

NEW COTA RTP POLICY (approved 2/2025)

**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

The College of the Arts concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.

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

1.2.2 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

DANCE RTP POLICY (near final for faculty approval, 3/24/25)

CSULB COTA DEPARTMENT OF DANCE REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP)

Designed to work in concert with the University and College of the Arts' Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) policies and guiding principles, the Department of Dance RTP policy further defines the parameters by which the diverse discipline-specific work and contributions of the faculty in the department will be evaluated. The policy provides guidance and specificity for the candidate in the three requisite areas of: Instructional Activities; Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities; and Service.

1.0 MISSION, VISION, PRINCIPLES, AND VALUES

1.1 Dance Mission and Vision

Our faculty and staff are committed to creating an inclusive, student-centered community where students discover educational pathways that reflect and expand upon their creative potential, intellectual curiosity and career aspirations. We offer a holistic approach to the study of dance that integrates coursework in dance history and ethnography, dance science, design and production, and pedagogy with dance-making, physical training, and an array of immersive creative and research opportunities. Through these experiences, our faculty seeks to equip our diverse student body with the skills, knowledge, and confidence to engage in the dynamic field of dance and to contribute to its vitality as artists, scholars, educators, and advocates. The Department of Dance strives to create well-rounded dancers by offering a diverse curriculum that includes modern/contemporary forms, ballet, street and club dances, jazz, contemporary African dance, tap, dance composition, improvisation, anatomy, physical conditioning and. Pilates, dance studies, lighting and costuming design, music for dance, pedagogy, and senior capstone courses.

1.2 Principles

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.

1.2.1 The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.2.1 and adds the following:

The Department recognizes that the professional engagement and active involvement of its faculty in the field of dance is essential to providing an impactful instructional experience for our students. Faculty are expected to maintain currency in their discipline, participate in professional development activities that contribute to their teaching effectiveness, and engage in ongoing service at the university as well as in the discipline and/or community.

1.2.2 The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA RTP Policy 1.2.2 and adds the following:

The Department of Dance recognizes and values the diversity of faculty expertise. The requirements for reappointment, tenure, and promotion defined in section 5 are designed to maintain transparency, promote equity and fairness for all faculty, and mitigate bias throughout the review process.

1.2.3 The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA RTP Policy 1.2.3 and adds the following:

The Department of Dance offers a variety of programs including three undergraduate tracks (BA in Dance, BS in Dance Science, BFA in Dance) and two graduate programs (MA in Dance, MFA in Dance) that differ in content and philosophy. Faculty positions cover a range of expertise, including but not limited to technique, composition, performance, theory, history, dance science, community dance, and dance education. Faculty positions may bridge multiple areas. The RTP standards of the department are tailored to establish consistent expectations for all faculty while honoring the differences in expertise. The Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity (RSCA) and professional service of faculty should align with expertise and teaching assignments.

1.2.4 The Department of Dance concurs with COTA RTP Policy 1.2.4.

1.2.5 The Department of Dance concurs with COTA RTP Policy 1.2.5.

1.3 Values

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.

1.3.1 The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA RTP Policy 1.3.1.

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.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.0 and adds the following. The criteria for evaluation for each of the three areas of review (instructional activities, RSCA, and service) describe the nature and level of performance required of all faculty in COTA. Criteria set by college and department RTP policies establish the standards by which faculty, following diverse career paths, are evaluated. Colleagues in each department of COTA and on review committees play the central role in evaluating the quality and quantity of performance in each of these areas.

2.1 Instructional Activities

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

Pedagogy and Method

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

Course Preparation

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

Ongoing Professional Development

The candidate shall show evidence of ongoing evaluation of pedagogy as it relates to the candidate’s teaching philosophy, and efforts to enrich the candidate’s teaching and student performance. Candidates shall demonstrate a challenging and current approach to course materials, incorporating the candidate’s research, scholarly and creative activities and/or professional activities into the classroom, and teaching methods where appropriate.

Other Instructional Activities

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

1.3.2 The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.2.

1.3.3 The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.3.

1.3.4 The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.4.

1.3.5 The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 1.3.5.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

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

2.1 Instructional Activities

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA RTP policies 2.1 and adds the following: The category of Instructional Activities for the Department of Dance includes all activities directly related to instruction in the classroom and/or studio setting and activities for which the candidate received reassigned time. Candidates should detail all course assignments and activities for which they receive weighted teaching units (WTUs) in the Professional Data Sheet, including reassigned time. When WTUs are not associated with an instructional activity the candidate may provide justification for consideration of the activity under Instructional Activities or may elect to have the activity considered for evaluation under Service or RSCA. Examples of Instructional Activities include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Teaching in the classroom or studio
- Supervision and mentoring of student's creative work such as choreography and performance
- Supervision and mentoring of directed studies, honors theses, student teaching, internships, research, graduate project reports, and fieldwork
- Chairing or membership on a graduate project or thesis committee
- Design and grading of graduate comprehensive exams
- Development of curriculum at the department or college level
- Assessments of student work
- Advising and mentoring students
- Setting choreography or structured improvisation on students for performance in department sponsored events (see requirements below)

Instructional Choreography

As part of their teaching assignment, faculty members are expected to contribute to student learning through restaging and/or creating dance works for performance by students at department events and/or concerts. During the first three years, tenure-track faculty should set a minimum of 2 works on dance majors. Between reappointment and tenure, faculty should set a minimum of 2 works on dance majors to receive tenure and a minimum of 3 works on dance majors for promotion to Associate Professor. For promotion from Associate to Full Professor, faculty should set a minimum of 3 works on dance majors. In the years following all promotions, faculty should continue to set work regularly on students. In cases where faculty do not receive WTUs for setting choreography, they may include the activity under the area of creative (RSCA) activities or service.

Pedagogy and Method

As a field of study, dance is inherently interdisciplinary. In alignment with the dance field, courses within the department vary in pedagogical approaches and methodologies. When teaching practice-based courses, faculty are expected to integrate creative practice, critical thinking, and analysis/synthesis into instruction. In all relevant courses (e.g., dancemaking, music for dance, or

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.

courses in dance history, science, education, or appreciation), teaching methods are expected to integrate critical thinking and analysis/synthesis in discussions about aesthetics and dance forms in their socio-cultural contexts.

Course Preparation

Faculty are expected to communicate clear expectations to students about their learning through an outcomes-based alignment of assignments and assessments. Course materials must be prepared in accordance with university standards and protocols, including providing students with information needed for successful accomplishment of learning outcomes. Faculty teaching hybrid or online courses are expected to complete appropriate training and to employ best practices in building courses within the learning management system.

Ongoing Professional Development

Faculty are expected to reflect on their pedagogy in relation to their teaching philosophy, professional activities, and research, scholarly, and creative activities, as well as its thoughtful development over time (see 2.1.1).

Other Instructional Activities

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

2.1.1 Continuous Professional Learning

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA RTP Policy 2.1.1 and adds the following: Thoughtful, deliberate effort towards continued growth and improvement in teaching effectiveness is expected of all candidates. This effort may include regular and ongoing interactions with colleagues such as discussion of pedagogical issues, classroom visits, and/or consultations on course development and giving and/or receiving formal or informal pedagogical coaching, as well as revision of course materials based on research into current pedagogy and best teaching practices. This development may also include involvement in training and enrichment programs presented by the CSULB Faculty Center, College, University, Chancellor's office, or professional organizations.

2.1.2 Reflection & Instructional Adaptation: Formative Assessment

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.1.2 and adds the following: In addition to discussing the formative assessment of their pedagogical practices, candidates should contextualize how formative assessments within courses align with course learning outcomes and summative assessments. Formative assessments of student learning in the Department of Dance may take diverse forms, ranging from assignments that are scaffolded to progressively develop writing and research skills to studio-based assignments that develop student creative work through reflection and feedback.

2.1.3 Instructional Practices that Foster Learning: Summative Assessment

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA RTP Policy 2.1.3 and adds the following: Summative assessments may take diverse forms in the Department of Dance, including more traditional assessments such as research papers, final projects, oral presentations, portfolios and exams. Assessments of this type may also include in-progress showings of creative work, performances, studio demonstrations, feedback sessions, community engagement events, and other methods demonstrating successful learning in a course. Candidates should discuss how their summative assessments align with goals for student learning and include documents to illustrate.

- In terms of SPOT evaluations, candidates should include:
1. An explanation of student course evaluation data that differ from department and/or college norms relative to level in their statistical deviation. Candidates and evaluators should keep in mind that while SPOT Summary forms provide the mean averages (M) for the candidate, department, and college, other measures of central tendency (i.e., median = Mdn, or mode = Mo) may provide more appropriate averages with small sample sizes or skewed distributions and should be considered accordingly. If mean averages (M) are used, standard deviations (SD) must also be considered, and candidates should provide explanations for large standard deviations or those that the candidate believes are anomalous or inaccurate.

Extensive research has demonstrated that student evaluations are inherently flawed instruments that by their nature, do not accurately represent instructional effectiveness. Student evaluations demonstrate both environmental bias (bias based on course conditions, including but not limited to course difficulty, course modality, course meeting time, student interest level, and modality) and equity bias (bias towards the instructor because of aspect/s or perceived aspect/s of their identity, including but not limited to race/ethnicity, gender, ability, national origin, sexual orientation, and appearance).

Candidates who believe that their student evaluations have been impacted by any of these factors may choose to use their narratives to address their student evaluation scores. Candidates should also be aware that Provision 11.2 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement states that instructors may submit written rebuttals to student course evaluations when they believe that additional

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.

information is needed “or in the case of student bias.” If such a rebuttal is submitted, it is incumbent upon the evaluating committee to review it.

2.1.4 Classroom Visitation

Department of Dance faculty must utilize the following schedule for classroom visitation. During the first three years after hire in a tenure track position, the Department Chair and a member of the tenured faculty will each observe a minimum of one class session taught by the candidate per year. Between reappointment and review for Tenure/Promotion, a plan will be developed between the candidate and the Department Chair, with a minimum requirement of two classroom visits by tenured faculty during the next period under review, as well as one visit by all members of the Department RTP Committee in the final year of review for tenure. Following the granting of tenure, the Department Chair will periodically observe class sessions, and during years when faculty members are being evaluated for promotion or undergoing an evaluation of tenured faculty, each member of the review committee will conduct a classroom visit.

2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)

Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 2.2 and adds the following:
Department of Dance faculty members are required to remain engaged in an ongoing program of research, scholarly, and/or creative activity that demonstrates intellectual and artistic growth in the field of dance. The Department of Dance values a wide array of research and modes of dissemination, including but not limited to Scholarship of Discovery, Scholarship of Integration, Scholarship of Application or Engagement, and Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, as defined in CSULB RTP Policy 2.2.

Criteria for evaluation in the areas of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA), and Service are divided into two tiers: Tier One and Tier Two. Examples of possible RSCA are grouped into categories within each tier. Tier Two activities are acknowledged as commendable contributions to the candidate’s RSCA agenda, while Tier One activities are peer reviewed by expert scholars or practitioners in the field and are noteworthy for their significant impact within the discipline and/or intended community. Expectations for each faculty include achievement in both Tier One and Tier Two categories and are designated relative to the areas of expertise and the stage of review. These expectations are clarified in Policy Section 2.2.3. Candidates will be evaluated on the impact of all achievements they include in the file. Candidates must disclose and describe any scholarly or creative activities for which they received reassigned time and/or additional compensation.

The narrative must clearly state the candidate’s focus and areas of scholarly and/or creative interest and achievement, as well as the impact of their documented accomplishments in terms of contribution(s) to the discipline and the level of professional recognition brought through forms of peer review.

Peer review has traditionally been defined as a process by which qualified experts in the discipline impartially evaluate the merit, importance, and originality of research, scholarly, and creative activities.
Peer review has also been defined as a mutually constitutive process established in the reciprocal relationship between a researcher and the communities with which they are engaged (e.g., organizations, governmental agencies, schools, business/industry, etc.). These forms of peer review may include, but are not limited to:
1. The process of selection of work for dissemination within the publishing venues of non-academic sectors.
2. Documentation of the quantity, strength, and impact of work on community members in the field (e.g., Adoption of innovations, and/or widespread changes in professional practice, etc.)
3. The process of evaluation of off-campus RSCA grant proposals by granting agencies or organizations.
4. A process leading to creative performances, exhibitions of work, or academic presentations in public venues in which peers independently evaluated the work.
5. Testimonials, letters of recommendation, or adaptations from peers, professionals, community stakeholders, etc. that affirm the value of the work.
6. Awards, honors, or other public recognition of the work by peers, professionals, community stakeholders, etc.

It is the responsibility of candidates to contextualize how their scholarly or creative activities are considered peer reviewed as well as their impact in the field/discipline or community. Candidates must also elucidate an ongoing plan developed in conjunction with the Department Chair for building achievements in their selected areas of interest.

Subsequent reviews shall discuss progress relative to this plan and any changes within their research trajectory. The intent is not to confine the candidate, should other opportunities or interests develop, but rather to help the candidate establish long-term goals. It is hoped that these discussions can assist the candidate in making effective decisions in terms of the prioritization of professional obligations and use of time, as well as provide context for the review committees.

2.2.1 Categories for RSCA Evaluation

The following categories are used for RSCA evaluation in the Department of Dance. These categories are separated into two tiers with the division based primarily on its impact and if the accomplishment was peer reviewed. If a candidate considers an achievement to be in a different tier than specified below, it is the responsibility of the candidate to provide justification and context,

along with supporting materials to defend the placement in a different tier. In all cases, candidates should provide context and supporting documentation for accomplishments. Examples below should not be construed as exhaustive or required:

TIER ONE ACTIVITIES

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

Choreography and Performance

- Choreography for and/or performance in an internationally or a nationally recognized dance company, film/television/online platform, theater/dance production, commercial industry production or production company, battle/competition, festival, and/or community event.
- Choreography and/or Performance presented in a venue recognized for its impact in the discipline (international to local).
- Invited Choreography and/or Performance in a higher education setting other than CSULB.
- A documented invitation to choreograph for and/or perform with a production of a highly recognized national or international nature which may be declined due to CSULB responsibilities.

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

- Peer-reviewed or invited article published in an academic journal or widely distributed popular press journal recognized for its impact in the field.
- Single or co-authored popular press book or textbook with an academic press recognized for its impact in the field.
- Single or co-authored monograph of original research with an academic press recognized for its impact in the field.
- Single or co-authored scholarly or academic book chapter with an academic press recognized for its impact in the field.
- Editor of a published book of academic or scholarly nature, or Editor of an academic journal with an academic press recognized for its impact in the field.
- Book-length translation of a scholarly nature.
- Invited or peer-reviewed course development with an organization recognized for its impact in the field.

Presentations:

- Invited presentation/class/workshop sponsored by an organization recognized for its impact in the field.
- Selected presentation, paper, lecture-demonstration, workshop, roundtable participation at an academic conference recognized for its impact in the field.
- Keynote Speaker at a conference or annual meeting of an organization known for its impact in the field.
- Oral interview/presentation given in a significant venue recognized for its impact in the field (e.g. Radio, TV, online platforms, performance talks).
- Host, MC or facilitator of event recognized for its impact to the field.

Grants and Residencies:

- An external grant or residency of a minimum of \$5,000 or the equivalent from a high impact organization/foundation for a project whose outcome will have a significant impact in the field (amount shall be identified).
- Internal university ORED Multidisciplinary Research Grant, or other significant university research grant.
- Artistic Engagement: Contracted residency in a community-based site or organization, series of workshops, activism/social justice projects, community-based program development and/or implementation with demonstrated significant impact.

Technology:

- Software development with national or international distribution.
- Designing a digital humanities project and/or designer of innovations in interactive/production technologies.
- Develop a webinar for a national or an international professional organization, or that make a significant contribution to the field.

TIER TWO ACTIVITIES

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

Choreography and Performance

- Choreography and/or performance with an off-campus organization with regional or local impact, including a dance company, film/television/online platform, theater/dance production, commercial industry production or production company, battle/competition, festival, and/or community event.
- Performance and/or choreography in a national or international venue or company may fall into this category if the impact is regional or local.
- Choreography or performance in a festival with local impact (e.g. *SOLA*, *Celebrate Dance*, and *Choreography Under the Stars*).
- Creating and/or restaging a dance work and setting it on students for performance in a department concert (only when not receiving WTUs for the activity).

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

- Article (non-refereed) in the popular press (e.g., *Dance Teacher Now*, *Pilates Style*).
- Editor of a published book of a trade nature.
- Author or co-author of a book chapter in popular or trade sector.
- Guest editor of a journal with local or regional impact.
- Reviewer of a book manuscript, published book, or academic article.
- Author of the forward or introduction to a scholarly book.
- Member of the editorial board of a professional journal.
- Regular reviewer for a professional journal.
- Author of a course manual (not including “readers”).
- Translation of a previously published scholarly chapter or article.
- Author of a teaching/curriculum guide.
- Author of a technical or lab manual published by a significant press.
- Revision and publication of a previously published scholarly work.
- Author of a self-published book.

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

- Invited presentation/class/workshop sponsored by an organization with local or regional impact (non-reviewed)
- Oral interview/presentation given in a venue with local or regional impact in the field (e.g. Radio, TV, online platforms, performance talks).
- Host, MC or facilitator of event with local or regional impact to the field.
- Presentation at another institution of higher education or an invited speaker at a colloquium or seminar.

Grants and Residencies:

- An internal or external grant of less than \$5,000 that contributes to the field (amount shall be identified).
- Artistic Engagement: Contracted residency in a community-based site or organization, series of workshops, activism/social justice projects, community-based program development and/or implementation with local impact.

Computer and Technology:

- Webinar for an organization with local or regional impact.
- Website development of significant impact for the field.

2.2.2 RSCA Documentation

Documentation of accomplishments may take the form of programs, reviews, scripts, photographs, digital videos, printed materials, etc. Digital copies for all publications (articles, chapters, sections of books, etc.) must be included in the file. When available, unsolicited evaluations of the work must also be included such as reviews, citation records, and/or related awards. Candidates may also elect to solicit external evaluations, particularly in circumstances where an outside specialist may be particularly well-qualified to evaluate the candidate’s scholarly and creative achievements. When appropriate, explanations detailing the active involvement of students must also be provided. When the accomplishment involves additional contributors, a clear explanation and verification of the candidate’s specific contribution must be included.

2.2.3 RSCA Evaluation Guidelines

The following guidelines are for all faculty in the Department of Dance. Faculty members with expertise in more than one area may elect to meet the requirements by drawing from both creative and scholarly criteria. The total number of accomplishments must be consistent with the Department criteria in all cases.

Both Tier One and Tier Two are considered commendable achievements in the field, and it is expected that a candidate will garner multiple achievements from Tier One by tenure and subsequent promotions. Requirements for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion require that candidates achieve the minimum number of accomplishments indicated below, or provide justification for equivalency, to demonstrate that their performance is Satisfactory in the area of RSCA.

Reappointment

The following numbers reflect the total number of accomplishments since hire (and service credit, if applicable), as a tenure-track faculty and are evidence of satisfactory performance:

- Minimum of 5 accomplishments with at least 1 being Tier One

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

Tenure

The following numbers reflect the total number of accomplishments since hire (and service credit, if applicable), as a tenure-track faculty and are evidence of satisfactory performance. (Note: Excellent performance in RSCA is demonstrated by meeting the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor below):

- Minimum of 12 accomplishments with at least 3 being Tier One

Promotion to Associate Professor

The following numbers reflect the total number of accomplishments since hire (and service credit, if applicable), as a tenure-track faculty and are evidence of excellent performance:

- Minimum of 12 accomplishments with at least 5 being Tier One.

Promotion to Full Professor

The following numbers reflect the total number of accomplishments since the last review and are evidence of satisfactory performance:

- Minimum of 10 accomplishments with at least 2 being Tier One.

The following numbers reflect the total number of accomplishments since the last review and are evidence of excellent performance:

- Minimum of 15 with at least 4 being Tier One.

2.3 Service

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA RTP.

All faculty members are expected to participate actively in the processes of faculty governance by working collaboratively and productively with colleagues. At all levels, the quality and degree of participation in service activities is equally important as the number of committees on which candidates serve. Candidates must disclose and describe any service for which they receive reassigned time or additional compensation.

Service contributions may also be related to the cultural/identity taxation a candidate experiences. CSULB’s RTP policy states that "cultural and identity taxation has the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas," and that all related policies "should be interpreted in ways that minimize these inequities and include mechanisms to mitigate them." It also notes the position taken in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA): "mentoring, advising, and outreach activities, including those leading to cultural and identity taxation, are particularly important for supporting underserved, first-generation, and/or underrepresented students." Although such work "may be difficult for candidates to document in conventional ways...college criteria and reviews...should still recognize their importance and guide candidates on necessary levels of evidence to document these activities."

The Department of Dance recognizes that the quality and degree of a candidate's service may be impacted by disproportionate expectations placed upon them for this work. Specifically, the labor undertaken to support diversity initiatives is often provided by, or extracted from, marginalized and/or minoritized faculty as a direct result of their identities (i.e., cultural/identity taxation). This policy defines cultural/identity taxation as: the suggested or unstated expectation that employees from marginalized and/or minoritized backgrounds and/or identities (including, but not limited to sexual orientation, gender, race, ethnicity, ability, etc.) should provide representation on committees and/or showcase their knowledge of and commitment to the groups and communities to which they belong.

2.3.1. University Service:

The Department of Dance concurs with COTA RTP Policy 2.3.1.

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.

2.3.2. Professional Service:

The Department of Dance concurs with COTA RTP Policy 2.3.2 and adds the following:
In the Department of Dance, a candidate’s professional service is considered substantive according to its impact in the disciplinary area or areas of the candidate. In Dance, professional service may occur in less traditional academic settings, such as events which may overlap with those considered service to the community.

2.3.3 Community Service:

The Department of Dance concurs with COTA RTP Policy 2.3.3.

2.3.4 Categories for Service Evaluation

The Department of Dance has categorized accomplishments into expected Departmental Service and Tier One, and Tier Two Service Activities. The division into the two tiers is largely based on the stature of the service in regard to the mission of the department, college, and/or university, and the time requirements generally inherent in each service contribution. The Dance Department has categorized contributions into the tier where a given service contribution will most likely fall. However, the Department is aware that the workloads of a given committee may shift markedly from year to year. Hence, the candidate may provide justification of why this or other achievements should be considered in a different tier. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to clearly describe the content, quality, and impact of their service contributions to the university, profession, or community.

In most cases, faculty receiving reassigned time for any of the service activities listed below should include those activities under Instructional Activities rather than Service. However, faculty may make the case within their narrative for why such activities should remain under Service. Faculty are encouraged to consult the Department Chair for guidance in such cases.

DEPARTMENTAL SERVICE

Specific audition assignments are determined at the start of each academic year by the appropriate administrator in consultation with the tenured and tenure-track faculty and the Department Chair. Faculty members are expected to attend undergraduate and graduate admissions auditions, to participate in screenings for technique classes, and to attend scholarship auditions as needed. For graduate auditions, faculty participating in those are expected to review application materials in advance; in the case of MFA applications, faculty may be asked to participate in the initial Screening Committee, as well as the audition. BFA Coordinators and a rotating third faculty member are expected to attend BFA auditions.

CATEGORIES OF SERVICE

The following examples should not be construed as exhaustive or required:

TIER ONE ACTIVITIES

**Service to the University
Committees**

- Member of a search committee on the department, college, or university level
- Member of a chair, dean or other administrator review committee on the department, college, or university level
- Member of an RTP committee on the department or college level
- Member of another substantial committee on the college level such as the Curriculum Committee, Faculty Council, Research Scholarly and Creative Activities Committee, or Mini-grant and Summer Stipend Committee
- Department Assessment Coordinator
- Member of another substantial committee on the University level such as Academic Senate, Nominating Committee of the Academic Senate, Executive Council of the Academic Senate, Curriculum and Educational Policies Council, General Education Governing Committee, General Education Evaluation Committee, Institutional and Program Review Council, Faculty Personnel Policies Council, Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement Committee, or University Mini-grant Summar Stipend Committee
- Chair of any college or university level committee
- Member of a task force involving substantial responsibility or leadership
- Author of a substantial document or report for a committee on the department, college or university level

Curriculum

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

Accreditation or Evaluation

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

Service to the Profession or Community Leadership

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

Adjudication

- Adjudication for an organization or event with national or an international impact

Department Visibility and Recruitment

- Coordinator of an American College Dance Association regional conference/national festival or another prestigious professional or scholarly conference or festival.
- Guest artist offering 3 or more technique classes, workshops, and/or lectures at local high schools and/or community colleges during a given academic year
- Supervisor for or creator of a university, college or special departmental function/event tied to recruitment, development, and/or retention (e.g. High School Dance Day)

TIER TWO ACTIVITIES

Service to the University

Committees

- Member of most department committees, as well as a member of a college or university level committee that requires less work than those considered Tier One
- Member of a task force that does not involve substantial time
- Author of a brief document or report, as well as being a contributor (without being the primary author) of a substantial document for a report for a committee at the department, college or university level

Curriculum

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

Accreditation or Evaluation

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

Student Organization Advising

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

Service Teaching

- Presenter for movement educators at a regional or local level
- Teacher for a dance festival such as ACDA
- Guest teacher at a local school or university
- Short-term substitute teacher within the Department
- Guest teacher for a CSULB course outside the candidate’s teaching load (such as DANC 110 Viewing Dance labs)
- Creating and/or restaging a dance work and setting it on dance majors for a department concert (only when not receiving WTUs for the activity)

Department Visibility and Recruitment

- Guest artist offering 1 to 2 technique classes, workshops, and/or lectures at local high schools and/or community colleges during a given academic year
- Developing tools and media for internal and external communication needs (website administration, copy and layout of brochures and public relations)
- Small-scale fund-raising activities to support Department needs

Service to the Profession or Community Leadership

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

Consultant

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

Adjudication:

- Adjudicator for a regional or local organization or event

2.3.5 Service Documentation

Documentation of service may take many forms including, but not limited to, letters of invitation, letters acknowledging the quality of the contribution, as well as copies of reports, policies, programs or other printed materials. When the accomplishment involves additional contributors, a clear explanation and verification of the candidate’s specific contribution must be included in the file.

2.3.6 Service Evaluation Guidelines

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

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

Candidates (in their narratives) and evaluating committees (in their evaluations) should pay special attention to the relationship between cultural/identity taxation and service, when applicable. Candidates who experience cultural/identity taxation may choose to describe this in their narratives, detailing how their service is in high demand due to their positionality, and how their service obligations may have exceeded typical expectations due to their marginalized and/or minoritized identities. While not easily quantifiable, the increased service workload undertaken by these faculty can be described in terms of the impact their work has had on their department, college, university, community, and/or discipline. Faculty may wish to describe in their narratives how their own unique circumstances intersected with the needs of the campus community during the period of review, stressing how this may have affected their work performance.

Evaluating committees should recognize that many faculty experience various forms of cultural/identity taxation, resulting in intense service work, student mentoring, and other activities on and off campus that are essential to the mission of the university. The university benefits from this work, and as such, it is the responsibility of evaluating committees to contextualize this service, and to recognize extraordinary service accomplishments that are tied to cultural/identity taxation.

Reappointment

The following numbers reflect the total number of accomplishments since hire (and service credit, if applicable) as tenure-track faculty and are evidence of satisfactory performance:

- Departmental Service.
- Minimum of 4 accomplishments in either Tier.

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 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

Tenure

The following numbers reflect the total number of accomplishments since hire (and service credit, if applicable) as a tenure-track faculty and are evidence of satisfactory performance (Note: Excellent performance in Service is demonstrated by meeting the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor below.):

- Departmental Service.
- Minimum of 10 accomplishments with at least 2 being Tier One.
- Of the above, at least one (1) shall be service on a university or college level committee of either Tier One or Tier Two level.

Promotion to Associate Professor

The following numbers reflect the total number of accomplishments since hire (and service credit, if applicable) as a tenure-track faculty and are evidence of excellent performance:

- Departmental Service.
- Minimum of 10 accomplishments with at least 4 being Tier One.
- Of the above, one (1) Tier One must be service on a university or college level committee.

Promotion to Full Professor

The following numbers reflect the total number of accomplishments since the last review and are evidence of satisfactory performance:

- Departmental Service.
- Minimum of 8 accomplishments with at least 2 being Tier One.

The following numbers reflect the total number of accomplishments since the last review and are evidence of excellent performance:

- Departmental Service.
- Minimum of 8 accomplishments with at least 4 being Tier One.
- Of the above, 2 Tier One must be at the university and/or college level.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

CSULB RTP Policy 3.0

3.1 Candidate

CSULB RTP Policy 3.1 and (COTA RTP Policy 3.1 – 3.1.1).

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

3.1.1 General File Categorization

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA RTP Policy 3.1.1.

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.

5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA
COTA defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.0 and adds the following.

3.2 Department RTP Policy

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA RTP Policy 3.2.

3.3 Department RTP Committee

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA RTP Policy 3.3.

3.4 Department Chair

The Department of Dance defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.4.

3.5 College RTP Policy

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA RTP Policy 3.5.

3.5.1 College RTP Procedures Document

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA RTP Policy 3.5.1.

3.6 College RTP Committee

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA RTP Policy 3.6.

3.7 Dean of the College

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA RTP Policy 3.7.

3.8 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA RTP Policy 3.8.

3.9 President

The Department of Dance defers to CSULB RTP Policy 3.9.

4. 0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

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

4.1 Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty for Reappointment

Dance defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.1.

4.2 Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty for Tenure and Promotion

Dance defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.2.

4.3 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion

Dance defers to CSULB RTP Policy 4.3.

5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

The Department of Dance defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.0.

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

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

5.5.1 Early Tenure

COTA concurs with CSULB RTP Policy 5.5.1 and adds the following.
At each level of evaluation within the college, in order to recommend a candidate for early tenure, evaluators must determine, and clearly and specifically state in the evaluation report, that the candidate has exceeded all relevant university and college RTP standards, protocols, documentation requirements, and deadlines, and that the candidate’s record during the period under evaluation indicates sustained performance and likely ongoing performance at a level that is excellent in each of the three areas of evaluation: (1) instruction, (2) RSCA, and (3) service.

Early tenure will not be recommended based upon a record of less than three complete academic years since the candidate’s appointment to their CSULB tenure-track faculty position inclusive of any years of service credit from a prior institutional appointment, and will not be recommended if the candidate has been employed at CSULB for less than one academic year, and requires excellent performance across all three areas of evaluation for the full duration of the period under evaluation.
See COTA RTP Policy 7.6 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.

5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Tenure-track Faculty

The Department of Dance defers to CSULB RTP Policy 5.1.

5.2 Awarding of Tenure

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA RTP Policy 5.2.

5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA Policy 5.3.

5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA Policy 5.4.

5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA Policy 5.5.

5.5.1 Early Tenure

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA Policy 5.5.1.

5.5.2 Early Promotion

The Department of Dance concurs with CSULB RTP and COTA RTP Policy 5.5.2.

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

6.2 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.

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

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

CSULB RTP Policy 6.0 – 6.9, and to all RTP deadlines established by Faculty Affairs.

6.2 Dance defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.2.

6.3 Dance defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.3.

6.4 Dance defers to CSULB and COTA RTP Policies 6.4.

6.5 Dance defers to CSULB RTP Policy 6.5.

6.6 Dance defers to CSULB and COTA RTP Policies 6.6.

6.7 Dance defers to CSULB and COTA RTP Policies 6.7.

6.8 Dance defers to CSULB and COTA RTP Policies 6.8.

6.9 Dance defers to CSULB and COTA RTP Policies 6.9.

6.10 The Department of Dance defers to CSULB Policy 6.10.

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

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

7.2 The Department of Dance defers to CSULB RTP Policy 7.2.

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

7.4 The Department of Dance defers to CSULB and COTA RTP Policies 7.4.

7.5 Dance 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.

7.6 The Department of Dance defers to CSULB and COTA RTP Policies 7.6.

8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY

The Department of Dance defers to CSULB Policy 8.0.

8.02. CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT RTP POLICY

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