

✓

**DEPARTMENT RTP DOCUMENT
APPROVAL TRACKING RECORD**

Department:	MUSIC
Starting Year for Department RTP Document:	2018/19
Intended Length for use of Department RTP Document: (maximum 5 years)	5 years

DEPARTMENT

"This Department RTP Document has been approved by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty in this department."

Dept. Chair: Peter Yates Peter Yates 3/9/18
Printed Name Signature Date

DRTPC Chair: Nadia Shpachenko Nadia Shpachenko 3/9/18
Printed Name Signature Date

COLLEGE RTP COMMITTEE

"The CRTPC has reviewed this Department RTP Document and makes the following recommendation."

1. Recommend Approval
 2. Recommend Approval, but concerns noted in attached memo.
 3. Recommend to DENY Approval (explanation must be attached.)

CRTPC Chair: DANIEL LEWIS Daniel Lewis 5/15/18
Printed Name Signature Date

COLLEGE/SCHOOL DEAN

"I have reviewed this Department RTP Document and make the following recommendation."

1. Recommend Approval
 2. Recommend Approval, but concerns noted in attached memo.
 3. Recommend to DENY Approval (explanation must be attached.)

Dean/Director: IRIS LEVINE Iris Levine 5/30/18
Printed Name Signature Date

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

1. Approved for the following years 5
 2. Not Approved (Explanation attached.)

AVP for Faculty Affairs: Marlin Sancho-Madriz Marlin Sancho-Madriz 08.10.18
Printed Name Signature Date

In cases where the Department RTP Document does not conform to the provisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement or University Policy 1328 (formerly Appendix 16) or Policy 1329 (formerly Appendix 10), those documents take precedence.

DATE: May 15, 2018

TO: Dr. Iris Levine, Dean
College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences

FROM: Dr. Daniel Lewis, Chair
College RTP Committee

RE: Review of Music RTP Document Updates

The CRTPC has reviewed the RTP revisions that the conversion to a semester-based system of operations requires. We make the following suggestions:

The document uses different fonts and has section headers at the end of pages. One more round of formatting would fix this, the committee thinks.

The modifier "long term" should be hyphenated: e.g., page 9 line 1.

Page numbers would be a welcome addition.

Please make these corrections to the document and return the revised document to the college dean's office at your earliest convenience. Assuming these changes are made in the document going forward, the CRTPC approves the revised document.

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences
Department of Music
Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Document

For AY 2018/19 through 2022-23

Section I – Introduction

The reappointment, tenure, and promotion process is a critically important faculty responsibility. RTP is the mechanism by which we assure the success of our faculty and thereby assure educational quality for our students. While the president makes final decisions on reappointment, tenure, and promotion, it is the department faculty who are in the best position to provide clear expectations, create an environment conducive to achieving expectations, and render the most informed recommendations to the president. The Department RTP Criteria Document communicates department expectations and RTP procedures to the department faculty, faculty candidates, the dean, the College RTP Committee, the University RTP Committee, and academic administrators. University policies including the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and Policies 1328 and 1329 of the University Manual define university procedures and expectations. Department documents must supplement and may not conflict with these policies. In the event of discrepancies, the CBA takes first precedence and university policies take second precedence over departmental policies.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement requires that a tenure-track faculty member be provided a copy of the Department RTP Criteria Document within two weeks of the start of their first term at Cal Poly Pomona. It is recommended that department criteria be maintained on the department web page so that they are available to candidates for faculty positions. The primary purpose of the Department RTP Criteria Document is to articulate clearly what the department expects of its faculty members and in particular what they must achieve in order to be granted reappointment, tenure, and promotion. These expectations must be stated with sufficient clarity and specificity that the candidates are able to plan their activities around them. Department criteria should be consistent with department and college mission, vision, goals, and accreditation standards. In other words, they should articulate a model of the department faculty colleague to which the candidate should aspire.

RTP is not simply a matter of evaluation. Faculty colleagues, deans, and academic administrators should commit themselves to mentoring and supporting candidates, providing them the maximum opportunity to be successful. It is important for those making recommendations to be honest, direct, and clear, just as it is important for candidates to be knowledgeable of department expectations and committed to meeting them.

I.1. Definitions: Policy 1328 provides a comprehensive overview of RTP procedures. Some of the more important definitions are provided here.

- A. **Candidate** refers to a faculty member who is under consideration for reappointment, tenure, or promotion action in the current cycle.
- B. **RTP Committee members** must be full-time tenured faculty members. Department RTP Committee (DRTPC) members are elected by the tenured and probationary faculty. A faculty member on professional leave (sabbatical or difference-in-pay) may serve if elected and willing. A tenured faculty member who will be a candidate for promotion may be elected, but may only participate on reappointment cases – may not participate in promotion or tenure recommendations. (see also Policy 1328 sections 3.1G and 3.1H).
- C. **Criteria** are the expectations articulated in the department RTP criteria document and in Policy 1328. Criteria define what a candidate must achieve in order to be positively recommended for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Criteria documents contain procedural information as well; however, it is important to distinguish between criteria and rules/ procedures. Department RTP Criteria are adopted by a majority vote of the tenured and probationary faculty, submitted to the dean and the College RTP Committee for review and comment, and ultimately approved by the president or his designee. (see also Policy 1328 section 2.1).
- D. The **first probationary year** begins with the first fall term of appointment.
- E. A faculty member is **eligible to apply for tenure** at the beginning of the sixth probationary year. An application for tenure prior to the sixth probationary year is an application for **early tenure**.
- F. A faculty member is **eligible to apply for the first promotion** at the time they apply for tenure. Once tenured, the faculty member is **eligible for a subsequent promotion** after having served four years in the current rank. Applications for promotion prior to having attained eligibility are applications for **early promotion**.
- G. **Criteria for early actions** shall place emphasis on teaching ability and accomplishment, and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to professional activities, and university service.
- H. **Student evaluation of teaching** is governed by Policy 1329 of the University Manual.
- I. **Peer evaluation of teaching** is the responsibility of the Department RTP Committee and includes a classroom visit, review of course syllabus & other teaching materials, and a written report.

- J. A **candidate for reappointment must use the Department RTP criteria** in effect at the time of the candidate's initial probationary appointment. *Current* procedures and policies apply.

- K. A **candidate for tenure or promotion may choose between the criteria** in effect at the time of the initial probationary appointment and those in effect at the time of the request for action. In any case, *current* procedures and policies apply. A candidate requesting both tenure and promotion must choose a single set of criteria for both actions.

I.2. Department Philosophy

Music Department faculty should be capable in a variety of areas of scholarship: discovery, integration, application, and teaching. Criteria for evaluation will necessarily be wide ranging, complex, yet specific to the declared areas of scholarship and activity for each faculty member. Each faculty member may have areas of expertise, responsibility, or experience; however, faculty are expected to be conversant with the range of expectations of the various approaches to scholarship. The Music Faculty recognize that teacher education is a university-wide initiative and faculty, regardless of their expertise, engage in teacher education through a variety of means, such as teaching music education courses, modeling various teaching strategies, advising and mentoring, and assessing teaching effectiveness.

I.2.2 Teaching Effectiveness

While there are three areas of evaluation in the RTP process, the Music Department values Teaching Effectiveness as the most important of these three. No amount of Scholarly and Creative activities or Service can substitute for successful teaching. Therefore, it is expected that all tenure track faculty will continually develop and improve their teaching in their particular areas of expertise and with respect to the changing needs of the students. This progress can be evidenced in a number of ways. While student evaluations are useful, the department does not consider them the sole indicator of teaching ability. In the words of the University Manual, Policy 1329, page 1:

The department faculty is best prepared to judge the quality of teaching by peers; The department should be given the maximum possible latitude in collecting, assessing and reporting available information on teaching performance consistent with this policy.

Additional evidence of teaching ability can be found in (but not limited to) a faculty member's taking advantage of the workshops and programs offered by the Faculty Center for Development, by attending CSU conferences and workshops on teaching and learning or assessment, by attending musical performances, personally directed listening and study, and by conferring with colleagues on the values that guide our particular department. These values include:

- a. the inclusion of multicultural/world music elements throughout the curriculum
- b. the use of technology where appropriate
- c. the assessment process
- d. the use of creative and innovative teaching approaches when they produce improved learning.
- e. staying current (particularly for faculty members in the Music Industry Studies areas) in advances in technology
- f. staying current (particularly as ensemble directors and studio teachers) in selection of repertoire, standards for performance at a variety of levels, and an awareness of available performance opportunities for ensembles and individuals such as festivals, master classes, special tours, competitions, etc.

We also value academic and other forms of advising as critical to our students' success. Advising is an integral part of faculty duties in the Music Department and each student must be advised at least once annually. We expect academic advisors to be familiar with university policies and the specific curriculum of their assigned areas. We expect them to be available to meet with students in our annual advising workshop and at other times throughout the year as needed. Through senior exit interviews and other assessment tools, we can gain information that will enable us to improve the advising process. We expect all faculty to be available for senior project and career advising in their particular areas of expertise. The quality of senior projects and successful placement of students in the work place can be an indicator of the effectiveness of the advising process. We require all faculty members to serve as either an area advisor, minor advisor, senior project advisor, at-risk advisor, or in some other form of mentoring as assigned by the department chair.

I.2.3 Scholarly, Creative, and Professional Activities:

The faculty value high performance standards and recognizes the array of opportunities that are available for creative and scholarly activities. We value excellence in performance, whether as performers, composer/arrangers, or writers. We encourage membership and participation in professional organizations that are related to the candidate's areas of expertise and expect that the results of such activities will enhance teaching and bring notice, respect, and acclaim to the department. We encourage faculty members to seek outside resources to supplement department activities.

We support the concept of life-long learning and expect our faculty members to strive to increase their own learning through classes, workshops, symposia, and other means of study.

I.2.4 Service:

We value the service given to the department, college and university as a necessary part of our positions. Department service on committees and through special assignment is vital to our success. We work well as a team, and we expect each faculty member to contribute to the workload at the appropriate level and to contribute to the atmosphere of collegiality and trust that

is essential in our department. The DRTP Committee and Department Chair will advise candidates throughout the RTP process as to where each can best serve.

We also support committee work at the college and university levels and encourage each faculty member to become aware of the place our department holds in the university as a whole. We value service to the community for its intrinsic worth, for the potential for personal satisfaction, and for the positive interactions that will continue to enhance our image and standing in the community.

I.2.5 Faculty Mentoring

In order to better support the candidates through the RTP process, the department chair in consultation with the DRTPC chair shall establish a Faculty Development Plan for each candidate during the first year of teaching (preferably during the fall term). This plan may include (but is not limited to) regular meetings with the department chair or DRTPC chair, informal class visitations by senior faculty to help direct teaching activities and development, additional peer observations, suggestions to attend specific CSU or Cal Poly workshops or conferences for teaching and learning, advising, or assessment, directed guidance to help each candidate understand his/her department responsibilities, helping with RTP packages, and other activities as deemed appropriate by the department chair and DRTPC chair.

Section II – Procedures

II.1. Policy 1328 describes RTP procedures in complete detail. A summary is provided here.

II.2. Department RTP Committee and Role of the DRTPC Chair

- A. The Music Department RTP committee shall consist of full time, tenured faculty members elected by probationary and tenured faculty. The minimum size for the committee shall be three (3). FERP faculty may serve on the committee if they are working half-time throughout the year rather than one term per year and with permission of the University President. The department may elect an alternate to the committee to simplify procedures should an elected member become unable to serve during the academic term.
- B. The structure, size and procedures of the Music Department RTP committee shall be determined by the probationary and tenured faculty in the department within limits stipulated in this document.
- C. Annual elections by secret ballot must be conducted during the spring term of the school year preceding the given RTP cycle, and election shall be by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty members of the Music Department. The DRTPC's term of service shall not end until all matters pertaining to the DRTPC's recommendations have been concluded.
- D. The chair is not a member of the DRTPC, but may prepare a separate evaluation.

- E. The department chair shall notify the Dean of the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences of the composition of the Music Department RTP committee immediately after its election.
- F. In promotion considerations, RTP committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion.
- G. The Music Department is not precluded from having an RTP committee with a changing membership for the purpose of dealing with different aspects of reappointment, tenure, and promotion, as long as the provisions of Section 3.1 are satisfied by the committee acting at any given time.
- H. If too few Music Department faculty members are available to form an RTP committee for all or some aspects of the DRTPC's work, the Music Department probationary and tenured faculty shall elect appropriate faculty members from outside the department to supplement the Music Department RTP committee.
- I. In the case of inability to serve or procedural difficulties, the CRTPC shall recommend, after consultation with the Music Department RTP committee, a course of action to the vice president for academic affairs.
- J. The DRTPC chair will be the official custodian of the RTP package for the period between the submission of the package to the DRTPC by the candidate and the forwarding of the package to the Dean's office. In this period, the DRTPC chair and only the DRTPC chair shall be responsible for additions to the package or any changes in the content of the package and notification of the appropriate parties of any additions or changes.
- K. During Fall term the DRTPC chair:
 - 1. Ensures that candidates have information they need: including information about what actions they must/may apply for, information they need to prepare requests, department criteria.
 - 2. Assists candidates in understanding expectations, preparing packages.
 - 3. Informs Faculty Affairs of requests.
 - 4. Ensures that packages are complete.
 - 5. Provide the department recommendation to the candidate.

And throughout the year:

- 1. Ensures that peer evaluations are conducted for all faculty members who will be candidate for RTP action in the future. Ensures that reports are provided to candidates in a timely manner.

II. 3 Candidate's Responsibilities

- A. All RTP requests are initiated by the candidate. If the candidate is eligible for an RTP action then there will be written notification from Faculty Affairs. The candidate must notify the DRTPC Chair that either there will or will not be a request for consideration. If the candidate is requesting early promotion or tenure, then the candidate must notify the committee chair in writing that there will be a request for an early action.
- B. At all times the candidate should monitor the progress of the request through the various review groups. The candidate can withdraw the request, without prejudice, at any level of review.
- C. In the self evaluation, the candidate must explicitly address the Department's criteria for the action(s) requested. The evaluation shall be structured so as to make very explicit references, item by item, to the Department RTP criteria. If the candidate is requesting reappointment, then there must be clear evidence that there is progress toward the successful attainment of tenure. Furthermore, the evaluation shall contain the following items:
 - 1. Discussion of teaching performance. This includes an evaluation of the student and peer evaluations. All deficiencies noted in the student and peer evaluations shall be addressed. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, steps taken or progress made toward remedying them must be included. Since academic advising is closely related to teaching, the department values thoughtful advising; in this section, the candidate shall also draw attention to activities relating to student advising and/or mentoring.
 - 2. Discussion of scholarly and creative activities. This includes specific citation of all performances, compositions, publications, dates of attendance of all professional meetings, and explicit reference to all duties and assignments in professional organizations. Works in progress and ongoing activities shall be addressed. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, steps taken or progress made toward remedying them must be included.
 - 3. Discussion of service to the University, College, Department, and community. This includes specific citation of committee assignments and duties, assistance in a professional capacity to any group, etc. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, steps taken or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed.
 - 4. Discussion of the candidate's attainable short and long-term goals in all evaluative areas, as set forth in the Faculty Development Plan. The candidate should build these goals around the desired outcomes listed in the section on Department Evaluation of the Candidate and as articulated by the candidate's

Faculty Development Plan. In the next RTP cycle, the candidate shall discuss whether or not the short term goals have been met or altered, and summarize the progress made on the long-term goals. The DRTP committee shall pay particular attention to the goals of the candidate and shall comment upon their appropriateness, evaluate whether they are applicable for the granting of tenure and/or promotion, and provide this feedback to the candidate in its recommendation.

- D. The period of time covered by the self-evaluation should be that which has passed since the last application was made for the same or similar action. Reappointment evaluations are normally based on the previous year's performance; promotion evaluations, on the period since the last promotion or since original appointment; tenure on the period since the original appointment of the probationary position.
- E. The candidate shall identify all materials to be considered, and make available copies of those not already available in the candidate's Personal Action File (PAF). Completeness must be balanced with consideration for the time commitment required of the committee and other evaluators. If material can be summarized or cited rather than included, this is preferable. The candidate should provide an Appendix to the evaluation package that contains originals (programs, reprints, books, grant proposals, course syllabi and other materials, lab manual, letters of thanks, commendations, newspaper articles, manuscripts, etc.). These supplemental materials will be provided with the package and will be located in the Department office or the DRTPC chair's office. Only an index to the Appendix (that specifies where the supplemental material is located) is then included in the RTP package.
- F. Candidate is responsible for making sure that all required student evaluations and peer evaluations are completed and included. (See II.4.A and III.5 below.)

II.4. Student Evaluation of Teaching (See Policies 1328 and 1329)

- A. The probationary and tenured members of the department shall develop specific procedures and forms for the department RTP committee to receive signed evaluative material, commentary, and substantiating documentation.
- B. The plan shall include methods for publicizing (on department bulletin boards and other relevant locations, newsletters, etc.) names of committee members to whom material is to be submitted, submission procedures, and, during an RTP cycle, the names of candidates for retention, tenure, or promotion. A committee calendar shall be established and published at an early date in each cycle.
 - 1. Evaluations by students are an important element to be considered by faculty evaluation committees in assessing the quality of teaching performance of colleagues. Such evaluations are not the only element which must be considered. Other indexes of the quality of teaching performance include i) direct

observations by peers in classroom; ii) judgments about the quality of instructional materials; iii) examinations and examination procedures, etc.

2. In-class evaluations are those administered to an assembled class using the department evaluation instrument. All faculty who teach are required to ensure that student evaluation of teaching is conducted on their behalf and that the results of these evaluations are placed in their Personnel Action Files.

- a. Frequency of In-Class Evaluation:

1. Probationary years 1-6: **all** classes are to be evaluated in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement and University Policies. Due to the unique nature of independent study or internship courses, the department does not expect them to be evaluated unless explicitly required by University Policy.

2. All student evaluation summary sheets become part of the faculty member's Personnel Action File. The analyses of the results of student evaluation of teaching serve as one of the elements by which peer review committees evaluate the quality of teaching performance. They are a source of information contained in the PAF available to RTP committees, post-tenure review committees, temporary faculty review committees, and other committees of tenured faculty charged with recommending actions based in part or wholly upon teaching performance.

3. Out-of-class Evaluation Comments

Students may submit signed letters expressing their opinions about faculty members to the department chair or chair of the DRTP committee at any time. Letters may also be received through the normal solicitation process at the time of request for action. See Policy 1329 for additional information.

II.5. Peer Evaluation of Teaching (See Policy 1328 section 3.3 as outlined below.)

- A. Peer evaluation of teaching shall include classroom observations and a review of course syllabus and related material. (See attached Peer Review Form.) Observations should be followed within no more than two weeks by a written report. The report must be submitted to the faculty member and to the DRTPC chair and placed in the PAF.
- B. In the fall term, the DRTPC Chair, in consultation with the Department chair and the candidate, shall determine which classes (with a minimum of two per year) will be evaluated and assign the evaluators for each class. Notification of this decision will be sent to the candidates and the evaluators

- C. A minimum of two peer evaluations per year shall be conducted, preferably in separate terms. Peer evaluations shall reflect, to the degree possible, the breadth of courses taught.
- D. Only peer evaluations conducted either prior to or during the period under consideration may be used for that period's deliberations. Exceptions may be allowed if the candidate does not have the minimum number of evaluations.
- E. The DRTPC is responsible for ensuring that the minimum number of peer evaluations is conducted.
- F. A candidate may request additional peer evaluations beyond those initiated by the DRTPC. Such requests are to be directed to the DRTPC chair.

II.6. Candidates and Future Candidates serving in administrative positions or performing administrative duties, serving in positions of academic governance, or on leave (see also Policy 1328 section 2.1).

- A. Candidates who are away from campus during the academic year in which they must/may apply for action shall observe the same procedures and timelines as candidates in residence. Candidates may provide their RTP requests by fax or email, and must provide fax numbers or addresses to be used for sending recommendations to candidates. It will be the candidate's responsibility to meet all deadlines.
- B. Individuals who accept positions outside of their departments while they are still eligible for RTP action must ensure that they understand department expectations during the time they are away. The candidate and the DRTPC must develop, upon acceptance of the assignment and, commit to writing, in light of the special circumstances, (a) an interpretation of the department criteria and (b) a statement that specifies expectations and outcomes. This memorandum of understanding shall be approved by the dean, URTPC chair, and Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

b. Criteria for RTP Action

III.1 Departmental Evaluation of Candidate

A. Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

1. Lecture Classes (GE, Music Industry Studies, non-performance oriented courses)

Faculty who teach academic classes are expected to set high academic standards and to model them in the manner that they approach the preparation and presentation of the course. Faculty are expected to incorporate effective pedagogical standards, to remain current in the scholarship of the discipline for which they have responsibility.

2. Performance Classes (Studio instruction, ensembles):

Faculty who teach studio and conduct ensembles are expected to set high performance standards in their own individual performances and to train students to emulate those standards. Faculty who conduct ensembles are expected to set high performance standards and conduct their activities with the highest degree of professionalism. It is the faculty member's responsibility to effectively manage personnel and fiscal resources within budget guidelines established by the department.

3. In its evaluation of the candidate, the DRTPC shall take into account information from the following sources:
 - a) Summaries and interpretations of students' numerical evaluations
 - b) Summaries and interpretations of peer evaluations of teaching performance
 - c) Self-evaluation provided by the candidate
 - d) Signed material (to be added to candidate's RTP package) received from other faculty, performance reviewers, administrators, and students
 - e) Material requested from candidate by committee (e.g., requests for clarification of, corrections to, augmentations of any aspect of RTP package)
 - f) Other written material, identified by source, submitted to the committee before the closing date
 - g) Candidate's Faculty Development Plan including discussion of long- and short-term goals and how the candidate is meeting those goals
- a. Student Evaluations

The candidate should stay within the department composite average score on student evaluations. This is generally in the 1.5-2.0 area with 1.00 being best. Scores that are higher in number should be discussed in the self-

evaluation and plans for improvement articulated by the candidate. (See III.2.A1, III.2.B1, III.3.A and III.5.A for specific criteria.) The DRTP committee can offer support and mentoring to candidates that require help toward improved student evaluation scores through the Faculty Development Plan.

b. Peer Evaluations

These evaluations are considered very important by the department. If used correctly, they can be an effective way of helping candidates to make improvements in the classroom. The DRTPC can offer support and mentoring to candidates that require help toward improved peer evaluations. Peer reviews are given an overall rating of either excellent, satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory.

c. Self-Evaluation (may include discussion of the following):

1. Course development or creation
2. Changes in teaching approach
3. Use of technology in teaching
4. Use of multicultural/world music elements in course material
5. Use of assessment tools in the classroom
6. Interdisciplinary accomplishments
7. Service learning components
8. Diverse teaching strategies
9. Other innovative or applicable activities related to teaching
10. Effective advising approaches

d. Advising

Areas in which faculty may be asked to serve:

1. Emphasis/Option area
2. Student organizations
3. At-risk students

4. Senior project committees
5. Advising of minors
6. Career advising

The candidate should address his/her advising responsibilities, giving evidence of their participation and effectiveness in these duties. For example, participation in the annual workshop, quality of senior project presentations, numbers of students advised, activities of student

organizations, alumni successes in finding jobs, etc., could show evidence of successful and active advising.

Evaluation: Evaluation by the committee will be based on the professional judgment of the DRTP committee members. Faculty evaluators will review and judge teaching performance and advising activities as articulated by the candidate and supported through student and peer evaluations.

B. Scholarly, Creative, and Professional Activities:

The Music Department faculty acknowledge that a wide range of activities is included under this topic including but not limited to the following categories:

1. Performances

- a. Formal recitals; including solo, joint/shared, chamber music
- b. Artistic director of off-campus performance ensemble
- c. Guest conducting of off-campus performance ensemble
- d. Guest performance in another faculty member's class
- e. Receptions
- f. Performance in off-campus ensembles
- g. Conducting of off-campus performance ensemble
- h. Regular position as church/synagogue/temple musician
- i. Guest soloist with off-campus performance ensemble
- j. Producing a performance event (on or off campus, not a class)

2. Creative Endeavors

- a. Composing
- b. Arranging
- c. Producing multimedia, audio recording
- d. Creation and maintenance of web pages

3. Scholarly

- a. Guest lectures (on campus, for other classes, off campus)
- b. Articles for various publications
- c. Books (writing, publishing, editing)
- d. Reviews in various publications
- e. Research projects
- f. Conference presentations

4. Applied scholarship
 - a. Learning and using specialized music software
 - b. Adjudication and evaluation for professional associations; including preparation and evaluation of musical scores for conferences/festivals
 - c. Leading workshops
 - d. Presenting master classes

5. Professional Association
 - a. Membership
 - b. Leadership position in professional associations
 - c. Attendance at professional conferences related to university work

6. Honors
 - a. Recognition of accomplishment in performance, academic, or other university work
 - b. Recognition by community or professional organizations for artistic, scholarly, intellectual, pedagogical endeavors

7. Other
 - a. Obtaining external grants, fellowships related to professional work
 - b. Administering/managing grant funds for special programs

Evaluation: The above list is created with the awareness that there is a range of magnitude for each endeavor. Evaluation by the committee will be based on the professional judgment of the DRTP committee members. Faculty evaluators will review and judge both the quantity of accomplishments and quality of achievement in each category as articulated by the candidate and supported by documentation when applicable.

C. Service to the University and Community

Service to the university includes, but is not limited to, discharging departmental responsibilities effectively, serving on College or University committees, providing performances for university functions. **Candidates should not only list areas of service but must also describe major accomplishments in each area.**

1. Music Department Assigned and Related Duties Responsibilities:

- a. Committees
 - 1. RTP
 - 2. Curriculum
 - 3. Assessment
 - 4. Events Planning
 - 5. Search Committee
 - 6. Recruitment
 - 7. Other committees
- b. Leadership
 - 1. Emphasis area
 - 2. Technology and lab oversight
 - 3. Equipment oversight
 - 4. Chairing department committees
 - 5. Special projects

2. CLASS Assigned and Related Duties

- a. Committees and Task Forces
 - 1. Curriculum
 - 2. Budget and Planning
 - 3. RTP
 - 4. Assessment
 - 5. Search Committee
 - 6. Other projects initiated by the Dean's office

3. University Assigned and Related Duties

- a. Academic Senate membership
- b. University Curriculum Committee
- c. University search committee
- d. TED liaison
- e. University Task forces
- f. Other university committees or assignments

4. CSU

- a. Summer Arts course creator
- b. Summer Arts course coordinator
- c. CSU Academic Senate
- d. Task forces created at the CSU system level
- e. Other CSU committees or assignments

5. Performances in support of department, college, or university event
6. Service to the Community (activities not covered in Scholarly and Professional Achievements)
 - a. Consultant work with local music groups, schools, lectures for community organizations, etc.
 - b. Benefit concerts
 - c. Service club music presentation or lecture
 - d. Workshops at schools (not a part of class assignments)
 - e. Adjudications as a service to the community
 - f. Music Consultant
 - g. Leadership position in professional associations
 - h. Religious/community performances

Evaluation: Evaluation by the committee will be based on the professional judgment of the DRTP committee members. Faculty evaluators will review and judge both the quantity of accomplishments and quality of achievement in each category as articulated by the candidate and supported by documentation when applicable.

III.2. Criteria for Reappointment

To be reappointed, a candidate must provide evidence of making steady progress toward meeting the criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure, or if hired at the Associate Professor level, for Professor and Tenure. “Steady progress” can be demonstrated by evidence of student and peer evaluations and effective advising, submission of evidence of Creative and Scholarly activities and other professional activity, participation on committees and other service, and meeting the expectations of the individualized Faculty Development Plan. The closer to tenure, the more concretely the candidates should be able to show how they have met their plans to satisfy the criteria.

- A. Years 1-3
 1. Teaching performance and advising will be evaluated throughout the probationary period by means of self-evaluation, student evaluations, and peer reviews. Probationary faculty must have **every class evaluated by students each term** as explained in section II.4.B.2a above. The *majority* of peer reviews must be rated as satisfactory or higher, and the self-evaluation must present an accurate account. The faculty member is expected to be involved in some aspects of student advising as directed by the department chair in their Faculty Development Plan.
 2. The faculty member is expected to be actively involved in areas of scholarly, creative and professional activities as outlined above and in their Faculty Development Plan.

3. The faculty member is expected to give service to the university and community each year as outlined above and in their Faculty Development Plan.
 4. If the candidate has an initial two-year appointment, he/she should follow the guidelines as set forth in the University Manual, Section 305.14 "Periodic Evaluation of Probationary Faculty Members with Initial Two-Year Appointments" when applying for reappointment.
- B. Years 4-6
1. Teaching performance and advising will be evaluated throughout the probationary period by means of self-evaluation, peer reviews, and student evaluations. Probationary faculty in years 4-6 must have **every class evaluated by students each year** as explained in section II.4.B.2a above. The faculty member is expected to have a composite average score on the last year's evaluations of "good" or "very good" (or evidence of progress toward this average score) on all items of student evaluations with overall scores **reflecting improvement** over scores in years 1-3. *All* peer reviews must be rated as satisfactory or higher, and the self-evaluation must present an accurate account. The faculty member is expected to be **more actively involved** in some aspects of student advising as directed by the department chair and as set forth in their Faculty Development Plan.
 2. The faculty member is expected to be actively involved in areas of scholarly, creative and professional activities as outlined above and in their Faculty Development Plan with **increased productivity** throughout years 4-6 in preparation for applying for tenure.
 3. The faculty member is expected to give service to the university and community each year as outlined above and in their Faculty Development Plan with **increased productivity and effectiveness** throughout years 4-5 in preparation for applying for tenure.

III.3. Criteria for Tenure

A faculty member is eligible to apply for tenure at the beginning of the sixth probationary year. An application for tenure prior to the sixth probationary year is an application for early tenure (see III.6). To be granted tenure the candidate shall:

- A. Demonstrate evidence of improvement and growth in teaching effectiveness and successful advising as verified through self-evaluations, student evaluation scores, and peer evaluations throughout the probationary period. The faculty member is expected to have a composite average score on the last year's evaluations of "good" or "very good" (or evidence of progress toward this average score) on all

items of student evaluations. The DRTPC will take into careful consideration evidence of improvement in existing courses; accounts of how the faculty member plans to respond (as well as reports on how the faculty member did respond) to less-than-positive evaluations of teaching; accounts that provide contexts for evaluations, whether positive or negative, of teaching; the development of new courses; currency in the discipline; and the development of appropriate creative approaches and applications of technology. Substantial activity with student advising as directed by the department chair. Meet or exceed goals as defined in their Faculty Development Plan.

- B. Demonstrate a **consistent pattern** of presentations, performances, publications or other scholarly and creative endeavors, throughout the probationary period, that establishes their expertise or leadership in an area of music relevant to their role in the department. Meet or exceed goals as defined in their Faculty Development Plan.
- C. Show evidence of **effective** execution of assigned and related duties throughout the probationary period with **mandatory service** on at least one College or University-level committee as well as department committees, successful and timely completion of departmental assignments, effectual participation on other committees as verified through self-evaluation and other documentation. Meet or exceed goals as defined in their Faculty Development Plan.
- D. Develop a **consistent pattern** of productive contributions to the university and greater community, throughout the probationary period, that is relevant to their role in the department. Meet or exceed goals as defined in their Faculty Development Plan.

III.4. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

A faculty member is eligible to apply for the first promotion at the time he or she applies for tenure (See Sections 14.2 and 14.3 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and Policy 1328). Once tenured, the faculty member is eligible for a subsequent promotion after having served four years in the current rank. Applications for promotion prior to having attained eligibility are applications for early promotion. Because promotion to associate professor is tied to tenure, the criteria for promotion to associate professor are those for tenure. Therefore the candidate for promotion to associate professor must satisfy the criteria in III.3.A.through D.

III.5. Criteria for Promotion to Professor

Promotion to professor requires tenure or the simultaneous award of tenure. To be promoted to Professor, the candidate shall:

- A. Demonstrate continued effectiveness and professionalism, showing competency in the classroom, efforts to improve and stay current, and willingness to support fellow teachers in their efforts to improve and stay current. Demonstrate strong

evidence of teaching effectiveness and successful advising activities as verified through self-evaluations, student evaluation scores, and peer evaluations throughout the period as Associate Professor. The faculty member is expected to have a composite average score on the last year's evaluations of "good" or "very good" (or evidence of progress toward this average score) on all items of student evaluations. The DRTPC will take into careful consideration evidence of improvement in existing courses; accounts of how the faculty member plans to respond (as well as reports on how the faculty member did respond) to less-than-positive evaluations of teaching; accounts that provide contexts for evaluations, whether positive or negative, of teaching; the development of new courses; currency in the discipline; and the development of appropriate creative approaches and applications of technology.

- B. Continue to demonstrate a pattern of presentations, performances, or publications or other scholarly and creative endeavors that will include **at least one event, production, or publication** that is recognized or reviewed at a national level. Continue to broaden their expertise or leadership in an area of music relevant to their role in the department throughout the period as Associate Professor.
- C. Demonstrate greater responsibility and effective execution of assigned and related duties throughout the period as Associate Professor, including mandatory service on at **least one College and University committee or body** (such as the Academic Senate) in addition to other committee responsibilities and departmental assignments, as verified through self evaluation and other documentation.
- D. Demonstrate a consistent, continuing pattern of productive contribution to the university and community that is relevant to their role in the department throughout the period as Associate Professor.

III.6. Criteria for Granting Early Tenure

Criteria for early tenure are governed by Section 305.206 of the University Manual.

All of the following conditions must be met:

- A. The candidate must have been in one academic rank as a full time tenure-track member for at least two years before effective date of early tenure.
- B. The candidate must satisfy the criteria for tenure.
- C. The candidate must demonstrate exceptional performance or extraordinary accomplishments in all areas of evaluation, i.e. teaching performance and advising, scholarly, creative and professional activities, or university or community service as judged by the DRTP Committee.

D. Exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications must be demonstrated by exceeding, in our three areas, all the specific criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Performance that exceeds our expectations in all three areas must include elements from the following list:

1. Teaching Performance and Advising

“Good” to “Very Good” (minimum 1.5) overall performance on each item of student numerical evaluations that apply to teaching and not student preparation

Peer evaluations that attest to extraordinary quality

Two or more years of effective advising

Significant course and curriculum development

Significant work in assessment

Participation in teaching-related workshops

Innovative integration of technology

Service-learning courses

Regional and national workshops on teaching

2. Scholarly, Creative, and Professional Activities

Six or more significant performances

Regional, national or international recognition in performance or composition

Significant record of publication

Significant record of professional activities within the discipline

Significant external grants

3. University and Community Service

Leadership in Academic Senate

Significant university or community performances

Leadership in specific department needs (i.e. technology, labs, recruitment)

Fund raising

E. The candidate must receive the endorsement of a majority of the DRTP committee.

III.7. Criteria for Early Promotion

Criteria for early promotion are governed by Section 305.206 of the University Manual. Early promotion is the promotion of a faculty member from the next to last step of a given rank to the first step of the next higher rank. Early promotion requires all of the following:

A. At least two years of full time service in the lower rank before the effective date of early promotion.

B. The candidate must receive minimum 1.5 (“good to very good”) teaching effectiveness ratings overall for two years prior to the application for early promotion.

C. The candidate must have exceeded all the expectations of the requirements of the next highest rank for two years prior to the application for early promotion (see III.5).

D. The candidate must receive the endorsement of a majority of the DRTP committee.

Approved, February, 2018

