designated primarily in two areas of expertise: a) technique, composition and performance; b) theory, history and dance science. However, some faculty positions may bridge both areas. The RTP standards of the department are tailored to establish consistent expectations for all faculty while honoring the differences in expertise. The Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity (RSCA) and professional service of faculty shall interface with expertise and teaching assignments.

Section 2 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

University Policy

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

Colleges, departments, and other academic units are responsible for defining the standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in their various disciplines, consistent with the mission and needs of the university. RTP standards and criteria shall articulate expectations for faculty accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation: 1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession.

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities

Faculty members are expected to demonstrate that they are effective teachers. Instruction and instructionally-related activities include teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom. Instructionally-related activities include, but are not limited to, curriculum development, academic and departmental advising, supervision of student research and fieldwork, direction of student performances and exhibitions, and related activities involving student learning and student engagement. Additional instructional activities may include, but are not limited to, student mentoring, study abroad, and thesis and project supervision.

2.1.1 Instructional Philosophy and Practice

Effective teaching requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching practices and assess their impact on student learning. Thoughtful, deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness, which may result in adopting new teaching methodologies, are expected of all faculty members. Effective teaching also requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with classroom and non-classroom assignments. Teaching methods should be consistent with course/curriculum goals and should accommodate student differences.

2.1.2 Student Learning Outcomes

Effective teaching requires that faculty members provide evidence of student learning. Instructional practices and course materials should clearly convey to students expected student outcomes and learning goals. Assessment methods should align with instructional practices.

2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction

In addition to evidence of teaching effectiveness as defined by department and college RTP policy documents, student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student response to instruction. Student course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. Utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of presenting student response to learning and teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any single item on this form—or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information—does not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness.

2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)

Departments and colleges shall develop their own definitions, standards, and criteria for the evaluation of RSCA. The University RTP policy provides a guiding framework for this charge.

Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions of substance in RSCA throughout their careers. All faculty members are expected to produce quality RSCA achievements that contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary studies.

Academic disciplines vary in the meaning, scope, and practice of RSCA. Evidence of research, scholarly and creative activities and accomplishments includes, but is not limited to, publications of merit reviewed by professional peers, scholarly presentations, fellowships, grants, contracts, scholarship of engagement, and artistic exhibits and performances. These achievements must be reviewed by professional peers and disseminated to appropriate audiences.

2.3 Service

Quality service contributions and activities are necessary to ensure and enhance the quality of programs and activities at the university, in the community, and in the profession. All faculty members are expected to participate in the collegial processes of faculty governance and to maintain active engagement within the university, community, and profession through quality service contributions and activities throughout their career. Meaningful service should be related to the academic expertise and rank of the faculty member.

Departments and colleges shall develop their own standards and criteria for the evaluation of quality service. These standards and criteria shall be based in a comparative evaluation of responsibility and commitment across service obligations at the department, college, and university levels. Departments and colleges shall then make clear to the candidate what types of service are appropriate to faculty rank and experience. Examples of service contributions may include, but are not limited to, leadership roles in faculty governance activities and committees; authorship of reports and other materials pertinent to university, college, or department policies and procedures; ongoing advising of student groups; service or leadership activities for professional organizations or boards; conducting external evaluations; and consulting in public schools, local government, and community organizations.

College of the Arts Policy

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.0 and adds the following.

The criteria for evaluation for each of the three areas of professional review (instruction and instructionally related activities, RSCA, and service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession) describe the nature and level of performance required of all faculty in the College of The Arts. Criteria set by college and department RTP policies establish the standards by which faculty, following diverse career paths, are evaluated. Colleagues in each department of the College of The Arts and on review committees play the central role in evaluating the quality of performance in each of these areas.

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1 and adds the following.

The category of Instructionally Related Activities includes all activities directly related to teaching in the classroom setting, the development of curriculum, student evaluation, supervision of student research and fieldwork, advising, and related activities involving students.

2.1.1 Instructional Philosophy and Practice

The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.1 and adds the following (COTA RTP Policy 2.1.1 – 2.1.1.5).

Teaching effectiveness shall be evaluated via RTP committee evaluation of instruction and related activities during the period subject to RTP review in 5 areas: (1) Pedagogy and Method; (2) Course Preparation; (3) Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher; (4) Integration of Ongoing Professional Development in the Discipline into Teaching; and (5) Other Criteria as appropriate by department.

2.1.1.1 Pedagogy and Method

Pedagogy and Method shall be assessed by the candidate's ability: (1) to impart information in a clear and effective manner; (2) to facilitate class productivity appropriate to the level and purpose of the course; (3) to establish an environment conducive to exploration, critical thinking and the development of creativity; (4) to establish grading practices compatible with department, college, and university guidelines; (5) to maintain high academic standards; (6) to use appropriate methods for assessing student performance; and (7) to effectively critique/evaluate student work.

2.1.1.2 Course Preparation

Course syllabi shall be organized, complete, clear about expectations of students and student learning outcomes, consistent with work produced in class, and consistent with university standards. Where appropriate, course preparation shall utilize current resource materials and technology to maximize teaching effectiveness.

2.1.1.3 Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher

The candidate shall show evidence of ongoing evaluation of pedagogy as it relates to the candidate's teaching philosophy, and efforts to enrich the candidate's teaching and student performance.

2.1.1.4 Integration of Ongoing Professional Development in the Discipline into Teaching

Candidates shall maintain a challenging and current approach to the presentation of course materials, incorporating the candidate's research, scholarly and creative activities and/or professional activities into the classroom, course materials, and teaching methods where appropriate.

2.1.1.5 Other Instructionally Related Activity

The following are representative, but not exhaustive, examples of other activities to be considered in the area of instructionally related activity: academic advising (additional to assignment), student mentoring, recruitment and retention activities; supervision of student research projects and / or theses; curriculum development; innovative approaches to teaching, and exemplary ways of fostering student performance; teaching seminars or pedagogical workshops; participating in and assisting with student activities such as field trips or sponsorship of student organizations.

2.1.2 Student Learning Outcomes

The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.2 and adds the following. Narrative, sample syllabi, and other course-related materials submitted, as well as evidence of activity in curriculum development, shall demonstrate that the candidate understands the role of Student Learning Outcome goals in teaching. This understanding shall be reflected in instructional materials, course assignments, exams, and other demonstrations of competence required in the candidate's courses.

2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction

The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.3 and adds the following. In the combined PDS and Narrative, candidates must accurately summarize, in table form, the numerical averages given for all questions on statistical summaries of all courses evaluated. Candidates may choose to allow the numbers to "speak for themselves," or to provide additional commentary.

In the event that a course that should have been evaluated per university and/or department policy was not evaluated, the candidate must explain the reasons/circumstances that led to the course not being evaluated.

2.1.4 Classroom Visitation

Departments may require that all RTP candidates be observed and evaluated by department RTP committee members visiting the classroom while the candidate is teaching. In departments that do not require classroom visitation, candidates may

request visitation, and such requests shall be granted. Departments shall clearly define procedures for classroom visitation with the goal of fairness and flexibility toward the candidate, objectivity of the process, and appropriate and consistent incorporation of classroom visitation, observation, and evaluation into the RTP process.

2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)

The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.2 and adds the following. Faculty are required to maintain professional currency by being engaged in an ongoing program of research, scholarship and/or creative activity in the discipline. All faculty are required to produce research, scholarly and/or creative achievements that contribute to the advancement of their discipline(s), as recognized by professional peer review. Research, scholarly and/or creative achievement is demonstrated by a substantial record of peer reviewed and recognized professional activities and products. Such activities and products may include books, articles in professional journals or newsletters, scholarly presentations, software and electronically published documents, works, exhibits, designs, performances, commissions, and awards. Candidates should consult their department RTP policy for examples of RSCA and peer review that are appropriate to their area or areas of expertise.

The focus of evaluation of RSCA shall be upon peer review and validation of RSCA within the present context of the field.

2.3 Service

The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.3 and adds the following (COTA RTP Policy 2.3 – 2.3.3).

Candidates are expected to provide substantive service through engagement in activities necessary to ensure and support the caliber of programs and activities at the university, in the community and in the profession.

Departments shall develop their own standards and criteria within university and college guidelines for the evaluation of substantive service. Department policy shall make clear to the candidate what types of service are consistent with the candidate's rank and academic experience, as well as the mission of the department and its instructional programs.

2.3.1. University Service:

Faculty service at all levels within the university shall reflect active, reliable, and collegial participation.

Examples of substantive university service may include, but are not limited to, leadership roles and participation in faculty governance, serving on committees, supervising and sponsoring student groups; authorship of policies, procedures and protocols, proposals, and other pertinent documents.

Service shall be appropriate for the candidate's academic experience and rank. Each candidate's balance of university, college, and department service shall be considered within the context of the candidate's department.

It is the candidate's responsibility to clearly account for service contributions in the combined PDS/Narrative. This shall go beyond simply listing committees upon which one has served; specifics as to the role the candidate has played, and the duration and extent of contributions shall be discussed. The candidate's account of service must be clearly substantiated by supplemental documentation. All levels of review shall provide a qualitative context for the candidate's university service.

2.3.2. 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.

2.3.3 Community Service:

Candidate's service shall be aligned with their discipline and be affiliated with the appropriate community organizations and/or activities.

DANCE Department Policy

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

The Department of Dance acknowledges that faculty members have diverse career paths and that each candidate shall establish and state goals and objectives for evaluation in collaboration with the Department Chair. Colleagues in the Department and on review committees play the central role in evaluating the quality of performance in each of the areas under review. Instructional and Instructionally Related Activities are evaluated according to expectations stated in Policy Section 2.1. The evaluation of RSCA and Service utilizes a two-tier structure. Faculty achievement is expected in Tier One and Tier Two levels, as appropriate to the areas of expertise and the stage of review. These expectations are clarified in Policy Section 2.2.3 for RSCA and 2.3.6 for Service. If a candidate holds that the established classification is not consistent with a given accomplishment, it is the responsibility of the candidate to provide context and supportive materials to justify the placement in a different category

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

The category of Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities for the Department of Dance includes all activities directly related to instruction in the classroom and/or studio setting and when WTUs are associated with the activity. When WTUs are not associated with the activity the candidate may provide justification for consideration of the activity under Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities, or may elect to have the activity considered for evaluation under Service or RSCA. Examples of Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Teaching in the classroom or studio

- Supervision and mentoring of student's creative work such as choreography and performance
- Supervision and mentoring of directed studies, internships, research and fieldwork
- Membership on a graduate thesis committee
- Development of curriculum at the department or college level
- Student evaluations
- Advising and mentoring students

2.1.1.1 Pedagogy and Method

In all relevant courses (e.g. dance composition, improvisation, music for dance, dance history, dance appreciation), teaching methods shall foster critical thinking and analysis, and support an understanding of dance as an art form and a cultural practice.

2.1.1.3 Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher

Thoughtful, deliberate effort towards continued growth and improvement in teaching effectiveness is expected of all candidates. This effort may include regular and ongoing interactions with colleagues such as discussion of pedagogical issues, classroom visits, consultations on course development, as well as revision of course materials based on research into current pedagogy and best teaching practices. This development may also include involvement in training and enrichment programs presented by the CSULB Faculty Center for Professional Development, College, University or professional organizations, as well as giving and/or receiving formal or informal pedagogical coaching.

2.1.1.5 Other Instructionally Related Activity

The category includes all activities directly related to instruction in the classroom and/or studio setting and when WTUs are associated with the activity. When WTUs are not associated with the activity the candidate may provide justification for consideration of the activity under Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities, or may elect to have the activity considered for evaluation under Service or RSCA.

2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction

Student evaluation ratings ideally reflect a favorable student perception of an instructor's ability to convey knowledge and to demonstrate teaching effectiveness with regard to commitment, availability, organization and clarity. Because of the subjective and contextual nature of student responses, the Department of Dance considers these evaluations as a tool in the assessment of teaching effectiveness, and views them as a part of a whole, rather than as the primary singular metric. If the student rating of instruction is considerably below the Department, College, and University averages, the candidate shall offer commentary about those courses.

In addition to the required summary table of student responses, the candidate may include a hard copy of the complete set of the subjective comments of students for

the purpose of evidentiary support for courses discussed by the faculty member in the narrative.

2.1.4 Classroom Visitation

The Department of Dance shall utilize the following schedule for classroom visitation. During the first three years after hire in a tenure track position, the Department Chair and a member of the Department RTP Committee will each observe a minimum of one class session taught by the candidate per year. After reappointment, a plan will be developed between the candidate and the Department Chair, with a minimum requirement of two classroom visits by the Department Chair during the next period under review, as well as one visit by all members of the Department RTP Committee in the final year of review for tenure.

2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)

Criteria for evaluation in the areas of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA), and Service are divided into categories of Tier One and Tier Two. Tier Two activities are acknowledged as commendable achievements and Tier One activities are considered as highly prestigious achievements in the field and/or higher education. These categories are based on generally accepted artistic and academic standards of practice in the field.

Department of Dance faculty members are required to remain engaged in an ongoing program of research, scholarly, and/or creative activity that demonstrates intellectual and artistic growth in the field of dance. In general, a faculty member with expertise in technique, performance and choreography is expected to focus his/her achievements towards creative/performance/scholarly activities, and a faculty with expertise in the theoretical components of dance will focus his/her achievements toward scholarly and/or research-oriented activities. However, there may be certain circumstances in which candidates' expertise and teaching assignments warrant pursuing work in both areas. Expectations for each faculty include achievement in both Tier One and Tier Two categories, and are designated relative to the areas of expertise and the stage of review. These expectations are clarified in Policy Section 2.2.3. A candidate will be evaluated on the quality of all achievements he/she includes in the file.

The narrative shall clearly state the candidate's primary focus and areas of scholarly and/or creative interest and achievement, as well as the significance of his/her accomplishments in terms of contribution to the discipline and the level of professional recognition brought by these accomplishments. The candidate shall also elucidate an ongoing plan developed in conjunction with the Department Chair for building achievements in his/her selected areas of interest.

Subsequent reviews shall discuss progress relative to this plan, and any changes within this plan. The intent is not to confine the candidate if other opportunities or interests develop, but rather to help the candidate establish long-term goals so that appropriate guidance and decisions may be made in terms of prioritization of professional obligations and use of time, as well as provide context for the review committees.

2.2.1 Categories for RSCA Evaluation

The following categories are used for RSCA evaluation in the Department of Dance. These categories are separated into two (2) tiers and the division is largely based on the stature of the accomplishments. Tier One activities generally involve national, international and highly prestigious accomplishments, and though Tier Two activities are considered important and commendable, they are generally less prestigious or of a local or regional nature.

If a candidate considers an achievement to be in a different tier than specified, it is the responsibility of the candidate to provide justification and context, along with supportive materials to defend the placement in a different tier.

TEIR ONE

Creative Work Accomplished works or those contracted (contract signed) for future completion:

- Performance in an internationally or a nationally acclaimed dance company, theater/dance production, television, industrial, special event or film
- Choreography:
 - Choreography performed in a significant venue (international to local)
 - Choreography for an internationally or a nationally recognized dance company, theatre/dance production, television, industrials, special event, or film
 - Invited choreography and/or performance in a University setting other than CSULB
 - A documented invitation to choreograph for and/or perform with a production of a highly recognized national or international nature which may be declined due to CSULB responsibilities

Publications Published works or those accepted for publication in print or digital format:

- Peer-reviewed article in a scholarly journal, an academic journal recognized as prestigious in the field
- Invited article in an academic journal recognized as prestigious in the field
- Single or co-authored book or textbook with a significant publisher
- Single or co-authored monograph with a significant publisher
- Single or co-authored book chapter of a high academic or scholarly nature with a significant publisher
- Editor of a published book of high academic or scholarly nature with a significant publisher
- Editor or Editor-in-Chief of an academic journal recognized as prestigious in the field
- Book-length translation of a scholarly nature

Presentations:

- Master Class sponsored by a prestigious organization
- Invited presentation/workshop sponsored by an organization recognized as prestigious in the field

- Selected presentation, paper, lecture-demonstration, workshop, roundtable participation at an academic conference recognized as prestigious in the field
- Keynote Speaker at a conference or annual meeting of a significant organization in the field
- Oral interview/presentation given in a significant venue recognized as prestigious in the field (e.g. Radio, TV, Pre Curtain talks)

Grants:

- An external grant from a prestigious organization/foundation (amount shall be identified)

Computer and Technology:

- Software development with national or international distribution
- Dance for camera presented in the professional category at a national or international festival
- A documentary with national or international distribution
- Webinar for a national or an international professional organization, or that make a significant contribution to the field

TIER TWO

Creative Work Accomplished works or those contracted (contract signed) for future completion:

- Performance in a regional and/or local dance company, theater/dance production, television, industrials, special event or film and performance in a non-campus production
- Choreography for a regional and/or local dance company, theater/dance production, television, industrials, special event or film, high school or community college
- Choreography for students performed at the Martha B. Knoebel Dance Theater (MBKDT) (note: if WTUs provided for the work, this shall be placed in "Teaching")
- Performance and/or choreography in a national or international venue or company may fall into this category if the venue or company is not of Tier One caliber
- Choreography or performance in a local festival (e.g. *SOLA*, *Celebrate Dance*, and the amateur component of *Choreography Under the Stars*)

Publications Published works or those accepted for publication in print or digital format:

- Article (non refereed or invited) in the popular press (e.g. *Dance Teacher Now*, *Pilates Style*)
- Editor of a published book of a trade nature
- Author or co-author of a book chapter in popular or trade sector
- Guest editor of a journal
- Reviewer of a book or professional manuscript
- Author of the forward or introduction to a scholarly book

- Member of the editorial board of a professional journal
- Regular reviewer for a professional journal
- Author of a course manual (not including “readers”)
- Translation of a previously published scholarly chapter or article
- Author of a teaching/curriculum guide
- Author of a technical or lab manual published by a significant press
- Revision of a previously published scholarly work

Presentations (non-refereed or less prestigious, local or regional level):

- Master Class with an organization recognized as less prestigious
- Presentation/workshop sponsored by an organization recognized as less prestigious in the field and/or which is non-reviewed
- TV or Radio presentation or interview for a less prestigious or local venue
- Presentation at another college/university or invited speaker at a colloquium or seminar

Computer and Technology:

- Dance for camera presented in the amateur division of a major film festival or in a less prestigious, local or regional level festival
- Webinar for a less prestigious, local or regional professional organization
- Website development of significant impact for the field

2.2.2 RSCA Documentation

Documentation of accomplishments may take the form of programs, reviews, scripts, photographs, videotapes, DVDs, printed materials, etc. A hard copy for all publications (articles, chapters, books, etc.) shall be included in the file. When available, unsolicited evaluations of the work shall be included such as reviews, citation records or related awards. Candidates may also elect to solicit external evaluations, particularly in circumstances where there may be few CSULB peers who are well qualified to evaluate the candidate's scholarly and creative achievements. When appropriate, explanations detailing the active involvement of students shall also be provided. When the accomplishment involves additional contributors, a clear explanation and verification of the candidate's specific contribution shall be included.

2.2.3 RSCA Evaluation Guidelines

The following guidelines are for all faculty in the Department of Dance. A faculty member with expertise in more than one area may elect to meet the requirements by drawing from both creative and scholarly criteria. The total number of accomplishments must be consistent with the Department criteria in all cases. Both Tier One and Tier Two are considered commendable achievements in the field and it is expected that a candidate will garner achievements from Tier One by tenure and subsequent promotions.

Reappointment The following numbers reflect the total number of

accomplishments since hire as a tenure-track faculty.

Faculty with expertise in technique, composition and performance areas:

- Four (4) Tier Two accomplishments
- Two (2) choreographed works for the Department staged at the MBKDT
- One (1) Tier One or significant progress towards a Tier One accomplishment

Faculty with expertise in theory, history, and dance science areas:

- Four (4) Tier Two accomplishments
- One (1) Tier One accomplishment

(With at least One (1) being a publication at a Tier One or Tier Two level; if this publication is Tier Two, the candidate must present a plan for achieving a Tier One publication)

Tenure The following numbers reflect the total number of accomplishments since hire as a tenure-track faculty and are evidence of superior performance.

Faculty with expertise in technique, composition and performance areas:

- Twelve (12) Tier Two accomplishments
- Five (5) choreographed works for the Department staged at the MBKDT
- Two (2) Tier One accomplishments (with at least one being of a national/international level)

Faculty with expertise in theory, history, and dance science areas:

- Ten (10) Tier Two accomplishments
- Three (3) Tier One accomplishments

(With at least Two (2) being publications, one of which must be Tier One)

Promotion

Associate Professor The following numbers reflect the total number of accomplishments since hire as a tenure-track faculty and are evidence of superior performance.

Faculty with expertise in technique, composition and performance areas:

- Fifteen (15) Tier Two accomplishments
- Five (5) choreographed works for the Department staged at the MBKDT
- Three (3) Tier One accomplishments (with at least one (1) being of a national/international level)

Faculty with expertise in theory, history, and dance science areas:

- Fifteen (15) Tier Two accomplishments
- Four (4) Tier One accomplishments

(With at least two (2) being publications, one of which must be Tier One)

Promotion

Full Professor The following numbers reflect the total number of accomplishments since the last review and are evidence of superior performance.

Faculty with expertise in technique, composition and performance areas:

- Fifteen (15) Tier Two accomplishments
- Four (4) choreographed works for the Department staged at the MBKDT
- Two (2) Tier One accomplishments (with at least one (1) being of a national/international level)

Faculty with expertise in theory, history, and dance science areas:

- Fifteen (15) Tier Two accomplishments
- Two (2) Tier One accomplishments
(With at least two (2) being publications, one (1) of which must be Tier One)

2.3 Service

The Department of Dance RTP Committee shall evaluate the candidate's service to the university, profession and community during the period subject to RTP review. Service to the profession and community must be clearly related to the academic expertise of the candidate and may be paid or unpaid

2.3.1. University Service

Faculty may enhance their service achievements with active involvement on committees at all levels of the University and the University system.

2.3.4 Categories for Service Evaluation

The Department of Dance has categorized accomplishments into Required Departmental Service, Tier One and Tier Two categories. The division into the two tiers is largely based on the stature of the service in regards to the mission of the university, and the time requirements generally inherent in a given service contribution. The Dance Department has categorized contributions into the tier where a given service contribution will most likely fall. However, the Department is aware that the workloads of a given committee may shift markedly from year to year. Hence, the candidate may provide justification of why this or other achievements should be considered in a different tier. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to clearly describe the quality and significance of their service contributions to the university, profession or community. Examples include, but are not limited to, the following:

REQUIRED DEPARTMENTAL SERVICE

Each faculty member is expected to attend three (3) undergraduate auditions per year and participate in screening for ballet and modern technique classes. Selected studio faculty members are expected to attend MFA, MA, BFA and scholarship auditions. Studio faculty in conjunction with the Department Chair shall determine which faculty will attend each audition in a given year.

TIER ONE

Service to the University

Committees:

- Member of a search committee on the department, college, or university level
- Member of a chair, dean or other administrator review committee on the department, college, or university level
- Member of an RTP committee on the department or college level
- Member of another substantial committee on the college level such as the

Assessment Committee, Curriculum Committee, Faculty Council, RSCA Committee or MGSS Committee

- Member of another substantial committee on the University level such as Academic Senate, Nominating Committee of the Academic Senate, Executive Council of the Academic Senate, Curriculum Committee, GEGC Committee or RSCA Committee
- Chair of any college or university level committee
- Member of a task force involving substantial responsibility or leadership
- Author of a substantial document or report for a committee on the department, college or university level

Curriculum:

- Developer of the Department schedule of course offerings for a given semester
- Developer or coordinator of a Degree Program (if no WTUs assigned)
- Developer of a standardized criteria/curriculum to be utilized for a course that has multiple sections which are taught by different instructors

Accreditation or Evaluation:

- Coordinator and writer of the University Program Review
- Primary author of a substantial national accreditation document (e.g. National Association of Schools of Dance Self Study-NASD)
- External evaluator for a program review at another college and/or university
- External evaluator for tenure/promotion review for a faculty member of another college and//or university

Department Visibility:

- Supervisor or creator of a special performance activity for a university, college or special departmental function

Service to the Profession or Community Leadership:

- Board member or other substantive leadership role in a prestigious national or international professional and/or scholarly organization (profit or non-profit)

Accreditation or Evaluation:

- External accreditation evaluator or consultant for NASD or another professional organization
- External evaluator for tenure or promotion of a faculty member in another university

Adjudication:

- Adjudication for a national or an international organization or event

Department Visibility:

- Coordinator for American College Dance Festival or another prestigious professional or scholarly festival or conference

TIER TWO

Service to the University

Committees:

- Member of most department committees, as well as a member of a college or

university level committee that requires less work than those considered Tier One

- Member of a task force that does not involve substantial time
- Author of a brief document or report, as well as being a contributor (without being the primary author) of a substantial document for a report for a committee at the department, college or university level

Curriculum:

- Updating university course catalog descriptions and restructuring course formats for university compliance by faculty teaching the course(s)
- Coordinator for a course with multiple sections taught by different instructors within the Department (e.g. DANC 101 or DANC 110)

Accreditation or Evaluation:

- Significant contribution to an accreditation or evaluation document without being the primary author

Student Organization Advising:

- Advisor to a student organization
- Presenter for a student organization

Service Teaching*:

- Presenter for movement educators at a regional or local level
- Teacher for a dance festival such as ACDFA
- Guest teacher at a local school or university
- Short-term substitute teacher within the Department
- Teacher for DANC 110 Viewing Dance lab

*(*Teaching outside of assigned courses)*

Department Visibility and Support

- Recruitment activities
- Developing tools and media for internal and external communication needs (website administration, copy and layout of brochures and public relations)
- Fund-raiser for any Department needs

Service to the Profession or Community Leadership

- Less substantive role than Tier One in a prestigious national or international professional or scholarly organization (profit or non-profit)
- Board member or other substantive leadership role in a regional, local, or less prestigious professional or scholarly organization (profit or non-profit)

Consultant:

- Consultant for public schools, another university, local government, or community arts organizations

Adjudication:

- Adjudicator for a regional or local organization or event

2.3.5 Service Documentation

Documentation of service may take many forms including, but not limited to, letters of invitation, letters acknowledging the quality of the contribution, as well as copies of reports, policies, programs or other printed materials. When the accomplishment

involves additional contributors, a clear explanation and verification of the candidate's specific contribution shall be included in the file.

2.3.6 Service Evaluation Guidelines

The following represent standards for service evaluation of Department of Dance faculty. The goal for all faculty members is to achieve substantive Tier One service accomplishments within the university or profession that include, but are not limited to, service on important college or university committees; leadership roles in faculty governance activities, committees within the university, or professional organizations; and authorship of policies and other documents for the university or profession.

The expectation is that there shall be substantial additional achievements at each level of the review process. Therefore, a candidate who meets the service requirements of the Dance Department at an early stage of the review process is expected to continue to make substantial contributions to the university, profession and community in terms of service. The following reflect the total number of required accomplishments since hire as a tenure-track faculty. In terms of committees, one (1) year of active service counts as one (1) accomplishment in the associated tier. Membership on ad hoc committees that do not require service during the period under review shall be listed in the narrative and included in the curriculum vitae of the candidate, but not used to meet quantitative service requirements.

Reappointment (All Faculty) The following numbers reflect the total number of accomplishments since hire as tenure-track faculty:

- Two (2) Tier Two accomplishments
- Required Departmental Service

Tenure (All Faculty) The following numbers reflect the total number of accomplishments since hire as a tenure-track faculty and are evidence of superior performance:

- Five (5) Tier Two accomplishments
- Two (2) Tier One accomplishments
 - (of the above seven accomplishments, at least one (1) shall be service on a university or college level committee of either Tier One or Tier Two level)
- Required Departmental Service

Promotion to Associate Professor (All Faculty): The following numbers reflect the total number of accomplishments since hire as a tenure-track faculty and are evidence of superior performance:

- Eight (8) Tier Two accomplishments
- Two (2) Tier One accomplishments with at least one (1) accomplishment being service on a Tier One university or college committee)
- Required Departmental Service

Promotion to Full Profession (All Faculty): The following numbers reflect the total number of accomplishments since the last review and are evidence of superior performance.

- Four (4) Tier Two accomplishments

- Three (3) Tier One accomplishments with at least one (1) being service on a Tier One university or college committee
- Required Departmental Service

Section 3 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

University Policy

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

Participants in the RTP process include the candidate, the department,² RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, the dean, the Provost, and the President. In addition, there may be external reviewers participating in the RTP process. For details on conducting external evaluations, see the Academic Senate policy on external evaluations.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) allows faculty, students, academic administrators, and the President to provide information concerning the candidate during the open period.

Deliberations on reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be confidential. Access to materials and recommendations pertaining to the candidate shall be limited to the RTP candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, the dean, the Provost, Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel (as an appropriate administrator), and the President (see CBA). In addition, external reviewers, if any, will have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.

3.1 Candidate

A candidate for RTP should make every effort to seek advice and guidance from the department chair, particularly regarding the RTP process and procedures and how criteria and standards are applied. The candidate has the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting the evidence of her/his accomplishments. The candidate's documentation must include all required information and supporting materials.

Candidate should clearly reference and explain all supporting materials.

The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes his or her goals and accomplishments during the period of review, including a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service to the university, community, and/or profession. The candidate shall provide all required supplemental documentation, including summary sheets from student evaluations and an index of all supplementary materials. The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations over the full review period, including candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any.

3.2 Department RTP Policy

The department shall develop and articulate specific standards and criteria to be applied in the evaluation of candidates in all three areas of evaluation. Department

standards shall not be lower than college-level standards.

The department RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary department faculty members and to approval by the college faculty council, the dean, and the Provost. Department RTP policies shall be subject to regular review by the department's tenured and probationary faculty.

3.3 Department RTP Committee

The department RTP committee has the primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's work and makes the initial recommendation to the college RTP committee regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Department RTP committee members are responsible for analyzing critically the candidate's performance by applying the criteria of the department.

The tenured and probationary faculty of a department elect representatives to the department's RTP committee. The Collective Bargaining Agreement restricts membership on RTP committees to tenured, full-time faculty members. The CBA also states that faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on RTP committees if requested by the majority vote of tenured and probationary faculty members of the department and approved by the President. However, RTP committees may not be made up solely of faculty participating in the FERP.

No one individual may participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

3.4 Department Chair

The department chair is responsible for communicating the department, college, and university policies to candidates. The chair also provides ongoing guidance to candidates as to whether their performance is consistent with department expectations. The chair, in collaboration with college or department mentors, is responsible for talking with candidates about their overall career development and providing professional mentoring.

The chair shall meet with the department RTP committee prior to the beginning of the department evaluation process to review the department, college, and university processes and procedures.

Department chairs may write independent evaluations of all RTP candidates unless the department chair is elected to the department RTP committee. However, in promotion considerations, a department chair must have a higher rank than the candidate being considered for promotion in order to contribute a review or participate on a review committee. In no case may a department chair participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

3.5 College RTP Policy

The college RTP policy shall specify in writing the standards to be applied in evaluating candidates in all three areas of evaluation, consistent with university and college missions. The college RTP policy shall ensure consistency of standards across the college. Colleges have the responsibility for setting forth the standards appropriate to the breadth of disciplines in the college.

College RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary college faculty members and to approval by the dean and the Provost. College RTP policy shall be subject to regular review by the tenured and probationary faculty of the college.

3.6 College RTP Committee

The college RTP committee reviews the materials submitted by the candidate as well as the department RTP committee and department chair evaluations and recommendations. The college RTP committee evaluates the candidate's file in accordance with standards established in the department, college, and university RTP policies. The college RTP committee shall ensure that fair and consistent evaluation occurs at the department and college levels according to the standards set by the department and college RTP documents. The college RTP committee shall take into serious account the department's specific standards for evaluating the candidate.

The college committee prepares and forwards an independent recommendation to the college dean.

3.7 Dean of the College

The dean has a unique role to play in providing oversight and guidance in the RTP process within the college. The dean mentors department chairs regarding their role in the RTP process, encourages departments to develop and clarify their expectations for faculty performance, provides clear guidance to the college RTP committee, and ensures that all evaluations are carried out in accordance with department, college, and university policies. The dean ensures that standards across the college are maintained.

3.8 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

The Provost provides oversight for the university's RTP process, establishes the annual calendar of the RTP cycle, provides training for committees, chairs, and deans, and distributes relevant information to prospective candidates, chairs, deans, and members of college and department RTP committees.

The Provost shall review the candidate's file, including all prior evaluations, and make a final recommendation.

3.9 President

The President has the authority to make final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President may delegate this authority to the Provost.

College of the Arts Policy

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.0 and adds the following. The CSULB RTP Policy specifically defines responsibilities of the candidate, the

department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, the dean, the Provost, and the President in the RTP process.

The COTA RTP Policy further defines responsibilities of the candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, and the dean.

Within parameters established by the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), the CSULB RTP Policy, and Academic Senate policy on the use of external evaluation in the RTP process, the COTA RTP policy further defines and guides the use of external evaluation within the College of the Arts.

For candidates who request consideration for early tenure and/or early promotion, external review shall be requested at the first level (department committee) of RTP review.

3.1 Candidate

The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.1 and adds the following (COTA RTP Policy 3.1 – 3.1.1).

For all years when not under a performance review, a probationary faculty member must go through a periodic “mini” review, the only exception being that probationary faculty who are in the first year of appointment, and who received no years of service credit may either go through a periodic review or develop a Professional Development Plan (PDP) in consultation with the Department Chair and Dean. The PDP is not an option under any other circumstances.

A department may establish a policy (1) allowing all eligible candidates to choose, in consultation with department chair, to do a periodic review or PDP, or (2) requiring all to do a periodic review, or (3) requiring all to do a PDP.

For all periodic reviews and performance reviews (reappointment, tenure, promotion), COTA requires that candidates provide an up-to-date Combined Professional Data Sheet (PDS) and Narrative. The Combined PDS and Narrative shall follow the sequencing established in the most current guidelines for the PDS provided by Faculty Affairs, and shall integrate narrative commentary with lists, bulleted or numbered points within sections of the document. Clarity, organization, and ease of navigation are crucial in the Combined PDS and Narrative, and candidates are encouraged toward concision, but not at the expense of thoroughness.

Some activities straddle categories, or could be placed in one or another category. Instructionally related activity and RSCA, for instance, might overlap, or a candidate could have activity that might be considered either RSCA or service. While the process should be flexible and open enough to consider both hybrid activity and activity that is not easily categorized, the candidate must make every effort to properly categorize and contextualize activity—decidedly and reasonably placing activity in one category or another, or clearly detailing why an activity might warrant partial consideration in one category as well as partial consideration in another, without in essence taking full credit for an activity in each of more than one categories.

For all instances in which a candidate has received assigned time, the candidate must account for what purpose the assigned time was granted, and what work was accomplished utilizing the assigned time.

The College of the Arts requires materials specific to the circumstances of candidates' periodic or performance review as specified in the COTA RTP Procedures Document. Departments may require materials as approved by the Dean of the College of the Arts.

3.1.1 Committee Request for Clarification of the File.

If content in a candidate's file is not clearly substantiated, the RTP committee at either level may ask for written clarification from the candidate. If a candidate is asked to provide further documentation/clarification at any point in the review process, the candidate must provide precisely what is requested and may not use this request as an opportunity to expand the file contents beyond the specific request. If request for clarification is made at the college level, the department RTP committee shall be notified of both the request and the candidate's response, and the file shall be returned to the department RTP committee for review, evaluation, and comment before the college committee resumes its review process.

3.2 Department RTP Policy

The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.2 and adds the following. Each department within the College of the Arts shall develop a department-level RTP policy. Department policies must align with university and college RTP policies, and comply with the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). The department RTP policy shall define clear standards for achievement and contribution in the three areas of (1) instruction and instructionally related activities, (2) RSCA, and (3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession. The department RTP policy shall provide clear examples of forms of evidence a candidate may present to substantiate and provide context for instruction and instructionally related activities, RSCA and related peer review, and service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession.

3.2.1 Department RTP Procedures Document

Each department shall create a document detailing specific departmental RTP procedures. These procedures may not supersede or impede upon the RTP process as defined in university and college RTP policy and university and college RTP procedures documents, and may not conflict with Academic Senate policy or the CBA. Department RTP Procedures documents shall be reviewed regularly and updated by the department chair and an appropriate faculty advisory committee, and shall be approved by the Dean.

3.3 Department RTP Committee

The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.3 and adds the following.

All candidates shall be reviewed by a committee of three or five members of appropriate rank; a full-time tenured faculty member is eligible to serve on RTP committees, provided that, in promotion reviews, the faculty member is of a rank equal to or higher than the candidate's sought rank. As necessary, departments may elect RTP committee members from other departments within the university, but only after every effort has been made to fill roles on the department committee and fulfill the obligation to provide a representative to the COTA RTP committee with faculty from the department.

3.4 Department Chair

The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.4.

3.5 College RTP Policy

The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.5 and adds the following. The College of the Arts RTP Policy is intended to uphold university standards and processes, and set general college standards and processes while providing a framework within which departments may establish standards and processes that reasonably fit their disciplines and departmental cultures.

3.5.1 College RTP Procedures Document

The Dean, in consultation with faculty as represented by the COTA Faculty Council and COTA Executive Committee (Department Chairs), shall create a document detailing specific college RTP procedures. These procedures may not supersede or impede upon the RTP process as defined in university RTP policy and procedures documents, and may not conflict with Academic Senate policy or the CBA. The COTA RTP Procedures Document shall be reviewed regularly and updated by the Dean, in consultation with the Faculty Council and Executive Committee.

3.6 College RTP Committee

The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.6 and adds the following. A full-time tenured faculty member is eligible to serve on RTP committees, provided that, in promotion reviews, the faculty member is of a rank equal to or higher than the candidate's sought rank. The COTA RTP Committee shall (1) whenever possible include one representative from every department in the college, and (2) whenever possible be comprised entirely of faculty eligible to review all files under review. These two goals supersede any other obligations for faculty to serve in the RTP review process except when a department has only one faculty member eligible to review all candidates in the department.

3.7 Dean of the College

The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.7.

3.8 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.8.

3.9 President

The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.9

DANCE Department Policy

3.1 Candidate

The candidate shall make every effort to seek advice and guidelines on the RTP process so that he/she understands how criteria and standards are applied. Candidates are expected to engage in regular discussion with the Department Chair as well as experienced colleagues in order to understand the RTP process and participate in it effectively.

3.3 Department RTP Committee

The Department RTP Committee shall normally consist of three (3) tenured faculty members of appropriate rank, duly elected by the Department faculty.

Section 4 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

University Policy

4. 0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

All tenured and probationary faculties undergo performance review and evaluation.³ Probationary faculty members are evaluated each year. During years when the candidate is not being reviewed for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, the candidate will undergo periodic review. Tenured faculty members are evaluated every five (5) years. The following timelines apply to candidates who are appointed at the rank of assistant professor with no service credit; actual timelines may vary according to level of appointment and service credit.

4.1 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Reappointment

In the first year and second years of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic review. The periodic review provides the candidate with feedback on progress toward tenure. The periodic review is conducted by the department RTP committee, the department chair, and the college dean.

In the third year of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a reappointment review. Successful candidates are reappointed for one, two, or three years.

4.2 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Tenure and Promotion

In the first and second years of reappointment (or fourth and fifth years of continuous service), the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic or reappointment review, as appropriate. In the third year of reappointment (or the

sixth year of continuous service) the annual evaluation takes the form of a tenure review, which may also be a review for promotion.

A probationary faculty member may request consideration for early tenure and promotion prior to the scheduled sixth year review. This process is discussed under Section 5.5.

4.3 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion

An associate professor becomes eligible for promotion review to full professor in the fifth year at the associate rank. A tenured associate professor may seek early promotion to full professor prior to the fifth year in rank. This process is discussed further under Section 5.5.

A tenured faculty member may choose not to be evaluated for promotion in a given year; however, the faculty member will still be required to undergo the five-year periodic evaluation of tenured faculty as outlined in a separate Academic Senate policy document.

College of the Arts Policy

4. 0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.0 – 4.3, and to all RTP deadlines established by Faculty Affairs.

DANCE Department Policy

4. 0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

The Department of Dance defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.0 – 4.3, and to all RTP deadlines established by Faculty Affairs.

Section 5 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

University Policy

5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will be evaluated in all three areas: 1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service.

5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty

The candidate must have completed at least one periodic evaluation and must demonstrate that he/she is making significant progress towards tenure. Based upon criteria established by the department and the college, a candidate for reappointment must show evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.

The candidate for reappointment is expected to demonstrate effective teaching responsive to the learning needs of CSULB's diverse students and to the university's educational mission. The candidate is expected to show progress in his or her program of ongoing RSCA and to have produced initial scholarly and creative achievements. The candidate is expected to have made service contributions

primarily at the departmental or program level and consistent with departmental and college service expectations.

5.2 Awarding of Tenure

The awarding of tenure represents the university's long-term commitment to a faculty member and is granted when the candidate has demonstrated the ability to make ongoing and increasingly distinguished professional contributions to the university and to the profession.

Tenure is based on a candidate demonstrating a sustained record of high quality over multiple years and evidence leading to the belief that a candidate will continue being productive. Tenure is not based solely on the quantity of scholarly output, courses taught, or committees on which one has served.

The candidate must present evidence of meeting the required tenure criteria in all three areas of evaluation as established in the RTP policies of the department, college, and the university. For review of an assistant professor, tenure and promotion to associate professor normally are awarded together.

5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor

An associate professor is expected to be an excellent teacher who is highly effective in the classroom, fosters quality learning experiences, and is responsive to the needs of CSULB's diverse students and to the university's educational mission. At this rank, the faculty member is expected to have a successful and ongoing program of RSCA.

The candidate is expected to have produced high-quality peer-reviewed work, which contributes to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is expected to have made high-quality service contributions to the university or the expanded community.

5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor

Standards for promotion to full professor shall be higher than standards for promotion to associate professor. A full professor is expected to demonstrate a consistent record of excellence in teaching, student engagement, and curricular development. The successful candidate will have a proven program of RSCA that includes high quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is expected to have disseminated a substantial body of peer-reviewed work at the national or international levels. In addition, a full professor shall have provided significant service and leadership at the university

5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

A potential candidate should receive initial guidance from the department chair and dean regarding the criteria and expectations for early tenure and early promotion. Early tenure and early promotion are granted only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons. Assistant professors may apply for early promotion, early tenure, or both. A candidate applying for early tenure is expected to meet all criteria for early promotion to associate professor. Tenured associate professors may apply

for early promotion to full professor. However, non-tenured associate professors may not apply for early promotion to full professor without also seeking early tenure.

5.5.1 Early Tenure

Early tenure may be granted in rare cases when a candidate demonstrates a record of distinction in all three areas and superior accomplishments significantly beyond what is expected for tenure on the standard six-year timeline. The candidate's record must establish compelling evidence of distinction in all areas and must inspire confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue. In addition, candidates for early tenure are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the Academic Senate policy on external evaluation.

5.5.2 Early Promotion

In order to receive a favorable recommendation for early promotion to associate professor or full professor, a candidate must achieve a record of distinction in all three areas of evaluation that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements established in the department and college policies.

In addition, candidates for early promotion are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the Academic Senate policy on external evaluation.

Candidates for early promotion to associate professor are normally also candidates for early tenure. In rare instances, the university may decide that a candidate's achievements merit promotion to the rank of associate professor without a concomitant awarding of tenure. This decision represents the belief that a candidate has produced a body of work sufficient for promotion, but has not yet fully demonstrated the sustained record upon which tenure is based.

College of the Arts Policy

5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.0.

5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty

The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.1 and adds the following. At any level of RTP review in the College of the Arts, in order to recommend a candidate for reappointment, reviewers must determine that the candidate has met all university and college standards, and that the candidate has met department-defined standards in each of the three areas of review: (1) instruction and instructionally related activities, (2) RSCA, and (3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession.

5.2 Awarding of Tenure

The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.2 and adds the following. At any level of RTP review in the College of the Arts, in order to recommend a candidate for tenure, reviewers must determine that the candidate has met all university and college standards, has demonstrated superior performance in at least

one of the three areas of review, and has met department-defined standards in all remaining areas of review.

5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor

The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.3 and adds the following. At any level of RTP review in the College of the Arts, in order to recommend a candidate for promotion to Associate Professor, reviewers must determine that the candidate has met all university and college standards, has demonstrated superior performance in at least the area of instruction and instructionally related activities, and has met department-defined standards in all remaining areas of review.

5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor

The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.4 and adds the following. At any level of RTP review in the College of the Arts, in order to recommend a candidate for promotion to full Professor, reviewers must determine that the candidate has met all university and college standards, has demonstrated superior performance in the area of instruction and instructionally related activities, and superior performance in at least one additional area of review, and has met department-defined standards in any remaining area of review.

5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.

5.5.1 Early Tenure

The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.1.

5.5.2 Early Promotion

The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.2.

DANCE Department Policy

5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

The Department of Dance defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.0 – 5.5.2.

Section 6 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

University Policy

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

6.1 The Division of Academic Affairs determines the timelines for the RTP process, including deadlines for the submission of the candidate's materials, dates for the open period, completion of all RTP reviews by all review levels, and final decision notification to the candidate. The deadlines for notification of final actions shall be

consistent with the requirements of the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

6.2 The Division of Academic Affairs notifies all faculty members of their eligibility for review and specifies items required to be provided by all candidates.

6.3 Departments shall post in the department office a list of candidates being considered for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, following timelines and guidelines for the open period provided by the Office of Academic Affairs and consistent with the requirements of the CBA. A copy of all information submitted shall be provided to the candidate. The department RTP committee chair prepares an index of the materials submitted during the open period to be included in the candidate's file.

6.4 Candidates prepare materials for review and deliver them to the department RTP committee by the deadline.

6.5 The department RTP committee reviews the candidate's materials and, using the standard university form, provides a written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.

6.6 The department chair, if eligible and if not an elected member of the department RTP committee, reviews the candidate's materials and may provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.

6.7 The college RTP committee reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.

6.8 The dean reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the Provost by the deadline.

6.9 The Provost reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the President. The President has the authority to make final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

The President (or Provost as designee) notifies the candidate of the final decision regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion by the deadline.

College of the Arts Policy

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.0 – 6.9, and to all RTP deadlines established by Faculty Affairs. Departments may develop steps that are clearly defined, reasonable, relevant, appropriate, and timely, and that do not supersede or impede steps defined in the CSULB RTP Policy.

Candidate rebuttal documents shall be limited to a written reply to the committee and shall not involve the addition of other materials or documents, or information not immediately relevant to those parts of the committee report being rebutted.

DANCE Department Policy

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

The Department of Dance defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.0 – 6.9, and to all RTP deadlines established by Faculty Affairs.

Section 7 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

University Policy

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

7.1 Prior to the final decision, candidates for promotion may withdraw without prejudice from consideration at any level of review (see CBA). This provision also applies to candidates for early tenure.

7.2 If, at any time during the review process, the absence of required evaluation documents is discovered, the RTP package shall be returned to the level at which the requisite documentation should have been provided. Such materials shall be provided in a timely manner.

7.3 At each level of review, the candidate shall be given a copy of the recommendation, which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation, before the recommendation is forwarded to the next review level. The candidate shall have the right to provide a rebuttal/response in writing no later than ten (10) calendar days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all of the candidate's rebuttal/responses shall accompany the RTP package and also be sent to any previous review levels.

7.4 The candidate or evaluators at each level of review may request an external evaluation, consistent with Academic Senate policy on external evaluations.

College of the Arts Policy

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

7.1 The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.1.

7.2 The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.2.

7.3 The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.3.

7.4 The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 7.4 and adds the

following.

For candidates who request consideration for early tenure and/or early promotion, external review shall be requested at the first level (department committee) of RTP review.

DANCE Department Policy

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

The Department of Dance defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.1-7.3.

7.4 The Department of Art concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 7.4 and COTA Policy 7.4.

7.5 The candidate, the Department RTP Committee and the Department Chair shall meet to allow the candidate to share supporting evidence with the Committee. The Candidate is expected to deliver an organized, contextualized, 30-40 minute presentation covering the three areas of instruction and instructionally related activity, RSCA, and service, and to respond to appropriate follow-up questions by members of the Committee. Questions shall pertain to materials and information contained in the candidate's file.

Section 8 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY

University Policy

8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY

Changes to CSULB RTP procedures may occur as a result of changes to the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Additionally, campus administrators may make certain procedural changes to accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs. In general, changes to procedures do not require a vote by the faculty.

The tenured and probationary faculty of CSULB, voting by secret ballot (with pro and con arguments attached), may amend the policy and evaluation criteria section of this document.

Amendments may be proposed either by the following:

- (1) A direct faculty action via petition from ten percent (10%) of the tenured and tenure- track faculty to the chair of the Academic Senate.
- (2) By action of the Academic Senate. Proposed amendments shall be submitted for discussion at a public hearing for the faculty called within fifteen (15) instructional days following their receipt and shall be distributed by the chair of the Academic Senate to the faculty at least five (5) instructional days before the public hearing. Amendments to this document shall become effective when they have received a favorable vote of a majority of the tenured and probationary faculty voting in a secret ballot conducted by the Academic Senate within twenty (20) instructional days of the public hearing and they have the concurrence of the University President.

Effective: Fall 2009

NOTES:

1 Every effort has been made to ensure compliance with the Unit 3 (Faculty) Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). However, this document should not be considered as a substitute for those parts of the Agreement that affect RTP matters.

2 Throughout this document, the designation 'department' applies also to 'program' or an equivalent unit in a non-instructional area whose employees are considered to be faculty under the provisions of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Thus, unit heads and directors are the equivalent of department chairs.

3 Evaluation of lecturers is not covered in this policy; see the Academic Personnel website and the Policy on Range Elevation for Lecturers.

The dean of the college shall review the candidate's file, including all prior evaluations, and provide an independent recommendation to the Provost based upon the three areas of evaluation listed earlier.

College of the Arts Policy

8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY

The College of the Arts defers to any and all changes to CSULB RTP procedures that may occur as a result of changes to the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), as well as changes procedural changes made by campus administrators to accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs.

8.0.1 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE COTA RTP POLICY

The tenured and probationary faculty of the College of the Arts, voting by secret ballot (with pro and con arguments attached), may amend the policy and evaluation criteria section of this document.

Amendments may be proposed either by the following:

(1) A direct faculty action via petition from ten percent (10%) of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the college to the Dean of the College of the Arts.

(2) By action of the COTA Faculty Council. Proposed amendments shall be submitted for discussion at a public hearing for the faculty called within fifteen (15) instructional days following their receipt and shall be distributed by the chair of the Faculty Council to the faculty at least five (5) instructional days before the public hearing.

Amendments to this document shall become effective when they have received a favorable vote of a majority of the tenured and probationary COTA faculty voting in a secret ballot conducted by the Faculty Council within twenty (20) instructional days of the public hearing and they have the concurrence of the COTA Dean and University President or designee.

8.0.2 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT RTP POLICY

The faculty of each department in the COTA shall develop a departmental procedure

for amending their document to be included in the departmental RTP document. The procedure, and any amendments, must be approved by the COTA Faculty Council, the Dean and the President or designee.

Effective: Fall 2010

DANCE Department Policy

8.0.2 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT RTP POLICY

Proposed amendments to the Department of Dance RTP document shall be submitted for discussion at a faculty meeting of tenured and probationary Department faculty. To become effective, the proposed amendment must receive a favorable vote, by secret ballot, of a majority of Department tenured and probationary faculty, and must be approved by the COTA Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost.