



Date: September 13, 2021

To: Talia Bettcher, Chair
Academic Senate

From: Heidi Riggio, Chair
Faculty Policy Committee

Copies: D. Fazzi, J. Lazo-Uy, R. Roquemoire, V. Salcido, A. Avramchuk

Subject: **Proposed Policy Modification for Chapter VI (Section B) of the *Faculty Handbook* FPC 20-14.3: Evaluation of Permanent Instructional Faculty**

In Spring, 2021, the Faculty Policy Committee (FPC) modified the University policy on the Personnel Accomplishments Report (PAR) to indicate that materials submitted as evidence of accomplishments outlined in the PAR are only required for performance reviews but are optional for period evaluations of permanent instructional faculty. This policy modification was approved by the Academic Senate in Spring, 2021. FPC subsequently modified the policy on Evaluation of Permanent Instructional Faculty to be consistent with the approved modifications to the policy on the PAR.

FPC deliberated about FPC 20-14.3 at several meetings in Spring, 2021, with final FPC approval of these modifications at its meeting of September 13, 2021.

The following points summarize the proposed changes to the policy:

- Lines 31-33: We rephrased the sentence to more clearly describe the permanent personnel action file (PPAF) and the working personnel action file (WPAF).
- Line 35: We deleted redundant language.
- Line 36: We added the word “all” to clarify materials contained in the PPAF.
- Lines 37-38: We clarified language, including faculty submission of materials as comprising the WPAF.
- Lines 39-41: We indicate that for performance reviews, faculty members must submit a curriculum vitae, a personnel accomplishments report (PAR) (with additional language defining the PAR), and evidence supporting the accomplishments outlined in the PAR.
- Lines 45-48: We indicate that for periodic evaluations, a curriculum vitae and a PAR are required, but submission of evidence of accomplishments outlined in the PAR is optional.

1 Evaluation of Permanent Instructional Faculty

2 (Senate: 8/3/76, 5/24/77, 7/28/82[EA], 5/24/83, 11/3/87, 7/25/89, 11/7/89, 8/21/90, 7/30/91,
3 2/4/92, 10/26/93, 5/10/94, 8/22/95, 5/9/00, 5/10/11, 1/24/12, 5/28/13, 12/2/14; President:
4 8/16/76, 6/14/79, 9/8/82, 6/14/83, 6/22/88, 8/16/89, 11/24/89, 11/1/90, 10/7/91, 3/11/92,
5 12/13/93, 6/29/94, 6/24/96, 6/6/00, 7/14/11, 2/23/12, 7/9/13, 1/26/15; Editorial Amendment:
6 9/00, 8/01)

7 Governing documents: Articles 13, 14, and 15 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between
8 the California State University and the California Faculty Association.

9 In keeping with the terminology utilized in the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the
10 California State University and the California Faculty Association, the term "permanent faculty"
11 shall refer to all probationary (tenure-track) and tenured faculty. This evaluation policy governs
12 permanent instructional faculty. Although librarians, counselors, and coaches fall within the
13 faculty bargaining unit, some aspects of their assignments differ from those of instructional
14 faculty and thus they are subject to specific evaluation criteria. Relevant evaluation policies for
15 each of these groups can be found in their respective evaluation policies elsewhere in this
16 Handbook.

17 Overview

18 The purpose of the University's instructional evaluation policy is to maintain and enhance the
19 high quality of the academic programs at Cal State LA by assuring that all permanent faculty
20 members meet and maintain high standards of performance as teachers, scholars, and
21 members of the campus community. The policy aims to achieve this objective by establishing
22 criteria for fair, thorough, and consistent evaluation of individual faculty members.

23 Evaluations of tenure-track and tenured instructional faculty shall focus on the quality and
24 effectiveness of educational performance, professional achievement, and other contributions
25 to the University by the faculty member under review.

26 The evaluation of an instructional faculty member is based upon a comprehensive review of the
27 individual's qualities, achievements, and promise during the year or years included in the
28 review period.

29 Attention shall be given to forming a general "profile" or comprehensive estimate of the faculty
30 member's performance and special professional interests and accomplishments.

31 All reviews shall be based on evidence in the two-part personnel action file, which includes the
32 permanent personnel action file (PPAF) and the working personnel action file MATERIALS
33 SUBMITTED BY THE CANDIDATE (REFERRED TO AS the working personnel action file, WPAF). All
34 evaluations will be entered into the faculty member's permanent personnel action file
35 (PPAF). The permanent personnel action file (PPAF) is maintained by the University. Reports of

36 ALL peer observations of instruction and quantitative summaries of student opinion surveys are
37 maintained in the PPAF. The candidate is responsible for providing SUBMITTING the following
38 materials AS THEIR WPAF to their working personnel action file (WPAF) before the published
39 date of the file closure.; FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEWS, PERMANENT FACULTY MUST SUBMIT a
40 current curriculum vitae; a personnel accomplishments report (PAR), A NARRATIVE
41 STATEMENT that summarizes and describes the candidate's activities and accomplishments
42 during the period under review; and evidence of these activities and accomplishments.
43 Although performance review for tenure is cumulative and comprehensive, evidence submitted
44 should focus on accomplishments since the last performance review. Inclusion of materials
45 previously submitted for performance review is optional. FOR PERIODIC EVALUATIONS,
46 PERMANENT FACULTY MUST SUBMIT A CURRENT CURRICULUM VITAE AND A PAR;
47 SUBMISSION OF EVIDENCE FOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OUTLINED IN THE PAR IS OPTIONAL FOR
48 PERIODIC EVALUATIONS.

49 I. Types of Evaluation

50 There are two types of evaluations of permanent faculty members:

51 **performance reviews**, required for retention, tenure and promotion of
52 permanent faculty, and

53 **periodic evaluations**, conducted when an evaluation is required, but in periods
54 in which a faculty member is not under consideration for retention, tenure, or
55 promotion.

56 Performance reviews serve the dual purposes of determining whether or not a faculty
57 member's performance warrants retention, tenure, or promotion, and of providing the faculty
58 member with constructive feedback on his or her performance in the areas under
59 review. Periodic evaluations are aimed primarily at providing the faculty member with
60 feedback on his or her performance. However, they may be considered in subsequent
61 performance reviews.

62 Permanent (probationary and tenured) faculty members shall undergo a performance review
63 when under consideration for retention, tenure, or promotion. A permanent faculty member
64 undergoing a performance review shall be reviewed by the appropriate
65 department/division/school peer review committee, the department/division chair or school
66 director (if not a member of the department/division/school peer review committee), the
67 appropriate college peer review committee, the dean, the Provost and the President.

68 A permanent faculty member undergoing periodic evaluation shall be reviewed by the
69 appropriate department/division/school peer review committee, the department/division chair
70 or school director (if not a member of the department/division/school peer review committee),
71 and the dean. Periodic evaluations shall include review of a faculty member's performance in
72 all of the same areas as during a performance review.

73 **II. Evaluative Standards**

74 Permanent instructional faculty members at Cal State LA shall be evaluated on the basis of their
75 educational performance, professional achievement, and contributions to the University.

76 Permanent faculty evaluations shall utilize the following official evaluative terms:

77 **Outstanding** - describes truly *exceptional* performance, for a faculty member at the particular
78 rank and career stage.

79 **Commendable** - describes performance that is better than satisfactory and that exceed
80 expectations for a faculty member at the particular rank and career stage.

81 **Satisfactory** - describes performance that meets expectations for a faculty member at the
82 particular rank and career stage.

83 **Needs Improvement** - describes performance that does not meet expectations for a faculty
84 member at the particular rank and career stage, in one or more specified areas of concern.

85 **Unsatisfactory** - describes performance that is *seriously deficient* for a faculty member at the
86 particular rank and career stage.

87 A review that finds a faculty member's performance to be satisfactory or better in all areas shall
88 be accompanied by a favorable recommendation for retention, tenure, or promotion, when
89 eligible and not applying early.

90 An evaluation of "needs improvement" does not preclude a reviewer/review committee from
91 recommending retention. To receive a favorable recommendation for tenure and promotion at
92 least satisfactory performance must be demonstrated in all three categories.

93 A judgment of unsatisfactory in any one area shall entail a negative recommendation for
94 retention, tenure, or promotion.

95 **III. Evaluation Timelines**

96 **Periodic and Performance Reviews for Probationary Faculty**

97 Initial probationary appointments will normally be for two years. Initial appointments of
98 probationary faculty members who are appointed in a term other than fall shall end in spring
99 term of the second academic year of service.

100 During the first year of an initial probationary appointment, a faculty member shall undergo a
101 periodic evaluation, with the exception of those appointed in spring semester (who will not be
102 reviewed in the first [partial] year of appointment). During the second year of an initial

103 probationary appointment, a faculty member shall undergo a performance review for
104 retention.

105 For the purposes of calculating tenure eligibility, the first year shall begin with the first fall term
106 in which a probationary faculty member is employed.

107 It is possible to receive approval for a one-year extension of the probationary period when
108 participating in specified leave programs. Information related to extensions may be found in
109 Articles 13.7 and 13.8 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

110 If found to be satisfactory or better during a performance review for retention, probationary
111 faculty members shall be reappointed for subsequent two-year appointment(s) unless they
112 have only one year remaining in their probationary period, in which case they will receive a
113 one-year appointment. If a probationary faculty member is found to be less than satisfactory,
114 he or she *may* receive a one-year appointment. During each year between retention reviews
115 probationary faculty shall undergo periodic evaluations.

116 Probationary faculty members may request a performance review during any year in which
117 they would otherwise receive only a periodic evaluation.

118 Consideration for tenure normally occurs during the sixth year of service as a probationary
119 faculty member minus any credit toward tenure.

120 A faculty member shall not normally be promoted to associate professor and may not be
121 promoted to professor during the probationary period. Assistant professors who are awarded
122 tenure shall be promoted concurrently to associate professor.

123 A faculty member must be employed by Cal State LA and in the current rank for at least two
124 years before applying for tenure or promotion to a higher rank.

125 **Early Tenure and/or Promotion for Probationary Faculty**

126 Consideration for tenure normally occurs during the sixth year of service as a probationary
127 faculty members minus any credit toward tenure. A probationary faculty member applying for
128 early tenure or early promotion shall demonstrate that they have, in a shorter period of time,
129 (A) achieved the level of development in all areas of review that is expected of candidates for
130 tenure; and (B) established a record of accomplishments that exceeds the standards and level
131 of performance expected during the probationary period. Probationary faculty members shall
132 not be promoted beyond the rank of associate professor. Prior to the final decision for early
133 tenure or early promotion, candidates may withdraw without prejudice from consideration at
134 any level of review. If a faculty member has applied for *and been denied* early tenure or early
135 promotion, the faculty member cannot apply again for early tenure or early promotion while in
136 the same rank.

137 **Post-Tenure Performance Reviews and Periodic Evaluations**

138 Once tenured, a faculty member will typically undergo a performance review during the fifth
139 year in rank as an associate professor, for consideration for promotion to the rank of
140 professor. A faculty member who does not wish to apply for promotion within five years of
141 receiving tenure/promotion to associate professor, must undergo a periodic evaluation in the
142 fifth year in rank. All tenured professors (at any rank) shall be evaluated at intervals no greater
143 than five years. Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) shall not be
144 required to undergo evaluation unless an evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant
145 or the college dean.

146 Tenured faculty members may be evaluated more frequently at the request of the faculty
147 member or the president.

148 The faculty member's evaluation for promotion to the rank of professor emphasizes the scope
149 and depth of teaching performance, the degree of professional recognition within and beyond
150 the University, and the distinctiveness of contributions to the general welfare of the faculty
151 members department/division/school, college, and University. Such a review must
152 necessarily include a careful evaluation of each individual achievement, with the aim of
153 determining its value to the faculty member, the students and the University.

154 **Early Promotion for Tenured Faculty Members**

155 Tenured associate professors may request to be considered for early promotion to the rank of
156 professor. Tenured associate professors applying for early promotion shall demonstrate that
157 they have achieved, in a shorter period of time, a record of accomplishments that exceeds the
158 standards and level of performance that would be expected during the normal five-year period
159 of time in rank as an associate professor. A faculty member cannot apply for early promotion if
160 they have applied for and been denied early promotion while in the same rank.

161 **Review Periods**

162 Performance Review Periods:

Review:	Review Period Begins:	Review Period Ends:
Retention review for second year faculty	Date of appointment to probationary position	File closure (fall semester of second year)
Retention (probationary performance review years other than second)	File closure of previous performance review	Current file closure (fall semester of performance review years)
Tenure and Promotion	Date of appointment to probationary position	Current file closure (fall semester of tenure <u>eligibility</u> year)

Promotion to Professor	File closure of tenure and promotion performance review	Current file closure (fall semester of promotion eligibility year)
------------------------	---	--

163 Periodic Evaluation Periods:

Evaluation:	Evaluation Period Begins:	Evaluation Period Ends:
First year evaluation	Date of appointment to probationary position	File closure (spring semester of first year)
Annual evaluation (probationary years not requiring retention review)	File closure of previous performance review	Current file closure (spring semester of current year)
Post-tenure review	File closure of last review	Current file closure (spring semester of current year)

164 **IV. Criteria Governing Evaluations of Permanent Faculty**

165 Reviews for retention, tenure, and promotion to associate professor are cumulative in the
166 sense that the progress or growth of the faculty member since joining the faculty is a factor in
167 evaluation. Generally, the evaluation of a probationary faculty member will take into account
168 all and only the activities and achievements since the initial probationary
169 appointment. Reviews are comparative in the sense that the faculty member is evaluated
170 against the quality and effectiveness of performance of colleagues taking into account the
171 broad range of activities in which different members of the faculty engage. Performance
172 reviews for promotion to the rank of professor are similarly cumulative and comparative - i.e.,
173 the progress or growth of faculty members while in their present rank is assessed against the
174 quality and effectiveness of colleagues' performance, taking into account the broad range of
175 activities in which different members of the faculty engage. Except when applying for early
176 promotion to the rank of professor, for a faculty member to receive promotion to the rank of
177 professor, they shall demonstrate a level of achievement that is commensurate with that of
178 other candidates recommended for promotion to the rank of professor, regardless of the
179 number of years since earning tenure at Cal State LA.

180 Permanent faculty members are evaluated on the basis of their performance in the following
181 categories:

- 182 A. Educational Performance
- 183 B. Professional Achievement
- 184 C. Contributions to the University.

185 Of the three categories, category A normally shall have the greatest weight. In the case of a
186 faculty member who is appointed or elected to a non-teaching position, special consideration

187 shall be given to performance in that assignment. In such cases, a faculty member should
188 consider preparing an individualized professional plan; the individualized professional plan is
189 described in section V. B.

190 Although the criteria governing performance reviews are the same for retention, tenure, and
191 promotion cases, reviewers should recognize qualitative differences between these types of
192 reviews. This difference, however, is one of degree, not kind, and it may be summed up under
193 the concept of growth or progress. At the time of the performance review of the faculty
194 member for retention during the probationary period, judgment is based on demonstrated
195 growth, performance and promise in categories A, B, and C.

196 At the time of candidacy for tenure and/or promotion, however, a faculty member is expected
197 to have demonstrated substantive achievements in each of the three areas; promise of future
198 growth will not be sufficient to warrant a positive recommendation for tenure or
199 promotion. Special consideration will be given to the continuity and growth of the activities
200 comprising this total performance.

201 **Category A, Educational Performance**, consists of two elements:

- 202 1. teaching performance, and
- 203 2. related educational activities.

204 1. Teaching performance includes those activities by the faculty member that directly
205 contribute to student learning. Effective teaching can include many pedagogical approaches,
206 such as lectures, individual and group exercises, inquiry-based learning, discussion sessions, and
207 other techniques. It can also include a wide range of activities such as supervising theses or
208 projects; supervising student learning experiences in academic and community based settings;
209 collaborating with students on research, performance, artistic, and other projects; mentoring
210 students; and tutoring students.

211 The evaluation of teaching performance is an assessment of the quality and effectiveness of the
212 efforts of faculty members that contribute to student learning. This evaluation must include
213 multiple measures:

- 214 a. A summary of the quantitative responses to the "Student Opinion Survey on Instruction."
- 215 b. Evaluation of teaching performance based upon a peer observation of instruction.
- 216 c. At least one other source of information, such as course syllabi, instructional
217 materials, assessment methods, assignments (including field assignments), evidence of
218 student work and accomplishments, and signed letters from students.

219 2. Related educational activities include, but are not limited to: academic advisement,
220 curriculum/program development, programmatic assessment of learning outcomes,
221 membership on thesis committees, the development and evaluation of comprehensive exams,

222 and other academic support activities that enhance student retention and student
223 achievement.

224 The evaluation of related educational activities is based upon such items as surveys of student
225 opinions of advisement, student mentoring, tutoring, field activities, etc.; written reports from
226 the department/division chair or school director, students, faculty, and/or other individuals
227 with first hand knowledge of the faculty member's activities; and other such documentation
228 provided by the faculty member regarding participation in program assessment, curriculum
229 development, and other related educational activities.

230 **Category B, Professional Achievement**, is defined as performance of discipline-related activities
231 that include, but are not limited to the following broad areas identified in no particular order:

- 232 • Academic and scholarly contributions to the faculty member's profession and field, that are
233 externally evaluated and published or formally accepted for publication such as research,
234 critical essays and analyses, and theoretical speculations.
- 235 • Innovative use of technology, textbooks, and original teaching or testing materials which
236 are adopted for professional and/or instructional use outside the faculty member's
237 department/division/school.
- 238 • Inventions, designs and innovations that have been favorably evaluated by authorities
239 outside the University.
- 240 • Creation, exhibition, performance or publication in the arts or literature. Producing and
241 directing events in the performing arts, including visual arts, music, dance, and theatre,
242 beyond normal instructional duties.
- 243 • Presentations before meetings of scholarly and professional societies, and presentations as
244 an invited authority in the faculty member's field before scholarly and professional
245 audiences.
- 246 • Participation in activities of scholarly or professional societies beyond mere membership,
247 such as elective office, fellowship status, committee membership, receipt of special awards,
248 organization of symposia, and chairing of conference sessions.
- 249 • Receipt of fellowships, grants, contracts or other subsidies and commissions for scholarly
250 activities in the faculty member's field.
- 251 • Holding special appointments such as visiting professorships, lectureships, or consultant
252 assignments in other academic, scholarly, professional, or governmental institutions.
- 253 • Editing or reviewing of scholarly or professional publications.
- 254 • Professional practice that utilizes the faculty member's academic expertise.
- 255 • Service to one's profession, in such cases where the activity is based on one's disciplinary
256 expertise (for example, appointment to a granting agency's review board or service on a
257 professional board).
- 258 • Community based participatory research, community service, and community based
259 activities that involve the academic expertise of the faculty member.

260 • In evaluating these contributions as to their relative merits, the quality and effectiveness,
261 and not only the quantity of the contributions in category B shall be the primary
262 consideration.

263 **Category C, Contributions to the University**, is defined as all other service to the University,
264 profession, or community that contributes to the mission and governance of the University
265 such as, but not limited to, those activities listed below.

- 266 • Contributions to academic governance such as membership and participation in the
267 activities of department/division/school, college, university, and system committees, and
268 service in administrative capacities.
- 269 • Participation in any student, faculty, professional, or community organization or
270 engagement in any service to colleges and/or the community or engagement in other
271 activities that bring positive recognition to the faculty member and to the University.
- 272 • Delivery of speeches, conducting of colloquia, or otherwise conveying information about
273 the faculty member's scholarship, profession, field and university to community groups.
- 274 • Organization of and engagement in significant university, college and
275 department/division/school activities that improve the educational environment and/or
276 student, staff, or faculty life, such as organization of retreats, conferences, or orientations.
- 277 • In evaluating these contributions in category C as to their relative merits, the quality and
278 effectiveness, and not only the quantity of the contributions shall be the primary
279 consideration.

280 **V. Additional Evaluation Policies**

281 **A. External Review**

282 A request for an external review of materials in one's personnel file may be made by any of the
283 parties involved in the review. Any request for an external review must be directed to the
284 President or his designee and must indicate (1) the extraordinary circumstances warranting
285 external review, and (2) the materials to be reviewed. For such a review to take place, the
286 faculty member under review must concur with the request for external review. The dean of
287 the college shall select appropriate external reviewer(s), with the approval of the President or
288 designee and the concurrence of the faculty member under review, and transmit to the
289 reviewers the materials to be reviewed. A copy of the relevant parts of this policy shall
290 accompany the materials to be reviewed.

291 Once the external reviewer(s)' report is received, the file is returned to the initial stage of
292 review and the review commences from that level forward with the reviewers' report added to
293 the permanent personnel action file (PPAF).

294 **B. Individualized Professional Plans (IPP)**

295 Each faculty member shall have the discretion to develop, in collaboration with his or her chair
296 or director and the appropriate department/division school personnel committee, an
297 individualized professional plan (IPP). Such plans shall specify the candidate's goals and
298 objectives and may alter the balance or focus of performance among categories A, B, and C for
299 a specified period of time.

300 A faculty member may choose to prepare an IPP when either his or her work assignment or
301 area of specialization warrants a departure from the usual evaluation criteria, or when the
302 faculty member's work is of a nature that it makes it difficult to apply the established
303 evaluation criteria articulated above. Such a plan must indicate the time period during which it
304 will apply to the evaluation of the faculty member's performance. No IPP may be retroactively
305 applied, and in no case shall an IPP exceed three years in duration. However, an IPP may be
306 renewed. An IPP must be approved by the faculty member, the department/division chair or
307 school director, the dean, the Provost and the President. The IPP must indicate (1) the unusual
308 circumstances or work assignment that warrant(s) the creation of the plan, (2) the work plan
309 (and expected outcomes) for the faculty member over the course of the IPP's duration, and (3)
310 where necessary, the criteria by which the faculty member will be evaluated. An individualized
311 professional plan will still require that a faculty member be evaluated in all areas of expected
312 performance. Whenever an IPP is approved, it must be placed in the permanent personnel
313 file. An IPP will be effective upon its approval and will govern only that part of the evaluation
314 period during which it is in place.

315 **C. Evaluation of Faculty Active in Interdisciplinary Programs**

316 When a faculty member with an appointment in a specific department/division/school devotes
317 all or part of his or her efforts to instruction in or participates in the development and
318 administration of an interdisciplinary program, that faculty member may request an assessment
319 of his or her performance in the activities associated with the interdisciplinary program. In that
320 case, prior to the file closure date, the coordinator of the interdisciplinary program shall
321 provide a written assessment of the contributions of the faculty member to that program for
322 the faculty member's permanent personnel action file. This assessment shall be part of the
323 evidence upon which the evaluation is based.

324 **D. Evaluation of Faculty with Joint Appointment**

325 The criteria for evaluating faculty with joint appointments shall be consistent with those used
326 for comparable evaluations of faculty members appointed to a single
327 department/division/school.

328 Faculty with joint appointments in two or more departments/divisions/schools or equivalent
329 units shall be evaluated either by the peer review committee, in each
330 department/division/school or by a joint committee of faculty from each
331 department/division/school. If a joint committee is utilized, this committee will consist of
332 members of all academic units within which the candidate holds a joint appointment. Each

333 academic unit shall elect the committee members representing the unit and each unit shall be
334 represented in as close to equal proportion as possible to proportion of the candidate's time
335 assigned to that unit. If not a member of the peer review committee, the chair or director of
336 each academic unit shall write an independent evaluation. A faculty member appointed in two
337 different colleges will be evaluated by the college-level peer review committee in each college
338 in which he or she is appointed.

339 College dean(s), in consultation with the faculty member holding a joint appointment and the
340 department/division chair(s) or school director(s), shall determine whether the faculty member
341 will be evaluated in each department/division/school or by a joint committee; this
342 determination should be made at least 30 days prior to the file closure date for the faculty
343 member's first evaluation. In subsequent years, changes to the department/division/school-
344 level review process can be effected either at the recommendation of the faculty member with
345 dean's approval or at the discretion of the dean after consultation with the faculty
346 member. Such changes will become effective for any review cycles beginning 30 days after the
347 change is instituted.

348 In every case, the department/division/school and college-level recommendations shall be
349 forwarded to the respective dean(s) of the college(s) in which an appointment is held; each
350 dean shall conduct an evaluation and forward a recommendation to the Provost. For
351 individuals holding a joint appointment, the President shall make a single decision regarding
352 retention, tenure, or promotion.

