

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona  
College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences  
Department of Music

Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Document  
For AY 2023-24 through AY 2027-28

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.IG and 3.IH).
- 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. (See III.6 and III.7)
- 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 **observation**, 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**

Our mission statement is one we try to honor daily:

The music department is a hands-on creative community combining performance, musicianship, industry, and technology to empower musicians of the future. We promote music as a diverse practice that rewards and fulfills individual lives and the human experience. We foster ethical innovative careers in performance, teaching, and the music industry. We encourage all to realize their highest artistic, scholarly, and professional potential.

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 and multifaceted/nuanced, 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 all expected to be conversant with the range of expectations of the various types of musical scholarship.

The Music Faculty recognize that teacher education is a university-wide initiative, and that faculty, regardless of their expertise, engage in teacher education through a variety of means, such as teaching music education courses, modeling different teaching strategies, advising and mentoring, and assessing teaching effectiveness as part of a process of ongoing improvement.

Also central to the success of the department and our students is an obligation of service: to the students, to the department, to the college and university, and to the community both within these walls and beyond the campus. It is our intention that service should be balanced and shared among the faculty, with everyone contributing to the governance and growth of this community.

We value collaboration in all its forms and encourage it where circumstances allow. We have a strong commitment to inclusive excellence and to educational experiences that leverage the diverse perspectives and experiences needed to succeed and thrive in a diverse society. We value the creation of community among faculty, staff and students. We value integrity. We value the pursuit of new understandings of how humans engage in music. We respect the responsibility of preparing future teachers of music.

### **I.2.A 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 or of active “continuous improvement” 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:

- (1) In-class and in-syllabus practices that are inclusive and welcoming; and that are responsive to student learning needs.
- (2) The inclusion of diverse, multicultural/world music elements throughout the curriculum
- (3) The use of technology where appropriate
- (4) The assessment process (both formal and informal as part of the plan-teach-assess-reflect teaching cycle)
- (5) The use of creative and innovative teaching approaches when they produce improved learning.
- (6) Staying current in advances in technology (particularly for faculty members in the Music Industry Studies areas)
- (7) Staying current 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. (particularly as ensemble directors and studio teachers)

We also value academic and other forms of advising as a type of Teaching that is critical to our students' success. Advising is an integral part of faculty duties in the Music Department. We expect academic advisors to be familiar with university policies and the specific curriculum of their assigned areas. We expect them to work collaboratively and communicate effectively with CLASS staff advisors. 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 various 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 workplace can be an indicator of the effectiveness of the advising process.

We expect 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.B Scholarly and Creative Activities**

The faculty value high performance standards and recognize 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, participation, and leadership 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.

We value investigations that contribute to new understandings of music as part of human history, culture, and development. We expect ethical research practices that respect and honor those who participate. We encourage wide dissemination of what is learned through research.

### **I.2.C 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 consider it important for faculty to understand and participate in the work of shared governance. There are many consultative processes that are essential to the workings of the university, each with a committee to perform that process. These are a good way to contribute service.

We value service to the community for its intrinsic worth as a means of human connection, for the potential for personal satisfaction, for the positive interactions that will continue to enhance our image and standing in the community, and for the general benefit of the community in which CPP is located.

### **I.2.D Faculty Mentoring**

In order to better support new faculty through the RTP process, the department chair in consultation with the DRTPC chair shall establish a Faculty Development Plan with 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. *Together we can design and use this plan to assist BIPOC faculty in dealing with cultural taxation: by setting goals and reasonable limits to what is expected of them, as well as setting the values and commitments we share as a department together.*

## 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) if there are 10 or fewer full-time, tenured faculty eligible to serve. If there are 11 or more full-time, probationary faculty who are eligible to serve, then the committee shall be five (5) members. 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 by March 1 each year (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 DRTPC elects its own chair. The DRTPC Chair must be a full-time tenured faculty.
- E. The department chair is not a member of the DRTPC; they prepare their own evaluation at the next level of review, after that of the DRTPC and before that of the Dean.
- F. 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.

- G. In promotion considerations, DRTP committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion.
- H. 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 II.2.A are satisfied by the committee acting at any given time.
- I. 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.
- J. 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.
- K. The RTP Package is submitted through an online platform established by the CSU and Faculty Affairs. This is considered the "working PAF" for the purposes of this review. The DRTPC and Department chairs should also consult the full PAF for additional relevant materials. The DRTPC chair is considered 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. This is managed in consultation with Faculty Affairs and their staff liaison for RTP processes.
- L. 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 that is outside of course-based evaluations.

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.

- M. 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. Convenes the DRTPC for consideration of candidate packages (including Pre-RTP package review, according to the calendar set by Faculty Affairs)
  6. Provide the department recommendation to the candidate.
- N. Throughout the year, the DRTPC chair:
1. Ensures that peer observation/evaluations are conducted for all faculty members who will be candidate for RTP action in the future.
  2. Ensures that peer observation reports are provided to candidates in a timely manner, and forwarded to the Dean's office for placement in the PAF.

### **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 for the action requested. 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, presentations, 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 Department, College, University, and community. This includes specific citation of committee assignments and duties, assistance in a professional capacity to any group, etc. It is not enough to list committees; candidate should include information concerning the work accomplished on each committee. For example, "the assessment committee reviewed the student evaluation questions of department x and offered feedback for improvement." 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 review the goals and progress toward them, 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. This is called the "period under review." 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. Candidate's self-evaluation shall focus on material relevant to the period under review.
- E. The candidate shall identify all materials to be considered and make available copies of any 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.). The submitted package materials may contain a document (index) listing those materials available in the Appendix. These supplemental materials will be provided upon request from the various levels of review. 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 observation evaluations are completed and included. (See II.4.A and II.5 below.)
- G. A request for an **external review** of materials submitted by a faculty undergoing an RTP action may be initiated at any level of review *by any party* to the review. Such a request **shall** document (1) the special circumstances which necessitate an external reviewer, and (2) the nature of the materials needing the evaluation of an external reviewer. The request **must** be approved by the President with the concurrence of the faculty unit employee.
  - 1. Upon approval, the DRTPC Chair shall gather names of qualified external reviewers and proceed to contact the individuals to arrange for the confidential review of materials.
  - 2. External reviewers, once secured, shall have 2 weeks to review materials and provide their assessment.

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

While the CSU and the Collective Bargaining Agreement require that students shall conduct evaluations of faculty in the form of questionnaires, and that these shall be included in faculty evaluation, it is the judgement of this department (based on multiple studies since 2010) that such measures are inherently flawed and biased, lacking in validity and reliability. Persons of color and women are often rated less well by students than white males. Students in required courses outside their major also often rate instructors lower. Therefore student evaluations of teaching may inform the process of assessing teaching, but present data of a limited nature.

As evaluative tools, student evaluations of teaching are of limited usefulness. We maintain that “the department faculty is best prepared to judge the quality of teaching by peers.” (policy 1329, C.)

- A. The probationary and tenured members of the department shall develop and regularly review and update the student evaluation questionnaire(s) for the different course types and modalities, keeping in mind current research on student evaluation of teaching with respect to equity, reliability, and validity. These questionnaires shall not provide for written student comments.

As part of this process, faculty shall also identify courses which do not require student evaluation of teaching, such as independent study and internship courses. This list shall be maintained by the Music department chair and communicated to Evaluations on a regular basis.

- B. CPP has adopted an online mode of conducting course-based student evaluations of teaching in order to better ensure student anonymity in the process. Faculty teaching face-to-face and/or synchronous online classes should allot class meeting time to

encourage and enable students to complete these questionnaires. This helps to engage a greater percentage of students in participating in the process.

If at some time the university reverts to using physical questionnaires as it did prior to 2018, the department will develop procedures that safeguard student anonymity and preclude tampering or other activities that may invalidate the results of the evaluation.

- C. Course-based student evaluations of teaching are required by the university and described in policy 1329. 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.
- D. 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 department RTP 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.
- E. Frequency of Course-based student evaluations: teaching of all courses must be evaluated with the exception of those courses identified in the review process of section II.4.B above.
- F. "Out of Class" evaluations: Students may submit signed letters expressing their opinions about faculty members to the department chair or chair of the DRTP committee at any time. These letters must include their Bronco ID number.

Letters may also be submitted through the normal solicitation process at the time of request for action, according to posted deadlines each August/September (10 days before the first reappointment package due date as established by Faculty Affairs each year). See Policy 1329 for additional information.

## **II.5 Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

- 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.
  - 1. the procedure for conducting the classroom observation shall include:
    - a. The Evaluator contacts the person to be evaluated and request the syllabus for the course, and for them to identify 3 specific dates on which evaluator can see them "in action" with their class.

- (1) If the course is entirely or partially asynchronous/online, then identify a 3-day period during which they will “swim around” in the online platform of the course. The Evaluator will need to be added to the class as a TA or another teacher.
  - b. Ideally, a 10-15 minute pre-observation meeting happens before the observation, for the evaluator to understand what it is the instructor is trying to accomplish with the course, and so forth. This is not always possible or practical.
  - c. Evaluator reviews the syllabus for accurate and up-to-date information, and for the required information about grading, evaluation, etc. There is space on the form for that. Keep the syllabus to attach to the end of the form.
  - d. Evaluator attends one of the specified classes. If it so happens that the 3 dates they have chosen all have conflicts evaluator should be honest and ask for 2 additional dates (or contact RTP Chair for a change of evaluator). When evaluator attends a class meeting, they take notes about what happens, list strengths as well as suggestions for improvement. Evaluator completes the form and edits written evaluation to present feedback to the observed.
  - e. Evaluator and Instructor meet by phone, zoom or in person within 2 weeks to review and discuss the document; then both sign.
  - f. Final draft (if there are corrections needed) must be signed/dated by evaluator and the evaluatee within that 2-week window, or the person evaluated has the right to refuse to accept the review.
  - g. Evaluator sends “original” of the signed form to DRTPC chair and the department ASC for logging and forwarding to the Dean’s office for placement in the PAF. Evaluator and ASC ensure that instructor also has a copy of the signed document.
- 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 with teaching responsibilities in other departments, 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 email, and must provide email addresses to be used for sending recommendations to candidates. They will need to confirm their access to Interfolio or whichever platform being used by the university. It will be the candidate's responsibility to meet all deadlines.
- B. Individuals who accept admin or advisory/nonteaching positions **or have teaching duties outside of this department** (such as reassigned time teaching in EDU or EWS) while they are still eligible for RTP action must ensure that they understand department expectations during the time they are away. Upon acceptance of the assignment, the candidate and the DRTPC must develop 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.

### III.1 Evaluation Standards

#### A. Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

##### 1. Lecture Classes (GE and non-performance oriented courses)

Faculty who teach academic classes are expected to set high academic standards, and to model those high standards in the manner that they approach their preparation and presentation of the course. Faculty are expected to incorporate effective pedagogical strategies including early formative assessment and giving constructive feedback to student work, using inclusive learning materials such as repertoire by underrepresented composers for analysis, and implementing grading policies that are equity minded and student learning focused. Faculty are expected to remain current in the scholarship of the discipline for which they have responsibility.

##### 2. Performance Classes (Studio instruction, ensembles):

Faculty who teach studio lessons 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.

Faculty teaching other performance-based courses that do not culminate in a jury or public performance (such as voice or instrument class, performance seminar, and fundamentals classes) are expected to include opportunities for students to perform in class for individual and collective feedback, as well as to organize a reasonable progression of skill-building relevant to the purpose of the course.

In all Performance Classes, grading should reflect growth in skills as one key objective of the course.

### 3. Service Learning Classes:

Faculty who teach Service Learning Classes are expected to emphasize the importance of working with community partners and to follow all university policies for such work.

They shall guide and facilitate students in developing their project for the community collaboration and provide opportunities for student reflection on what they are learning at multiple points during the semester.

### 4. Advising as teaching.

Faculty may be asked to work in one or more areas:

- a. Emphasis/Option area
- b. Student organizations
- c. At-risk students
- d. Senior projects
- e. Advising of minors
- f. Career advising

The candidate should track their advising responsibilities, noting evidence of their participation and effectiveness in these duties. For example, participation in the annual advising workshop, developing and publishing/distributing advising materials, a calendar of appointments for advising individual students, 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.

### 5. How Teaching and Advising are Evaluated by the DRTPC:

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. These, along with the Professional Development Plan, are the most heavily weighted factors of the several listed with elaborations below.

#### a) Self-evaluation provided by the candidate

The candidate shall discuss their accomplishments and areas for growth in teaching and advising, presenting their analysis of, and responses to, student evaluation scores and peer observations. This may include a discussion of

- Course development or creation
- Changes in teaching approach
- Use of technology in teaching
- Use of multicultural/world music elements in course material
- Use of assessment tools in the classroom
- Interdisciplinary accomplishments

- Service-learning components
  - Diverse teaching strategies
  - Other innovative or applicable activities related to teaching
  - Effective advising approaches
- b) Summaries and interpretations of **students' numerical evaluations**
- The candidate's scores should lie within the department composite average score on student evaluations. This is generally in the 1.5-2.1 area with 1.00 being best, or "very good". Scores that are higher in number—reflecting a student composite rating of less than "good to very good"—should be discussed in the self-evaluation and the candidate should articulate plans for improvement. (See III.2.AI, III.2.BI, 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.
- c) Summaries and interpretations of **Peer Evaluations** of teaching performance
- These evaluations are considered very important by the department. They must include an observation of teaching. 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 Evaluations are given an overall rating of either excellent, satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory.
- 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 the 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.

## **B. Scholarly and Creative Activities**

Faculty are expected to pursue Scholarly and Creative excellence, contributing to the body of human understanding in their field. It is understood that each candidate has areas of expertise and focus. The Music Department faculty acknowledge that a wide range of activities is included under this topic including but not limited to the following categories and examples given below. This list is created with the awareness that there is a range of magnitude for each endeavor. Candidates will necessarily provide context for each accomplishment reported.

1. Performance
  - 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 off-campus event
  - e. Receptions
  - f. Performance in off-campus ensembles
  - g. Conducting of an 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)
  - k. a performance of a work you composed
2. Creative Endeavors
  - a. Composing (including both commissioned and non-commissioned work)
  - b. Arranging (including both commissioned and non-commissioned work)
  - c. Producing multimedia, or audio recording
  - d. Creation and maintenance of web pages
3. Scholarly Work
  - a. Research projects
  - b. Articles for various publications
  - c. Books (writing, publishing, editing) and Critical Editions of musical scores
  - d. Reviews in various publications
  - e. Conference presentations
  - f. Guest lectures on or off campus
4. Applied Scholarship
  - a. Developing, or 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. Leadership in a Professional Organization
  - 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, research, 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.



8. How Scholarly and Creative Activities are **Evaluated** by the DRTPC

Evaluation by the committee will be based on the professional judgment of the DRTPC 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.

Candidates should include in their self-evaluations a discussion of the most significant work completed and in progress; provide context for those achievements; and they should refer to their professional development plan and any revisions they have made.

**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 work done and 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. Option/Emphasis area
2. Technology and lab oversight
3. Equipment oversight
4. Chairing department committees
5. Advising mentoring of junior faculty
6. Special projects

2. CLASS assigned and Related Duties Responsibilities

a. Committees and Task Forces

1. Curriculum
2. Student Success
3. RTP
4. Assessment/Teaching and Learning
5. Search Committee

6. Inclusive Excellence
  7. 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. Credential Program liaison/"Single Subject Advisor"
    - 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. Music presentation or lecture to a community service organization (such as Rotary or Optimists)
    - 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
  7. How Service is Evaluated by the DRTPC

Evaluation by the committee will be based on the professional judgment of the DRTPC 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. Service at the department level often has far-reaching effects on the quality of work life for all in the department, and some committees, some services require a greater time obligation

than others. The DRTPC shall weigh both the time invested and the results when evaluating candidate's service.

In the first years, service is focused in the Department and College; as a candidate moves toward tenure their plan should include service at the university level.

Candidates should include in their self-evaluations a discussion of the service work completed and in progress; provide context for those achievements; and they should refer to their professional development plan and any revisions they have made.

### 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 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.C and E above. The *majority* of peer evaluations should 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 and Creative 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 a two-year (re)appointment, he/she should follow the guidelines as set forth in Policy 1328 when applying for reappointment or an intermediate review.

#### B. Years 4-6

1. **Teaching 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 evaluations 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 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 and Creative Activities** as outlined above and in their Faculty Development Plan with **increased productivity** throughout years 4-6 in preparation for applying for tenure. Increased productivity is interpreted as an increase in either quantity or level of publication/dissemination. For example, a journal article might be published by a local chapter of an organization, or by its state entity, or the national or international parent organization. The level of prestige or renown may be balanced by differences in quantity.
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. Peer Evaluations of Teaching shall demonstrate growth and improvement over the years, and the most recent year's evaluations should demonstrate excellence. 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. Professional scholarly reputation should reach beyond the campus (and throughout the region) in a positive way. 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, effective 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 they apply 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 continue having peer evaluations performed each year during the period after promotion to Associate Professor (in preparation for the

application for promotion to full professor). We expect these to rate the candidate's performance as satisfactory or excellent.

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 or international 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 and Promotion to Associate Professor

Criteria for early tenure are governed by policy 1328.

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 **multiple elements** (but not necessarily all elements) from the **following list**:

1. Teaching Performance and Advising
  - "Good" to "Very Good" (minimum 1.75) overall average performance on each item of student numerical evaluations that apply to teaching
  - 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 to Professor**

Criteria for early promotion are governed by Policy 1328. 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 1.75 ("good to very good") teaching effectiveness ratings overall for two years prior to the application for early promotion. A majority of Peer Evaluations must be rated as Excellent.
- C. The candidate must have met or 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.

### **IV. Post Tenure Review**

When required and as notified by Faculty Affairs, those faculty who have held the rank of Professor for 5 or more years shall submit a report on their activities of the previous 5 years. This is governed by policy 1335. The following are required:

A. Curriculum Vita for the period under review

Faculty shall curate a focused CV for the previous 5 years. It is encouraged that the full scope of assigned and related duties be included with the listed work at CPP, in addition to scholarly and creative achievements, and service to the profession and community.

B. Self-narrative

Faculty shall produce a self-assessment narrative of **4 pages or less** concerning the work of the previous 5 years, discussing relevant areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, service, and administrative roles. It is intended that they list the highlights and accomplishments in support of CPP's core values and the department's mission.

C. Summaries of student ratings

Faculty should provide copies of the student evaluation rating summaries of courses taught during the period under review.

D. Evaluation by Peer Committee

An elected committee of at least two faculty at the rank of Professor shall read and respond to the report. The department chair may serve as a member of this committee, provided they are at the appropriate rank. If there are not enough music faculty to properly constitute the committee, faculty members from other departments shall be elected to supplement the committee.

In their review, the peer committee shall consider student ratings of teaching, and take note of any apparent decline in teaching quality. The committee shall highlight any area needing growth and make recommendations for improvement, as needed. They shall call attention to the Faculty member's accomplishments, especially those that may have been unrecognized over the long term.

There is no separate review by the Chair of the Department. The Post Tenure Review process stops at the Dean's level.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Music Department 2023  
Janine Riveire, DRTPC chair