

COTA RTP POLICY (November 2024)

**CSULB COLLEGE OF THE ARTS REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP)
2024 (Supersedes all previous COTA RTP policies)**

Designed to work in concert with the CSULB RTP Policy, the College of the Arts (COTA) policy on reappointment, tenure and promotion further defines, applies, and interprets the RTP process for the College of the Arts —specifically the departments of Art, Cinematic Arts, Dance, Design, Music, and Theatre Arts—and provides parameters within which departments may still further define, apply, and interpret the process as appropriate to specific disciplines. All references to CSULB RTP Policy numbers in this document are to sections and subsections of the 2024 CSULB RTP Policy (Academic Senate Policy Statement 23-24).

1.0 MISSION, VISION, PRINCIPLES, AND VALUES

1.1 COTA Mission and Vision

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

1.2 Principles

COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.

1.2.1 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.1.

1.2.2 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.2 and adds the following. Given the broad diversity of instructional approaches; research, scholarly, and creative activity (RSCA); and service contributions in a College that includes scholars and practitioners in diverse departments, RTP standards must establish a consistent level of expectation while allowing candidates to meet expectations in varied ways. Requirements for reappointment, tenure, or promotion are defined in section 5, and evaluative terms are defined in section 7.6.

1.2.3 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.3 and adds the following. COTA expects sustained and substantive achievements and contributions over the specified period of review in: (1) instruction, (2) RSCA, and (3) service. COTA recognizes that every candidate is unique and that the specifics of a position, a discipline, a program, and a department will result in candidate files with differing balances and overall levels of achievement and contribution.

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

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

1.3 Values

COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3

1.3.1 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.1 and adds the following.

COTA recognizes that cultural taxation and identity taxation impact the morale, productivity, and well-being of some employees within our institution. Definitions of cultural and identify taxation continue to evolve, and in the absence of specific guidance from CSULB or the CSU, COTA adopts the following:

Cultural taxation and identity taxation refer to extra responsibilities, pressures, and/or expectations placed on individuals from marginalized or underrepresented backgrounds. These may include: educating colleagues and/or students about their culture; representing an entire identity or group in discussions and/or demonstrating knowledge or expertise about said group; taking on diversity related tasks; serving/consulting on additional committees, or being expected to do so solely on the basis of their identity; serving as informal advisor for students and/or emotionally containing students who share the candidates’ cultural and identity backgrounds; and/or withstanding other increased pressures or burdens.

COTA recognizes that cultural taxation and identity taxation may result in forms of invisible labor that cannot be documented in the same way as other tasks and assignments. COTA supports candidates in addressing cultural taxation and identity taxation in their RTP file. If these matters are raised by a candidate, COTA stresses the necessity that evaluators at all levels of evaluation within the RTP process recognize and directly address the complexity, scope, and scale of related workload demands and contributions. COTA is committed to providing training and support to department chairs, candidates, and evaluators about ways to recognize, address, and diminish cultural taxation and identity taxation.

1.3.2 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.2.

1.3.3 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.3

1.3.4 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.4

1.3.5 COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.5

2.1 Instructional Activities

COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1 and adds the following. Candidates are required to demonstrate via a combination of data, narrative, and documentation, a thorough account of the following:

Pedagogy and Method

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

Course Preparation

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

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

COTA RTP POLICY (November 2024)

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

Other Instructional Activities

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

2.1.1 Continuous Professional Learning

COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.1 and adds the following.

In addition to formal training sessions suggested by this policy, candidates may show evidence of continuous professional learning through self-reflection in one’s narrative; willingness to adapt and evolve in response to feedback; and changes to course material in order to remain current with one’s discipline.

2.1.2 Reflection & Instructional Adaptation: Formative Assessment

COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.2.

2.1.3 Instructional Practices that Foster Learning: Summative Assessment

COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.3 and adds the following. Candidates must present a clear and complete case for their overall instructional effectiveness through multiple forms of evidence. Candidates should provide syllabi for all courses and SPOT summaries for all course sections taught during the period of review. In addition, candidates should curate a selection of documents that demonstrate the range and evolution of their teaching. Documents could include, but are not limited, to assignments prompts, rubrics, and student work.

2.1.4 Classroom Visitation

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

2.2 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

2.3 Service

COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.3. and adds the following. While it is the responsibility of the candidate to actively seek opportunities for service, the College, Departments, and Chairs should work to equalize service opportunities, prevent service fatigue and potential cultural and identity taxation.

2.3.1 University Service:

All faculty are expected to participate in substantial, reliable, collegial university service and more specifically in shared governance (as it pertains to decision-making and policy development). Examples of university service may include, but are not limited to, leadership roles and participation in faculty governance, serving on committees, supervising and sponsoring student groups; authorship of policies, procedures and protocols, proposals, and other pertinent documents. COTA values community and professional service. However, these alone are insufficient for a satisfactory rating in the area of service.

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

Candidates must demonstrate a thorough account of sustained and significant service contributions spanning the full period under evaluation via a combination of data, narrative, and documentation. This shall go beyond simply listing services provided or committees upon which one has served. For each service activity, it is the candidate’s responsibility to clearly detail the following, at minimum: role, duration, activities performed, time required, and specific outcomes and the impact of such work.

COTA interprets the statement contained in CSULB RTP Policy section 2.3.1 that “it is the responsibility of every tenure-track and tenured faculty member to engage in service, and to do so in a way that potentially leads to equitable contributions that minimize cultural and identity taxation” not as a specific RTP requirement of or burden of proof for candidates but as a general statement about the need for all faculty to engage in service and to address service equitably within our university, college, and department structures and cultures.

2.3.2. 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 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.

COTA RTP POLICY (November 2024)

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 candidate must make every effort to properly categorize and contextualize activity—decidedly and reasonably placing activity in one category or another, or clearly detailing why an activity might warrant partial consideration in multiple areas. In other words, candidates must not take full credit for an activity in more than one category. For all instances in which a candidate has received assigned time or additional compensation, the candidate must account for what purpose the assigned time was granted, and what work was accomplished utilizing the assigned time.

3.2 Department RTP Policy

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

3.3 Department RTP Committee

COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 3.3 and adds the following. All candidates shall be reviewed by a committee of three or five members of appropriate rank; a full-time tenured faculty member is eligible to serve on RTP committees, provided that, in promotion reviews, the faculty member is of a rank equal to or higher than the candidate's sought rank. As necessary, departments may elect RTP committee members from other departments within the university, but only after every effort has been made to fill roles on the department committee and fulfill the obligation to provide a representative to the COTA RTP committee with faculty from the department.

3.4 Department Chair

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

3.5 College RTP Policy

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

3.5.1 College RTP Procedures Document

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

3.6 College RTP Committee

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

3.7 Dean of the College

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.

3.8 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.8.

3.9 President

COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.9

4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.0, and to all RTP deadlines established by Faculty Affairs.

4.1 Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty for Reappointment

COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.1.

4.2 Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty for Tenure and Promotion

COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.2.

4.3 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion

COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.3.

COTA RTP POLICY (November 2024)

5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.0 and adds the following.

Throughout the following subsections of this COTA RTP Policy (5.1 through 5.5.2) reference is made to each level of evaluation within the college.

These levels are:

department RTP committee evaluation,

department chair (optional) evaluation,

college RTP committee evaluation,

college dean’s evaluation.

Candidates and evaluators are advised that the criteria for each of the possible actions under consideration in the RTP process (see sections 5.1-5.5.2) are distinct from one another and necessitate careful reading of their specifics.

5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Tenure-track Faculty

COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.1 and adds the following. At each level of evaluation within the college, in order to recommend a candidate for reappointment, evaluators must determine, and clearly and specifically state in the evaluation report, that the candidate has met all university and college RTP standards, protocols, documentation requirements, and deadlines, and that the candidate’s record during the period under evaluation indicates significant performance and likely ongoing performance at a level that at minimum is satisfactory in each of the three areas of evaluation: (1) instruction, (2) RSCA, and (3) service.

See COTA RTP Policy 7.6 for definitions of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and excellent.

5.2 Awarding of Tenure

COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.2 and adds the following. At each level of evaluation within the college, in order to recommend a candidate for tenure, evaluators must determine, and clearly and specifically state in the evaluation report, that the candidate has met all university and college RTP standards, protocols, documentation requirements, and deadlines, and that the candidate’s record during the period under evaluation indicates significant and likely ongoing performance that is excellent in one area and satisfactory in the other two areas.

These are the COTA criteria for tenure alone. See section 5.3 for criteria for appointment/promotion to Associate Professor and section 5.4 for criteria for appointment/promotion to Professor.

See COTA RTP Policy 7.6 for definitions of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and excellent.

5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor

COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.3 and adds the following. At each level of evaluation within the college, in order to recommend a candidate for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, evaluators must determine, and clearly and specifically state in the evaluation report, that the candidate has met all university and college RTP standards, protocols, documentation requirements, and deadlines, and that the candidate’s record during the period under evaluation indicates significant, sustained, and ongoing performance that is excellent in one area and satisfactory in the other two areas.

See COTA RTP Policy 7.6 for definitions of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and excellent.

5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor

COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.4 and adds the following. At each level of evaluation within the college, in order to recommend a candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor, evaluators must determine, and clearly and specifically state in the evaluation report, that the candidate has met all relevant university and college RTP standards, protocols, documentation requirements, and deadlines, and that and that the candidate’s record during the period under evaluation indicates significant, sustained and ongoing performance that is excellent in two areas and satisfactory in the remaining area.

See COTA RTP Policy 7.6 for definitions of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and excellent.

5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.

5.5.1 Early Tenure

COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.1 and adds the following.

At each level of evaluation within the college, in order to recommend a candidate for early tenure, evaluators must determine, and clearly and specifically state in the evaluation report, that the candidate has exceeded all relevant university and college RTP standards, protocols, documentation requirements, and deadlines, and that the candidate’s record during the period under evaluation indicates sustained performance and likely ongoing performance at a level that is excellent in each of the three areas of evaluation: (1) instruction, (2) RSCA, and (3) service.

Early tenure will not be recommended based upon a record of less than three complete academic years since the candidate’s appointment to their CSULB tenure-track faculty position inclusive of any years of service credit from a prior institutional appointment, and will not be recommended if the candidate has been employed at CSULB for less than one academic year, and requires excellent performance across all three areas of evaluation for the full duration of the period under evaluation.

See COTA RTP Policy 7.6 for definitions of satisfactory, unsatisfactory, and excellent.

5.5.2 Early Promotion

COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.2 and adds the following.

The following applies only to candidates seeking early promotion to either the rank of Associate Professor or the rank of Professor.

At each level of evaluation within the college, in order to recommend a candidate for early tenure, evaluators must determine, and clearly and specifically state in the evaluation report, that the candidate has exceeded all relevant university and college RTP standards, protocols, documentation requirements, and deadlines, and that the candidate’s record during the period under evaluation indicates sustained performance and likely ongoing performance at a level that is excellent in each of the three areas of evaluation: (1) instruction, (2) RSCA, and (3) service.

Early promotion will not be recommended based upon a record of less than three complete academic years since the candidate’s appointment to their CSULB tenure-track faculty position inclusive of any years of service credit from a prior institutional appointment, or since the candidate’s tenure or last promotion, whichever is most recent, and will not be recommended if the candidate has been employed at CSULB for less than one academic year, and requires excellent performance across all three areas of evaluation for the full duration of the period under evaluation.

See COTA RTP Policy 7.6-7.6.1 for definitions of satisfactory, unsatisfactory, and excellent.

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.0 and 6.1 and to all RTP deadlines established by Faculty Affairs. Departments may develop steps that are clearly defined, reasonable, relevant, appropriate, and timely, and that do not supersede or impede steps defined in the CSULB RTP Policy.

6.2 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.2.

6.3 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.3.

6.4 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.4 and adds the following. Department RTP committee chair must notify candidate when supplementary materials collected during the Open Period are compiled and added to the candidate’s file.

6.5 COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.5.

COTA RTP POLICY (November 2024)

- 6.6** COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.6 and adds the following. The department RTP committee must conclude its evaluation report by clearly stating whether the committee recommends or does not recommend the candidate for each RTP action under consideration.
- 6.7** COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.7 and adds the following. If completing an optional independent written evaluation, the department chair must conclude the written evaluation by clearly stating whether the chair recommends or does not recommend the candidate for each RTP action under consideration.
- 6.8** COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.8 and adds the following. The college RTP committee must conclude its evaluation report by clearly stating whether the committee recommends or does not recommend the candidate for each RTP action under consideration.
- 6.9** COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.9 and adds the following. The dean must conclude their written evaluation by clearly stating whether the dean recommends or does not recommend the candidate for each RTP action under consideration.
- 6.10** COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.10.

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 file. 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.