

NEW 2025 COTA RTP POLICY	NEW DRAFT CINE RTP POLICY
<p><b>CSULB COLLEGE OF THE ARTS REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP)</b> <b>2024 (Supersedes all previous COTA RTP policies)</b> Designed to work in concert with the CSULB RTP Policy, the College of the Arts (COTA) policy on reappointment, tenure and promotion further defines, applies, and interpret the RTP process for the College of the Arts —specifically departments of Art, Cinematic Arts, Dance, Design, Music, and Theatre Arts—and provides parameters within which departments may still further define, applies, and interprets the process as appropriate to specific disciplines. All references to CSULB RTP Policy numbers in this document are to sections and subsections of the 2024 CSULB RTP Policy (Academic Senate Policy Statement 23-24).</p> <p><b>1.0 MISSION, VISION, PRINCIPLES, AND VALUES</b></p> <p><b>1.1 COTA Mission and Vision</b> 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.</p> <p><b>1.2 Principles</b> The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.</p> <p><b>1.2.1</b> The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.1.</p> <p><b>1.2.2</b> COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.2 and adds the following. Given the broad diversity of instructional approaches; research, scholarly, and creative activity (RSCA); and service contributions in a College that includes scholars and practitioners in diverse departments, RTP standards must establish a consistent level of expectation while allowing candidates to meet expectations in varied ways. Requirements for reappointment, tenure, or promotion are defined in section 5, and evaluative terms are defined in section 7.6.</p> <p><b>1.2.3</b> 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.</p> <p><b>1.2.4</b> 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.</p> <p><b>1.2.5</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>CSULB DEPARTMENT OF CINEMATIC ARTS REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP)</b> <b>2025 (Supersedes all previous Department of Cinematic Arts/Film &amp; Electronic Arts RTP policies)</b> Designed to work in concert with CSULB RTP policy and COTA RTP policy on Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (RTP), the Department of Cinematic Arts (CINE) RTP policy articulates the department standards for the successful reappointment, tenure and promotion of its faculty as well as the manner and the criteria by which their work will be evaluated.</p> <p><b>1.0 MISSION, VISION, PRINCIPLES, AND VALUES</b></p> <p><b>1.1 CINE Mission and Vision</b> CINE's mission is to nurture and educate the next generation of filmmakers and scholars. We are dedicated to fostering diverse voices. Our students create captivating narratives, which reflect individual experiences and address broader social issues. CINE is committed to providing every student with the tools necessary to grow in their chosen areas within the cinematic arts. Our program is designed around three pillars: critical and analytical thinking, written and visual storytelling, and production skills. CINE upholds shared governance and promotes the creative and scholarly activities of its faculty. An engaged, professional faculty is essential to providing a high quality and challenging instructional experience.</p> <p><b>1.2 Principles</b> CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2 and COTA RTP Policy 1.2.</p> <p><b>1.2.1</b> CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.1 and COTA Policy 1.2.1 and adds the following. CINE expects its faculty to maintain currency appropriate to their discipline(s) and specialization(s).</p> <p><b>1.2.2</b> CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy and COTA RTP Policy 1.2.2 and adds the following. CINE encompasses multiple areas of special competency that differ in their philosophy, methods, results of instruction, and in the productions that meet requirements for Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity (RSCA). CINE RTP standards are tailored to respect the differences in these areas, while establishing a consistent level of expectation across the board.</p> <p><b>1.2.3</b> CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.3 and COTA RTP Policy 1.2.3.</p> <p><b>1.2.4</b> CINE concurs with COTA RTP Policy 1.2.4.</p> <p><b>1.2.5</b> CINE concurs with COTA RTP Policy 1.2.5.</p>

NEW 2025 COTA RTP POLICY	NEW DRAFT CINE RTP POLICY
<p><b>1.3 Values</b> COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3</p>	<p><b>1.3 Values</b> CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3 and COTA RTP Policy 1.3.</p>
<p><b>1.3.1</b> 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 identity taxation continue to evolve, and in the absence of specific guidance from CSULB or the CSU, COTA adopts the following:</p>	<p><b>1.3.1</b> CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.1 and COTA RTP Policy 1.3.1.</p>
<p>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.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	
<p><b>1.3.2</b> COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.2.</p>	<p><b>1.3.2</b> CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.2. and COTA RTP Policy 1.3.2.</p>
<p><b>1.3.3</b> COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.3</p>	<p><b>1.3.3</b> CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.3 and COTA RTP Policy 1.3.3.</p>
<p><b>1.3.4</b> COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.4</p>	<p><b>1.3.4</b> CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.4 and COTA RTP Policy 1.3.4.</p>
<p><b>1.3.5</b> COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.5</p>	<p><b>1.3.5</b> CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.5 and COTA RTP Policy 1.3.5.</p>
<p><b>2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION</b></p>	<p><b>2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION</b></p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.0 and COTA RTP Policy 2.0.</p>
<p><b>2.1 Instructional Activities</b></p>	<p><b>2.1 Instructional Activities</b></p>
<p>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:</p>	<p>CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1 and COTA RTP Policy 2.1 and adds the following. The category of Instructional Activities for CINE includes all activities directly related to instruction in the classroom, production facilities, and/or other environments for the practice and study of the cinematic arts, when WTUs are associated with these activities. When WTUs are not associated with an instructional activity, the candidate may provide justification for consideration of the activity under Other Instructional Activities or may elect to have the activity considered for evaluation under Service or RSCA.</p>
<p><b>Pedagogy and Method</b></p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The candidate must address each subcategory below in their PDS/narrative, in addition to providing the narrative and evidence cited in CSULB and COTA Policy 2.1.</p>
<p><b>Course Preparation</b></p>	<p><b>Pedagogy and Method</b></p>
<p>Course syllabi shall be organized, complete, clear about expectations of students and student learning</p>	<p>See COTA policy 2.1. The candidate is also encouraged to address any innovations to their pedagogy and teaching methods.</p>

<b>NEW 2025 COTA RTP POLICY</b>	<b><u>NEW DRAFT CINE RTP POLICY</u></b>
<p>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.</p>	<p><b>Course Preparation</b> CINE requires the candidate to include at minimum: 1) Syllabi: the first and the most recent syllabus from each course taught, and any additional syllabi from terms demonstrating significant change to the course; 2) Assignments: prompts for each major assignment (not necessarily from each course); 3) Grading rubrics: rubrics and grading procedures for each major assignment; 4) Other Assessment such as quizzes, midterms, and finals (if used); 5) Sample student work; 1-2 examples of completed student work from each major assignment; 6) Presentation Materials: lecture slides or other materials to give evaluators a clear picture of their instructional approach. 7) Additional items are encouraged for submission, such as study guides, samples and/or explanations of how online teaching platforms such as Canvas are integrated, or other items relevant to the candidate's instruction.</p>
<p><b>Ongoing Professional Development</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>Ongoing Professional Development</b> – CINE requires the candidate to submit narrative and evidence of any professional development relevant to the everchanging world of cinematic arts.</p>
<p><b>Other Instructional Activities</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>Other instructional Activities</b> – Other instructional activities may be considered when contextualized in the PDS/Narrative and supported by evidence. This includes but is not limited to the following: innovative approaches to cinematic arts that foster student learning; supervising, advising, and/or consulting on research and/or creative projects, including independent study courses, university honors programs, capstones, and/or theses; planning and conducting special events and/or field trips; community partnership and service learning that support course instruction; administering databases and licenses for professional certifications in all courses in specific sub-plans; supporting student learning in extra-curricular activities, such as exhibitions or student organizations and/or recruitment and retention activities; developing or advising on new instructional programs or materials.</p>
<p><b>2.1.1 Continuous Professional Learning</b> COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.1 and adds the following. In addition to formal training sessions suggested by this policy, candidates may show evidence of continuous professional learning through self-reflection in one's narrative; willingness to adapt and evolve in response to feedback; changes to course material in order to remain current with one's discipline.</p>	<p><b>2.1.1 Continuous Professional Learning</b> CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.1 and COTA RTP Policy 2.1.1. and adds the following. Thoughtful and 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; revision of course materials based on research into current pedagogy and best teaching practices; and efforts to expand historical, theoretical, and/or technical knowledge via continuing education.</p>
<p><b>2.1.2 Reflection &amp; Instructional Adaptation: Formative Assessment</b> COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.2.</p>	<p>This development may also include involvement in training and enrichment programs such as those presented by the CSULB Faculty Center, Academic Technology Services, and/or Bob Murphy Access Center (BMAC); participation in teaching development seminars sponsored by the Department, College, University, or professional organizations; giving or receiving of formal or informal pedagogical coaching; and/or other activities that contribute to professional development of teaching effectiveness.</p>
<p><b>2.1.3 Instructional Practices that Foster Learning: Summative Assessment</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>2.1.2 Reflection &amp; Instructional Adaptation: Formative Assessment</b> CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.2 and COTA RTP Policy 2.1.2.</p>
<p><b>2.1.3 Instructional Practices that Foster Learning: Summative Assessment</b> COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.3 and adds the following. Faculty should make every effort to encourage students to participate in SPOT evaluations, as responses must be addressed by evaluators. Due to the subjective and contextual nature of student responses (SPOT evaluations), as well as their inherently biased nature, CINE considers them as a tool in the overall assessment of a pattern of teaching effectiveness, rather than as the primary, singular metric.</p>	<p><b>2.1.3 Instructional Practices that Foster Learning: Summative Assessment</b> CINE 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 SPOT evaluations, as responses must be addressed by evaluators. Due to the subjective and contextual nature of student responses (SPOT evaluations), as well as their inherently biased nature, CINE considers them as a tool in the overall assessment of a pattern of teaching effectiveness, rather than as the primary, singular metric.</p>
<p><b>2.1.4 Classroom Visitation</b> Departments may require that all RTP candidates be observed and evaluated by department RTP committee</p>	<p>The candidate must provide SPOT evaluation summary data (currently represented by a response rate and bar graph) for all sections in the period of review. If the candidate elects to submit SPOT comments for one or more sections, all SPOT comments from the selected section(s) must be provided.</p>
<p><b>2.1.4 Classroom Visitation</b> Departments may require that all RTP candidates be observed and evaluated by department RTP committee</p>	<p>In their narratives, the candidate must provide qualitative self-reflection of strengths and potential areas for improvement, referencing SPOT data as well as comments, if submitted. In their evaluation, the committee shall compare and contrast SPOT data and the candidate's self-reflection alongside all other required instructional materials listed under section 2.1.</p>
	<p>The candidate may also submit other forms of evidence that speak to students' perception of teaching, such as unsolicited thank you emails, notes, self-made surveys, and any other form of response to teaching. If provided, CINE RTP Committee must consider these documents in their overall deliberation of the candidate's instructional practices.</p>
	<p><b>2.1.4 Classroom Visitation</b> CINE concurs with COTA RTP 2.1.4 and adds the following. For all actionable reviews (reappointment, tenure, promotion), CINE requires</p>

#### **NEW 2025 COTA RTP POLICY**

members visiting the classroom while the candidate is teaching. In departments that do not require classroom visitation and evaluation by a faculty member of equal or higher rank, candidates may request visitation, and such requests shall be granted. Departments shall clearly define procedures in alignment with the CSU-CFA CBA for classroom visitation with the goal of fairness and flexibility toward the candidate, objectivity of the process, and appropriate and consistent incorporation of classroom visitation, observation, and evaluation into the RTP process.

#### **2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)**

COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.2 and adds the following. Faculty are required to demonstrate and provide evidence of professional currency and an ongoing program of RSCA. Candidates must demonstrate via a combination of data, narrative, and documentation a clear pattern of RSCA being recognized through peer review or other indicators of reception and stature in the field as appropriate to the candidate's practice and further described in each department's policies. Examples of RSCA within COTA may include, but are not limited to: performances, exhibitions, films, scholarly presentations, books, journal articles, designs, choreography, digital humanities projects, community projects, clinical practices, contracts, and countless others. This list should not be construed as exhaustive in any way.

COTA embraces the diversity of RSCA across our community of arts practitioners, educators, and scholars. For this reason, evidence for RSCA in COTA might look significantly different from one candidate to another.

COTA defers to the CSULB RTP Policy requirement that "candidates must disclose and describe any scholarly or creative activities for which they receive reassigned time or additional compensation." No additional disclosures beyond what Faculty Affairs requires is expected.

#### **NEW DRAFT CINE RTP POLICY**

at least one Department RTP Evaluation Committee Member to observe teaching and address it in their evaluation. Evaluators may consider instructional clarity, student engagement, and/or other means of assessment.

If the candidate requests an additional visitor, every effort will be made to accommodate this; this person may write their own independent assessment, which can be included in the candidate's file and must be considered by the CINE Evaluation Committee. The candidate may request a classroom visitation in non-actionable reviews, and every effort will be made to grant this request.

Classroom visitation requests must be made with at least five (5) days advanced notice to the scheduled visit. In accordance with CBA Article 15.14, there shall be consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits their class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits.

#### **2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)**

CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.2 and COTA Policy 2.2 and adds the following.

CINE faculty are expected to produce research, scholarly, and/or creative activities (RSCA) that contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the cinematic arts. Faculty are required to remain engaged in an ongoing RSCA program that demonstrates sustained intellectual and professional accomplishments over time. Evidence of a sustained trajectory of professional growth should be the central organizing element of the candidate's PDS/Narrative.

Candidates must disclose and describe any scholarly or creative activities for which they receive reassigned time or additional compensation.

RSCA work must be disseminated to appropriate audiences, receiving recognition from professional peers prior or subsequent to completion. The Candidate shall use their PDS/Narrative to explain, contextualize, and validate with supporting evidence the significance of their RSCA, including: 1) project description; 2) status of project; 3) description of peer review (e.g., invitation, contract, publication, screening, etc.); and 4) indicators of significance, quality, recognition, and/or impact of the work. Documented invitation to engage in RSCA from an organization, institution, publisher, or other entity may be understood as a form of peer review. Evaluation of RSCA shall involve a qualitative analysis of the level and nature of peer review as described in the candidate's file and in accordance with CINE RTP Policy 2.2 and 2.2.1.1-2.2.3.

The evaluation of ongoing or in-progress RSCA shall account for the scale and/or duration of the project, and shall consider indicators of incremental progress such as invitations to present or exhibit; preliminary reviews of drafts; awarding of contracts, grants, or funding; peer review reports, etc.

In some instances, RSCA may overlap with instructional activity, service to CINE/COTA/CSULB, and/or service to the profession/community. RSCA may also establish dialogues across disciplines in the sciences and humanities, and/or move between CINE's main three areas of RSCA: critical studies, production, and writing. It is the candidate's responsibility to clearly delineate categorical and disciplinary boundaries in such instances and ensure that contributions are not counted in multiple categories.

Joint authorship or collaboration in RSCA is valuable, though it may be difficult to evaluate. The candidate must identify and describe the specific extent of their participation in collaborative activities for transparency and assessment.

Activities in which a candidate has had a consultative, editorial, organizational, and/or supervisory role may be considered within the category of RSCA. It is imperative that the candidate provides clarification regarding the specifics of the responsibilities and duties they took on in each distinct role they fulfilled within the project.

Emerging forms of scholarly and creative dissemination shall be evaluated based on standards of rigor and validation appropriate to the discipline.

If RSCA includes currently enrolled students, the candidate should clarify the nature and scope of student involvement. Reviews of the candidate's RSCA—whether solicited, unsolicited, published, or unpublished—if included in the file by the candidate or submitted appropriately during the open period, shall be considered.

**NEW 2025 COTA RTP POLICY****NEW DRAFT CINE RTP POLICY**

Acceptable and appropriate RSCA endeavors cannot be restricted to a simple, all-inclusive list. Sections 2.2 and 2.2.1 - 2.2.3 are meant to provide suggested expectations, guidelines, and commonplace examples for peer review in various fields of cinematic arts. The candidate must demonstrate achievements in one or more of the following three sections. RSCA must be thoroughly documented in the candidate's file. Guidelines and criteria that establish parameters of quality and recognition for each area within CINE are detailed in the sub-sections below.

**2.2.1 Critical Studies**

Critical Studies RSCA takes various forms, such as: publications; obtaining internal and/or external grants; presenting papers at conferences; programming film screenings; creating video essays, digital humanities projects, and/or other types of mixed research/creative practice endeavors within the cinematic arts. The list above is not exclusive. Activities that are clearly defined as Production or Media Writing projects—such as narrative/documentary films or screenplays, among others—may be evaluated under subsections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 of this policy.

Activities such as organizing academic events and/or serving as journal editor, peer reviewer, external evaluator for grants/awards or jury in competitions/festivals may constitute RSCA or service to the profession/community. It is the candidates' responsibility to choose the appropriate category and to delineate their narratives accordingly.

In their narratives, the candidate shall explain, contextualize, and substantiate the quality, distinction, and/or impact of their RSCA achievements, submitting evidence of peer-review and publication status. The candidate and CINE RTP Committee shall use the following criteria as quality indicators for Critical Studies RSCA, with the understanding that the list below is not exhaustive, and that these criteria are flexible, as there are many factors involved in assessing the significance of a RSCA achievement.

Categories A-D (described below) represent the most common forms of Critical Studies RSCA, but not the only ones. Any other type of work beyond categories A-D may be considered valuable and quality Critical Studies RSCA, provided that the candidate explains and documents in their narratives the nature of the activity and how it relates to their RSCA trajectory.

For all evaluation purposes, everything listed under "A) Publications" refers to single-authored and/or co-authored works. When the candidate is co-author, or one among multiple authors/editors, it is expected that they use the narrative section to explain and detail their contributions to the project.

**A) Publications:**

Peer-reviewed monographs. Recognized presses are typically University Presses; scholarly-oriented but non-university presses (such as Bloomsbury, Brill, Lexington, Palgrave, Routledge, and others); and trade presses that regularly publish academic work intended for broader audiences. Evidence for peer-review in published monographs can take the form of peer-review reports with critical comments by external reviewers, and/or statements from the publisher's website. Evidence for the quality of a press may also come from the publisher's list of recent authors and/or awards, as well as its relevance for the candidate's specific area of research expertise. The publication of a book following these standards should be taken as a sign of excellency in Critical Studies RSCA.

Peer-reviewed articles in academic journals. The journal can be evaluated by its publisher (a University press, scholarly press, or professional organization); the reputation of its editors; its acceptance rate; its indexing in databases such as the Web of Science or Scopus; its list of recent authors; and/or its overall status in Critical Studies or in the candidate's specific area of research expertise. The sustained and ongoing publication of peer-reviewed journal articles following these standards should be taken as a sign of excellency in Critical Studies RSCA.

**NEW 2025 COTA RTP POLICY****NEW DRAFT CINE RTP POLICY**

Publishing chapters in books or special journal issues edited by others, and/or editing/co-editing books/journal issues. The quality of this achievement can be measured by the type of press and publisher (following the criteria established for monographs), the list of contributors, the peer-review reports, and/or any post-publication review or award. When co-editing an academic book/anthology/volume/journal issue, it is expected that the candidate uses the narrative section to explain and detail their specific editorial contributions to the project.

Video essays and/or Digital Humanities projects. The quality of these achievements shall be evaluated following similar standards of peer-review and recognition to the ones outlined for previous kinds of publications. Video essays and/or Digital Humanities projects may be published in peer-reviewed academic journals, appear under the label of an academic press, and/or be published in magazines/newspapers/critical outlets intended for broader audiences.

The publication of film and/or book reviews in academic journals shows evidence of a committed scholar who is engaged in current debates in their area of expertise. Reviews in academic journals count towards RSCA achievements. Their value, however, is not equivalent to all the other types of RSCA outputs listed above, since those are based on the candidate's original scholarship.

**Further Guidelines for the candidate and CINE RTP Committee:**

CINE RTP committee should not place excessive emphasis on the quantity of publications but rather consider the consistency of the candidate's RSCA file, evaluating the sustained development of the candidate's overall RSCA trajectory.

Whenever RSCA is not already published, the candidate should attach evidence of its precise publication status. By "publication," the committee should understand already published, in print, forthcoming, and/or accepted publications.

Publication awards obtained by the candidate's book, article, or chapter; post-publication reviews about the candidate's work in academic journals; and/or translations of the candidate's publication(s) into languages other than English should be considered evidence of excellent, significant, and high-impact Critical Studies RSCA work.

Such achievements are rare; they are a marker of distinction and should not be considered required for tenure and promotion. Original publications in languages other than English should be evaluated under the same criteria of quality outlined in this policy. The candidate must provide an unofficial English-language translation of an excerpt from the publication, and/or of any document that substantiates the publication's quality.

**B) Grants/Fellowships/Awards:**

Internal and/or external grants, fellowships, and awards can adopt the form of cash prizes or funds meant to provide reassigned time devoted to research. External grants/fellowships/awards should be considered evidence of excellent, significant, and high-impact Critical Studies RSCA work. Such achievements are rare; they are a marker of distinction and should not be considered required for tenure and promotion. The prestige of the grant/fellowship/award can be judged by the organization that manages it, its longevity, its scope (international/national/regional/local), and/or its list of recent awardees.

**C) Conference Presentations/Invited Talks:**

The delivery of papers in peer-reviewed academic conferences and/or talks in professional events shall be a regular activity performed by scholarly engaged Critical Studies Faculty, whenever funding is provided. CINE RTP Committee must consider access to internal and/or external funding as a determinant factor in evaluating the candidate's productivity in conference presentations. Likewise, the candidate should contextualize in their narrative any conference paper acceptance and/or invited talk they have declined and/or have not been able to pursue due to lack of funding.

Invited keynotes, research talks at universities or other academic/professional venues, and other invitations to present academic work constitute evidence of recognition of the faculty member's status in Critical Studies.

**D) Curating/Programming:**

Writing, curating, programming, or organizing screenings for film festivals/ archives/ museums/ cultural institutions constitutes evidence of public-facing scholarship and commitment to reaching broader audiences. This type of work should also be considered evidence of significant RSCA. The prestige of the curatorial work can be judged by the organization that exhibits it, its scope (international/national/regional/local), and/or its list of recent programmers/curators, among other factors. In their narratives, the candidate should contextualize the type of curatorial work they performed, and how it relates to their RSCA.

**NEW 2025 COTA RTP POLICY****NEW DRAFT CINE RTP POLICY****2.2.2 Production**

CINE recognizes that creative work in moving-image production consists of projects whose forms, duration, and time required for completion may vary significantly. Moreover, production most frequently requires collaboration amongst multiple individuals who perform various and distinct roles requiring different responsibilities, levels of collaboration with other artists and technicians, and time commitments. Job titles (also known as credits) alone—such as Producer, Unit Production Manager, Director, Cinematographer, Audio Recordist, Editor, Graphic Artist, Visual Effects Artist, Sound Editor/Re-Recording Mixer, etc. – do not explain the scope of an individual's contributions to a production. Additionally, the length of a finished work is significant but not indicative of the effort required to complete it. It is the candidate's responsibility to explain what their production credit is and specifics on the scope of their labor for each project.

In the candidate's PDS/Narrative and supporting evidence, it is imperative that they explain, contextualize, and substantiate the quality and distinction of their achievements. Quality and quantity are both considered valuable. For example, film festivals can be of local, regional, national, or international importance, and selection of a film at a festival with a prestigious reputation can be indicative of the quality of the work. Because the reputation of festivals is not static, it is imperative that the candidate provide supporting context about the festival, explain the festival's selection process, and substantiate its distinction. Freelance labor may require a few hours or several weeks/months/years of work. Similar measurement criteria relevant to other forms of peer review must be provided by the candidate.

Absent clear context and evidence, or if minimal progress is demonstrated, evaluators must deem RSCA as "Unsatisfactory". For RSCA to be considered "Excellent" overall, there should be multiple strong indicators of nationally or internationally recognized peer review in the categories defined below (or similar).

As noted in 2.2., it is the candidate's responsibility to explain and document their work and role on productions that have not been distributed or only partially distributed, and to provide contextual information regarding the production timeline and distribution plans. The evaluation of ongoing, or in-progress RSCA, shall account for the scale and/or duration of the project, and shall take into account peer review indicators of incremental progress such as preliminary drafts, trailers, select scenes or cuts, and/or other items such as those listed in the categories below.

Possibilities for peer review of RSCA production projects include the non-prioritized and non-exhaustive examples in the paragraphs below. Candidates are *not* expected to have work in each area. Evaluators shall consider the professional reputation of the peer review source, and the extent of the labor provided—in other words, both quality and quantity—as contextualized by the candidate:

**Freelance Work in Pre-Production, Production, and/or Post-Production** – Multiple individuals with distinct skills are often hired to perform labor on a production project. Contracts or other proof of being hired to perform a creative, managerial role, craft, or consultancy role may be considered evidence, so long as the evidence source does not rely on user-generated information (such as IMDB and Wikipedia).

**Distribution** – The terms of distribution may vary widely, such as acceptance at competitive film/media festivals, exhibition at venues of recognized merit (such as movie theaters, museums, national parks, public libraries, screenings at educational institutions, community events provided selection of the material is based on jury or panel decision, or invitation rather than mere proximity, etc.); dissemination through a recognized book or journal publisher (print or electronic; see 2.2.1 Critical Studies for additional criteria) or theatrical/broadcast/streaming outlet. Candidates are encouraged to provide evidence of the broader impact of their RSCA, including citations, reviews, audience engagement, policy influence, contributions to professional practice, etc. Unless extraordinary explanation and support is provided, personal uploads to user-generated sources are unlikely to count as peer review.

**Awards and/or Honors** – Nominations or awards by recognized festivals, organizations, guilds, or other industry groups; securing COTA RSCA Course Release for a Production project; selection for competitive fellowships, residencies, labs, and/or pitch forums.

**Fundraising** – CINE recognizes that production is inherently expensive, and fundraising is a time-consuming but often necessary process. Receiving internal and external grants, securing investors and equity partners, and other forms of raising capital are considered peer review. Creating and running a successful crowd-funding campaign may be considered peer review if the campaign clearly extends beyond the production's personal connections.

**Invitations to Present or Participate** – Forums and venues for invitations to speak vary widely and could also be considered Service; it is up the candidate to categorize and not double count this activity. Examples may include, and are not limited to, invitations to speak or present work at juried scholarly/professional conferences, panels, or events; K-12 schools, colleges, and universities other than CSULB;

## NEW 2025 COTA RTP POLICY

## NEW DRAFT CINE RTP POLICY

and professional or trade organizations. Participation in an event is much more highly valued than an invitation. Invitations to write an article or chapter are only considered peer review if the chapter is drafted or published, with narrative and supporting evidence.

Optioning – Optioning of a pitch by a reputable professional production company is a commitment that indicates sufficient merit in a production and is recognized as peer review if substantiated by sufficient evidence.

Membership and Representation – Obtaining professional representation, such as an agent or manager, or being invited to join a guild or association requiring application and peer assessment is considered peer review. Such achievements demonstrate validation of a body of work or professional promise.

Judging works submitted for acceptance or award consideration for film/media festivals, industry/guild awards, conferences, etc. should be considered as Professional Service, as further discussed in 2.3.2,

If faculty use a creative project as an opportunity to mentor students, it will not be considered a “professional” creative activity if a majority of the cast and primary crew positions are occupied by currently enrolled students. (It could, however, be included in Instructional Activities.)

### **2.2.3 Media Writing**

CINE recognizes media writing (such as screenplays and other forms of dramatic writing for moving-image productions – from film to television to streaming to podcasts to new media, etc.) has intrinsic value and can receive positive peer review without ever being produced. Scripts selected for production might be chosen for their own merit, but it is equally possible for a script to be produced, optioned, or shelved for reasons pertaining to market forces, changes in industry personnel, etc. A script might also be re-written by someone other than the original writer before it is produced. Furthermore, the timelines of commercial productions are seldom aligned with the schedules of the academic world. To bring any writing project forward can be a multiple-year process that carries over outside periods of review. The fate of a screenplay is not necessarily a reflection of its quality or the skill with which it was written. Screenplays can nevertheless be disseminated and subjected to peer review as part of the RTP process.

Possibilities for the dissemination of faculty media writing projects for peer review include the following non-prioritized and non-exhaustive list of examples:

Production: Actual production of scripts by recognized professional production companies.

Optioning: Optioning a script by professional production companies. Optioning is a commitment that indicates sufficient merit in a script in hopes of producing the project.

Awards and/or Honors: Nominations or awards by recognized guilds or organizations such as Writers Guild or Emmys; awards or honors at juried screenplay competitions; securing internal or external grants, and/or RSCA course release for a Media Writing project.

Public readings and/or Conference Presentations: Readings by local or regional groups, provided selection of the material is based on jury or panel decision rather than mere proximity to the writer; participation in competitive conference readings and/or presentations, etc.

Publication of scripts: Publication in whole or in part.

Competitive Fellowships, etc. – selection for competitive writing residencies, writing fellowships, writing labs, etc.

Representation – Obtaining any new representation—such as an agent or manager—is considered peer review. Such representatives seek out talent whose work demonstrates promise for optioning, sale, or production. Representation track trends of the media industries and is essential to obtain such opportunities for writing projects.

Script Review Platforms – Selection and reviews with high ratings from script review platforms demonstrates peer review as well, considering paid industry readers review and recommend scripts which can also garner attention from production entities and representation.

**NEW 2025 COTA RTP POLICY****NEW DRAFT CINE RTP POLICY**

Hired writing – Being hired by a recognized professional production company to write an original screenplay or an adaptation from another medium, or to re-write, revise, or consult on a story or script originally written by someone else, also constitutes peer review, whether or not the project is produced. For example, it is common practice for professional screenwriters to receive payment for editorial consultation or "script doctoring" services—when hired to revise and improve scripts- without receiving screen credit.

In all instances, it is imperative that the candidate's narrative explain, contextualize, and substantiate the quality and distinction of their achievements.

NEW 2025 COTA RTP POLICY	NEW DRAFT CINE RTP POLICY
<b>2.3 Service</b> 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.	<b>2.3 Service</b> CINE concurs with 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, and/or mentorship and advising different from instructional activities. While this policy categorizes service into campus, community, and professional contributions, these categories are not mutually exclusive.
	Within their narratives, candidates must disclose and describe whenever activities include reassigned time or compensation, including details about the expectations or goals of the service activity.
	CINE recognizes that faculty are granted 3 WTU for service as part of their faculty workload as defined in EPR 76-36 and expects significant time and effort allocated to CSULB, COTA, and/or CINE service each academic year. Candidates should consult with the department chair and the tenured and tenure track faculty to identify appropriate service opportunities for their RTP trajectory.
	The evaluation of service contributions shall be on: 1) Quality and Impact: the extent to which the activity contributes to the mission of the University, College, Department, or Profession; and 2) Level of Engagement: The depth of involvement, leadership, and sustained contributions. While service to the Profession is valued, service to CSULB, COTA, and/or CINE must be prioritized to ensure an equitable distribution of duties in University, College, and Department committee work among CINE tenured and tenure track faculty.
	Candidate must clearly document their service activities in their Professional Development Sheet (PDS)/Narrative, including: 1) a description of their role and contributions; 2) the significance and impact of their service activities; 3) supporting documentation such as letters of invitation, acknowledgments, reports, programs, or other relevant materials.
	When the accomplishment involves additional contributors, a clear explanation and verification of the candidate's specific contribution should be included.
<b>2.3.1 University Service:</b> 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.	<b>2.3.1. University Service</b> CINE concurs with COTA Policy 2.3.1 and adds the following. Faculty may enhance their service achievements by actively participating in committees at all levels of the University and the CSU system, with emphasis on the department and college levels for newer faculty. The role of a CINE area head is an extensive one that requires multiple service tasks and should be considered a major contribution to the candidate's service record, and the level of responsibility and engagement must be clearly conveyed in the candidate's PDS/Narrative. Serving as Subplan/Area Head, however, does not exempt a colleague from department, college, or university committee work.
<b>2.3.2. Professional Service:</b> Candidate's service shall demonstrate qualitative contributions to professional organizations and institutions that are appropriate to the candidate's discipline.	<b>2.3.2. Professional Service</b> CINE concurs with COTA Policy 2.3.2 and adds the following.
	In addition to campus governance activities, faculty members may contribute to community service through involvement with professional arts/media organizations and participate in professionally relevant activities at the local, state, national, and/or international levels. These activities may include conducting peer review for publications, manuscripts, and/or grants or awarding organizations; serving as external reviewer; serving on professional committees; leading workshops; mentoring; delivering speeches; participating in media interviews,

## **NEW 2025 COTA RTP POLICY**

### **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.

## **3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS**

COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.0

### **3.1 Candidate**

COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.1 and adds the following. Tenure-track faculty with no service credit may elect to go through either a Professional Development Plan (PDP) or a periodic "mini" review in their first year. The decision to opt for a PDP or mini review must be made in consultation with the department chair. The PDP is not an option after the first year. For each subsequent year prior to tenure, candidates must submit a periodic "mini" or performance review.

For all periodic reviews and performance reviews, COTA requires that candidates provide an up-to-date Professional Data Sheet (PDS) and Narrative as combined or separate documents. These shall follow the sequencing established in the most current guidelines for the PDS provided by Faculty Affairs, and shall integrate narrative commentary with lists, bulleted or numbered points within sections of the document. Clarity, organization, and ease of navigation are crucial in the documents. The documents should contextualize the candidate's accomplishments during the period of review and describe their significance. Candidates are encouraged toward concision, but not at the expense of thoroughness.

COTA recognizes that the work done by both candidates and evaluators in the RTP process is demanding; however, the special actions that are taken in the RTP process necessitate that candidates produce RTP files that provide a thorough overview of performance via a combination of data, narrative, and documentation in order to facilitate a process that also necessitates that evaluators take the time and care essential to a thorough review and thoughtful deliberations in making recommendations of a highly consequential nature. The candidate's file must, via a combination of data, narrative, and documentation, instill total confidence in evaluators and academic administrators in recommending or granting the renewal of a multiyear employment contract (reappointment), the establishment of a long-term commitment of the institution to an individual (tenure), or the elevation of a member of our faculty to a respected and coveted academic rank tied to a significant long-term increase in compensation (promotion to Associate Professor or to Professor). Simply put, in seeking reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the candidate must thoroughly make the case for the action they seek.

### **3.1.1 General File Categorization**

Some activities straddle categories, or could be placed in one or another category. Instructional Activities and RSCA, for instance, might overlap, or a candidate could have activity that might be considered either RSCA or service. While the process should be flexible and open enough to consider both hybrid activity and activity that is not easily categorized, the candidates must make every effort to properly categorize and contextualize activity—decidedly and reasonably placing activity in one category or another, or clearly detailing why an activity might warrant partial consideration in multiple areas. In other words, candidate must not take full credit for an activity in more than one category.

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

## **NEW DRAFT CINE RTP POLICY**

writing articles and/or editorials; conducting, curating, and/or organizing screenings and/or displays; organizing events, conferences, and symposia; jurying film festivals; and moderating panels/participating as a panelist at conferences. This list is not meant to be exhaustive or restrictive.

### **2.3.3 Community Service**

CINE concurs with COTA Policy 2.3.3 and adds the following.

Service to the community may also include consultancies to PK-14 schools, local government, and arts community service organizations, and arts advocacy or media literacy initiatives or organizations. Service contributions based on consultancies, whether paid or unpaid, shall be evaluated on the basis of their contributions to the mission of the University and particularly to the candidate's Department. Meaningful service must be clearly related to the academic expertise of the faculty member.

## **3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS**

CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.0 and COTA RTP Policy 3.0.

### **3.1 Candidate**

CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.1 and COTA RTP Policy 3.1 – 3.1.1., and adds the following. The candidate is required to follow current policy, guidelines, and memos issued by Faculty Affairs. These delineate important information on timelines, terms to cover in actionable and mini reviews, and guidelines on how to organize submissions. Regular discussions with the Department Chair and experienced colleagues are necessary if candidates are to understand the RTP process and participate in it effectively.

In all reviews that do not require the Candidate Status Sheet supplied by Faculty Affairs or COTA (which includes date of hire, rank, and semesters under review included in submission), the candidate is required to provide this information clearly in a top section of their Professional Data Sheet (PDS).

For clarification, all reviews should include PDS/Narrative of activity in all three areas since date of hire, including service credit (if any). Probationary faculty members who have completed a Reappointment review should include materials (supporting documents/evidence) for the period since their most recent Reappointment review.

### **3.1.1 General File Categorization**

CINE concurs with COTA RTP Policy 3.1.1.

NEW 2025 COTA RTP POLICY	NEW DRAFT CINE RTP POLICY
<p><b>3.2 Department RTP Policy</b>  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.</p>	<p><b>3.2 Department RTP Policy</b>  CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.2. and COTA RTP Policy 3.2.</p>
<p><b>3.3 Department RTP Committee</b>  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.</p>	<p><b>3.3 Department RTP Committee</b>  CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.3 and COTA RTP Policy 3.3, and adds the following. Faculty may, if elected, serve on the Department RTP Committee for consecutive terms. Ideally, the committee <u>constituency will represent the diversity of disciplines within CINE</u>.</p>
<p><b>3.4 Department Chair</b>  The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.4.</p>	<p><b>3.4 Department Chair</b>  CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.4 and COTA RTP Policy 3.4, and adds the following. The CINE department chair has a number of responsibilities, particularly with regard to probationary faculty, that require them to be the primary source of information regarding CINE procedures and deadlines. The department chair must also provide guidance to the candidate as to CINE expectations. The Department chair must initiate collegial discussions with the candidate about their overall career development and provide professional mentoring, as appropriate. The Department Chair has the responsibility of directing RTP candidates to the relevant policies and procedural documents prior to candidates submitting their dossiers.</p>
<p><b>3.5 College RTP Policy</b>  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.</p>	<p><b>3.5 College RTP Policy</b>  CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.5 and COTA RTP Policy 3.5.</p>
<p><b>3.5.1 College RTP Procedures Document</b>  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.</p>	<p><b>3.5.1 College RTP Procedures Document</b>  CINE concurs with COTA RTP Policy 3.5.1.</p>
<p><b>3.6 College RTP Committee</b>  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.</p>	<p><b>3.6 College RTP Committee</b>  CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.6 and COTA RTP Policy 3.6.</p>

<b>NEW 2025 COTA RTP POLICY</b>	<b><u>NEW DRAFT CINE RTP POLICY</u></b>
<p><b>3.7 Dean of the College</b> COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.7 and adds the following. Evaluations at the department level provide discipline-specific summaries of the candidate's record and are provided for the Dean's consideration in reaching an independent evaluation.</p>	<p><b>3.7 Dean of the College</b> CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.7 and COTA RTP Policy 3.7.</p>
<p><b>3.8 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs</b> COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.8.</p>	<p><b>3.8 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs</b> CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.8.</p>
<p><b>3.9 President</b> COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.9</p>	<p><b>3.9 President</b> CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.9.</p>
<p><b>4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS</b> COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.0, and to all RTP deadlines established by Faculty Affairs.</p>	<p><b>4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS</b> CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.0, and to all RTP deadlines established by Faculty Affairs.</p>
<p><b>4.1 Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty for Reappointment</b> COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.1.</p>	<p><b>4.1 Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty for Reappointment</b> CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.1.</p>
<p><b>4.2 Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty for Tenure and Promotion</b> COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.2.</p>	<p><b>4.2 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Tenure and Promotion</b> CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.2.</p>
<p><b>4.3 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion</b> COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.3.</p>	<p><b>4.3 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion</b> CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.1.</p>
<p><b>5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA</b> COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.0 and adds the following. Throughout the following subsections of this COTA RTP Policy (5.1 through 5.5.2) reference is made to each level of evaluation within the college. These levels are: department RTP committee evaluation, department chair (optional) evaluation, college RTP committee evaluation, college dean's evaluation. Candidates and evaluators are advised that the criteria for each of the possible actions under consideration in the RTP process (see sections 5.1-5.5.2) are distinct from one another and necessitate careful reading of their specifics.</p>	<p><b>5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA</b> CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.0 and COTA RTP Policy 5.0.</p>
<p><b>5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Tenure-track Faculty</b> COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.1 and adds the following. At each level of evaluation within the college, in order to recommend a candidate for reappointment, evaluators must determine, and clearly and specifically state in the evaluation report, that the candidate has met all university and college RTP standards, protocols, documentation requirements, and deadlines, and that the candidate's record during the period under evaluation indicates significant performance and likely ongoing performance at a level that at minimum is satisfactory in each of the three areas of evaluation: (1) instruction, (2) RSCA, and (3) service. See COTA RTP Policy 7.6 for definitions of, unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and excellent.</p>	<p><b>5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Tenure-track Faculty</b> CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.1 and COTA RTP Policy 5.1.</p>

<b>NEW 2025 COTA RTP POLICY</b>	<b><u>NEW DRAFT CINE RTP POLICY</u></b>
<p><b>5.2 Awarding of Tenure</b>  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.</p>	<p><b>5.2 Awarding of Tenure</b>  CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.2 and COTA RTP Policy 5.2.</p>
<p>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.</p>	
<p>See COTA RTP Policy 7.6 for definitions of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and excellent.</p>	
<p><b>5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor</b>  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.</p>	<p><b>5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor</b>  CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.3 and COTA RTP Policy 5.3.</p>
<p>See COTA RTP Policy 7.6 for definitions of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and excellent.</p>	
<p><b>5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor</b>  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 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.</p>	<p><b>5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor</b>  CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.4 and COTA RTP Policy 5.4.</p>
<p>See COTA RTP Policy 7.6-7.6.1 for definitions of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and excellent.</p>	
<p><b>5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion</b>  The College of the Arts defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.</p>	<p><b>5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion</b>  CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.</p>
<p><b>5.5.1 Early Tenure</b>  COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.1 and adds the following.  At each level of evaluation within the college, in order to recommend a candidate for early tenure, evaluators must determine, and clearly and specifically state in the evaluation report, that the candidate has met all relevant university and college RTP standards, protocols, documentation requirements, and deadlines, and that the candidate's record during the period under evaluation indicates sustained performance and likely ongoing performance at a level that is excellent in each of the three areas of evaluation: (1) instruction, (2) RSCA, and (3) service.</p>	<p><b>5.5.1 Early Tenure</b>  CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.1 and COTA RTP Policy 5.5.1.</p>
<p>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.</p>	
<p>See COTA RTP Policy 7.6-7.6.1 for definitions of satisfactory, unsatisfactory, and excellent.</p>	

<b>NEW 2025 COTA RTP POLICY</b>	<b><u>NEW DRAFT CINE RTP POLICY</u></b>
<p><b>5.5.2 Early Promotion</b>  COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.2 and adds the following.  The following applies only to candidates seeking early promotion to either the rank of Associate Professor or the rank of Professor.  At each level of evaluation within the college, in order to recommend a candidate for early tenure, evaluators must determine, and clearly and specifically state in the evaluation report, that the candidate has met all relevant university and college RTP standards, protocols, documentation requirements, and deadlines, and that the candidate's record during the period under evaluation indicates sustained performance and likely ongoing performance at a level that is excellent in each of the three areas of evaluation: (1) instruction, (2) RSCA, and (3) service.  Early promotion will not be recommended based upon a record of less than three complete academic years since the candidate's appointment to their CSULB tenure-track faculty position inclusive of any years of service credit from a prior institutional appointment, or since the candidate's tenure or last promotion, whichever is most recent, and will not be recommended if the candidate has been employed at CSULB for less than one academic year, and requires excellent performance across all three areas of evaluation for the full duration of the period under evaluation.  See COTA RTP Policy 7.6-7.6.1 for definitions of satisfactory, unsatisfactory, and excellent.</p>	<p><b>5.5.2 Early Promotion</b>  CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.2 and COTA RTP Policy 5.5.2.</p>
<p><b>6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS</b>  COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.0 and 6.1 and to all RTP deadlines established by Faculty Affairs. Departments may develop steps that are clearly defined, reasonable, relevant, appropriate, and timely, and that do not supersede or impede steps defined in the CSULB RTP Policy.</p>	<p><b>6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS</b>  CINE to CSULB RTP Policy 6.1 and COTA RTP Policy 6.1.</p>
<p><b>6.2</b> COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.2.</p>	<p><b>6.2</b> CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.2.</p>
<p><b>6.3</b> COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.3.</p>	<p><b>6.3</b> CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.3.</p>
<p><b>6.4</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>6.4</b> CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.4 and COTA RTP Policy 6.4.</p>
<p><b>6.5</b> COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.5.</p>	<p><b>6.5</b> CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.5.</p>
<p><b>6.6</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>6.6</b> CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.6 and COTA RTP Policy 6.6.</p>
<p><b>6.7</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>6.7</b> CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.7 and COTA RTP Policy 6.7.</p>
<p><b>6.8</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>6.8</b> CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.8 and COTA RTP Policy 6.8.</p>
<p><b>6.9</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>6.9</b> CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.9 and COTA RTP Policy 6.9.</p>
<p><b>6.10</b> COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.10.</p>	<p><b>6.10</b> CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.10.</p>
<b>NEW 2025 COTA RTP POLICY</b>	<b><u>NEW DRAFT CINE RTP POLICY</u></b>

**7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES**

7.1 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.1.

7.2 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.2.

7.3 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.3.

7.4 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 7.4 and adds the following. Candidate rebuttal documents shall be limited to a written reply to the committee and shall not involve the addition of other materials or documents, or information not immediately relevant to those parts of the committee report being rebutted. Any submitted written reply shall become part of the candidate's history. In subsequent RTP submissions, the candidate must provide the rebuttals and/or replies in the same area as other prior evaluations. Additionally, official documentation of modifications to the RTP timeline and/or the date of the next RTP evaluation must be included. These items must be clearly named so they are easy for evaluators to locate.

7.5 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 7.5

7.6 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 7.6 and adds the following.

In keeping with the example language used in CSULB RTP Policy 7.6, COTA adopts and requires the use of the following terms as summary evaluative descriptors for rating a candidate's performance in each of the three areas of evaluation: Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Excellent.

At each level of evaluation within the college (department RTP committee evaluation, department chair optional evaluation, college RTP committee evaluation, college dean's evaluation) for each area of evaluation (instruction, RSCA, service), the evaluator or evaluating committee must conclude the evaluation of the candidate's performance in each of the three areas of evaluation by rating the candidate's performance using one of the three summary evaluative descriptors.

For the purposes of RTP evaluation, COTA defines the summary evaluative descriptors as follows.

Unsatisfactory: Candidate fails to clearly and demonstrably meet expectations in the area of evaluation (instruction, RSCA, service) as described in the COTA RTP policy (section 2.0 and subsections) and further delineated in the department-level RTP policy.

Satisfactory: Candidate clearly and demonstrably meets expectations in the area of evaluation (instruction, RSCA, service) as described in the COTA RTP policy (section 2.0 and subsections) and further delineated in the department-level RTP policy. A satisfactory evaluation should not be interpreted as a pejorative, nor confused with the designation of excellent for candidates who truly exceed expectation.

Excellent: Candidate clearly, demonstrably, and significantly exceeds expectations in the area of evaluation (instruction, RSCA, service) as described in the COTA RTP policy (section 2.0 and subsections) and further delineated in the department-level RTP policy. Designation of excellent is a particular honor, and should be used selectively when merited.

**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.

**7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES**

7.1 CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.1.

7.2 CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.2.

7.3 CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.3.

7.4 CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.4 and COTA RTP Policy 7.4.

7.5 CINE defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.5.

7.6 CINE concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 7.6 and COTA RTP Policy 7.6. and refers candidates and evaluators to CSULB, COTA, and CINE RTP Policies, section 2 and its subsections.

**8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY**

CINE defers to CSULB Policy 8.0 and COTA Policy 8.0.