

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS
STATEMENT OF MISSION AND VALUES

PERSONNEL POLICIES, PROCEDURES
AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

Update August 2018

**This is the sole personnel document for the
College of Science and Mathematics.
It replaces all previous college and department documents.**

The term "Department" in this document shall also be interpreted as "School" for the School of Education and the term "Department Chair" shall be interpreted as "Director" for the School of Education.

Current, past, and future students depend on the faculty and administration to participate responsibly in personnel matters and to make recommendations and decisions that are fair, supportable, and in the best interests of the university. The quality of personnel actions has a tremendous influence on the reputation of the university, the value of a Cal Poly diploma, and the welfare of members of the university community including students, faculty, staff, alumni, and loyal friends and supporters. Candidates for retention, promotion and tenure and evaluators at all levels have a solemn responsibility to pursue their roles thoughtfully, with high integrity, and with sincere dedication to the future of Cal Poly.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	Mission and Values Statement.....	5
Chapter 2	Criteria for Retention, Promotion and Tenure and Periodic Review of Probationary and Tenured Faculty Members	8
I.	Criteria for Retention, Promotion and Tenure	9
II.	Special Considerations for Evaluation of School of Education Faculty	13
Chapter 3	Appointment of Tenure Track Faculty Members.....	15
I.	Appointment of Tenure Track Faculty Members.....	16
II.	Procedure for Evaluation of Tenure Track Candidates.....	16
III.	Inter-Departmental or Inter-College Transfer of Tenured Faculty Members or Granting of Retreat Rights	17
Chapter 4	Personnel Policies and Procedures for Periodic Review of Probationary Faculty Members and Evaluation of Probationary and Tenured Faculty Members for Retention, Promotion and Tenure	18
I.	Evaluation Schedule for Retention, Promotion and Tenure.....	19
A.	Application for Promotion and Off-Schedule Personnel Actions:	19
B.	Required Personnel Actions: Retention and Tenure of Probationary Faculty Members	19
II.	Periodic Review of Probationary Faculty Members	22
A.	Materials for Review.....	22
B.	Levels of Review (for Periodic Review of Probationary Faculty Members).....	23
III.	Performance Evaluation: Evaluation Procedures for Retention, Promotion and Tenure	24
A.	Application for Personnel Action	24
B.	Materials for Review: Personnel Action File and Working Personnel Action File	24
C.	Levels of Review (for Performance Evaluation).....	26
Chapter 5	CSM Voting Procedure for Prioritizing Candidates for Appointment and Promotion.....	32
I.	Appointment.....	33
II.	Promotion.....	33
Chapter 6	Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty Members	34
I.	Periodic Review of Third Year Tenured Associate Professors	35
A.	Materials for Examination: Personnel Action and Working Personnel Action File	35
B.	Levels of Review:.....	36
II.	Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty Members	37
A.	Frequency of Evaluation	37
B.	Materials for Evaluation: Personnel Action and Working Personnel Action File.....	37
C.	Levels of Review.....	38
Chapter 7	Criteria and Procedures for Appointment and Evaluation of Lecturers.....	39
I.	Appointment of Lecturers	40
II.	Criteria for Evaluation of Lecturers	40
III.	Policies and Procedures for Periodic Evaluation of Part-Time and Full-Time Lecturers	42
A.	Criteria	42

B.	Frequency of Evaluation	42
C.	Materials for Evaluation.....	42
D.	Levels of Review.....	43
E.	Evaluation Format.....	45
IV.	Policies and Procedures for Periodic Evaluation of Student Teacher Supervisors	45
A.	Required WPAF Materials for Clinical Practice Student Teacher Supervisor Reviews:	45
V.	Cumulative Evaluation for 12.12 and 12.13 Eligible Lecturers: Criteria and Procedures	47
A.	Evaluation Criteria:	47
B.	Frequency of Evaluation	47
C.	Materials for Submission	47
D.	Levels of Review.....	48
VI.	Lecturer Range Elevation.....	51
A.	Eligibility and Application.....	51
B.	Criteria for Evaluation	52
C.	Materials for Submission	52
D.	Levels of Review.....	53
Chapter 8	Appointment and Evaluation of Teaching Associates	56
I.	Appointment and Evaluation of Teaching Associates.....	57
A.	Appointment.....	57
B.	Training and Mentoring Program	57
C.	Evaluation	57
Chapter 9	Student Evaluation of Teaching	58
I.	Student Evaluation of Teaching	59
A.	Requirement	59
B.	General Criteria.....	59
C.	Timing.....	60
D.	Placement in Personnel Action File	60
Chapter 10	Professional Leaves with Pay	61
I.	Professional Leaves with Pay	62
A.	Application	62
A.	Department Review	62
C.	College Professional Leave Committee.....	62
D.	Decision.....	62
E.	Guidelines for Professional Leave Applications	62

Appendix A Working Personnel Action File.....	64
<i>Outline for Faculty Members</i>	65
<i>Preparing Working Personnel Action Files</i>	65
PART 1: Index of Materials, CV, Summary Table of Grades Assigned, Summary Table of Student Evaluation Results, Statement of Teaching Philosophy and Approach, Professional Plan, Case for Tenure/Promotion / Three-Year Appointment / Lecturer Range Elevation, Response to Previous Evaluations.	65
A. Index of Materials	65
B. Curriculum Vitae (CV):.....	65
C. Summary Table of Grades Assigned	68
D. Summary Table of Student Evaluation Results.....	69
E. Statement of Teaching Philosophy and Approach	69
F. Professional Plan	69
1. Required Professional Plans	69
2. Description of the Professional Plan	70
G. Case for Tenure / Promotion / Three Year Appointment / Lecturer Range Elevation.....	73
H. Response to Previous Evaluations:.....	73
PART 2: Materials for Examination in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service / University Citizenship.	74
A. Teaching	74
B. Scholarship	74
C. Service and University Citizenship	74
Appendix B Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) Composition, Election and Duties Tables	75
Summary Tables of DPRC Sections of the CSM Personnel Document.....	76
A. Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty Reviews	76
B. Lecturer Reviews.....	83

Chapter 1

Mission and Values Statement

“It’s All about Our Students”

*“Every Cal Poly Student is a
College of Science and Mathematics Student”*

College of Science and Mathematics

A Statement of Mission and Values

“It’s All about Our Students”

“Every Cal Poly Student is a

College of Science and Mathematics Student”

The College of Science and Mathematics promotes the learning, understanding, and appreciation of science and mathematics as a basis for creative endeavors, intellectual pursuits, careers, and critical consideration of issues confronting society. It provides the foundation for the polytechnic curriculum, offers a rich and distinctive general education program, and prepares students pursuing degrees in the college for post-baccalaureate education and careers. An excellent and committed faculty guides Cal Poly students in developing the interest and capacity for lifelong learning by engaging their curiosities, imaginations, and critical and creative thinking skills.

Our Community of Students, Faculty, and Staff

The College of Science and Mathematics is a community in which commitment, collegiality, and integrity are expected in each of its members. We value dedication, strong work ethics, and genuine concern for the intellectual growth and personal success of our students, faculty, and staff. Especially important are openness to new ideas, acceptance of diverse points of view, respect for personal and cultural differences, and an environment of civility where all are treated with dignity and respect. We strive to be courteous, considerate, and supportive members of the university and San Luis Obispo area community.

Our Students

The faculty and staff of the College of Science and Mathematics encourage Cal Poly students to:

- value the privilege of pursuing a university education,
- demonstrate a genuine interest in intellectual growth,
- demonstrate an appreciation for the arts and sciences and the polytechnic emphasis of the university,
- take personal responsibility for learning,
- focus on achieving a degree and preparing for a career or post baccalaureate opportunities,
- develop a strong work ethic,
- work cooperatively with their fellow students, the staff, and the faculty, and
- demonstrate respect, honesty, and integrity in all aspects of their lives.

We also believe that student involvement in co-curricular and extracurricular activities, community service, and participation in thoughtful discussions and activities concerning societal issues is an important part of university life.

Our Faculty

In teaching and learning

The faculty is dedicated to helping all Cal Poly students succeed academically, graduate, and pursue a career or post baccalaureate education. It is especially committed to orienting new students, many of whom take their initial courses in the College of Science and Mathematics, to the academic standards of the university. We strive to be respected role models, trusted personal and professional mentors, and valued intellectual guides. We lead by example and provide thoughtful and challenging learning experiences that develop the intellect and capacity for lifelong learning. We model and nurture curiosity, imagination, creativity, critical thought, and problem solving. Cal Poly embraces the “learn by doing” approach to education, with a strong intellectual base, and the faculty makes meaningful and innovative contributions to the curriculum and to pedagogy.

In scholarly activities

We pursue career-long scholarship to maintain our engagement in, and enthusiasm for, teaching and learning. We encourage both disciplinary and interdisciplinary scholarly activities as well as collaborative endeavors and the involvement of students to provide them meaningful creative learning experiences. Our faculty members make scholarly contributions to their disciplines throughout their careers; they and their student collaborators are encouraged to present this work at regional, national, and international meetings and in published form.

In service, university citizenship and contributions to the community

Our faculty members participate in department responsibilities and activities and in special events of the college and university community. They make meaningful service contributions at all levels in personnel matters, curriculum, student welfare and success, and other areas important to the advancement of the university. They support student organizations and activities, arrange for the expression of external ideas and expertise on campus, and they share their own expertise with both the university and external community.

Our Staff

The College of Science and Mathematics instructional support staff is a team of professionals who provide clerical, administrative, and technical services. They promote a working environment of cooperation, collaboration, respect, openness, and professionalism. Service to Cal Poly students is a priority and is provided with efficiency, warmth, and sensitivity.

Our staff members support the faculty in teaching and scholarly activities. They support Cal Poly students in all aspects of their personal and academic needs in pursuing a college education. They maintain continuity in the departments and college and communicate traditions, values, and policies to our students and faculty. Staff members are valued mentors to students; they are role models, teach specialized skills, and demonstrate a strong work ethic. College of Science and Mathematics staff members take responsibility for their professional development and maintaining excellence in their skills and disciplines. They foster creative partnerships with students, administration, and faculty members and strive to serve in leadership roles at all levels of the university. The staff is an integral part of the college and plays an important role in promoting and strengthening the spirit of community.

Chapter 2

Criteria for Retention, Promotion and Tenure and Periodic Review of Probationary and Tenured Faculty Members

I. Criteria for Retention, Promotion and Tenure

Tenure is the most important of all personnel actions. It is an expression of confidence in a faculty member's intellect, creativity, initiative, work ethic, and career-long value to Cal Poly. It presumes a loyalty and responsibility on the part of the faculty member to the university, students, and curriculum. With tenure comes the expectation that a faculty member will, during his or her career, accomplish a body of work in teaching, scholarship, service and as a respected citizen of the university that is of recognizable value and importance and which constitutes a meaningful contribution to the mission of the university. Tenure expresses a belief in the future and the role of the tenured faculty in shaping it. Achieving tenure is an honor and privilege, an accomplishment of tremendous significance and with it come responsibilities and expectations of immense importance to the university.

When a faculty member is awarded tenure, it is with the expectation that the capability exists of meeting the requirements for full professor at some timely point during her or his career. A full professor is an effective and respected teacher who has a sustainable, career-long, creative program of scholarship, and who demonstrates thoughtful leadership in issues of shared governance including personnel decisions, curriculum and pedagogy development, utilization of resources, and matters of student welfare and success.

The faculty also has expectations of the State of California and the California State University. Prime among them is the responsibility to provide compensation commensurate with the responsibilities and expectations for achievement of the faculty and the resources required to fulfill these responsibilities and expectations successfully.

Following are criteria for retention, promotion and tenure. The statements on teaching, scholarship, and service are intended to provide a college philosophy which should be applied with flexibility and appreciation for differences in ideas, approaches, and contributions.

The professional plan is an especially important part of the Working Personnel Action File. Criteria for personnel action in the College of Science and Mathematics are purposefully general. They are applied to each faculty member via the faculty member's individual professional plan that is developed to demonstrate career-long commitment in teaching, externally validated scholarship, and active service and participation in the university community. The plan is evaluated as to whether or not it is an appropriate guide towards tenure and promotion and it thus serves as the faculty member's own personalized set of criteria.

A. Teaching

Teaching and promoting student learning and success are the most important responsibilities of a faculty member and this category is weighted most heavily in periodic reviews and performance evaluations. In evaluating teaching performance, many modes of instruction are recognized including classroom, laboratory, integrated lecture/laboratory courses, non-traditional courses, and supervision of student projects and research. Peer review, classroom visitations, student evaluations, and examination of course materials are among the methods to be used in assessing teaching performance. Quality performance is expected in the various aspects of teaching including the following:

Engagement and Guidance of Students in Learning

- Involvement of students in learning by inspiration: lecture or laboratory course content and delivery
- Involvement of student in learning by incentive: assignments and exams
- Guiding students to take responsibility for learning
- Engaging curiosity, imagination, creative and critical thinking in students
- Supervision of student projects and research.

Course Organization

- Informative and complete course syllabus
- Content appropriate to course objectives and level
- Effective organization and scheduling of topics, projects, papers, exams, and other assignments and methods of evaluation

Course Presentation

- Effective pedagogy
- Effective presentation techniques
- Clarity of expression
- Effectiveness in guiding student learning
- Satisfying intellectual experience for students

Laboratory Teaching

- Respect for the hands-on, laboratory-intensive curriculum at Cal Poly and the resources required including instructor and technical staff salaries, operating expense, instrumentation, and facilities
- Effective use of the entire laboratory period of instruction
- Effective instructor interaction with students during laboratory sessions
- Quality of intellectual experience
- Quality of lab lectures and discussions
- Effective use of evaluation schemes such as lab reports and quizzes

Evaluation of Student Performance

- Quality and effectiveness of evaluation methods and instruments
- Application of high but reasonable and appropriate standards
- Assignment of grades appropriate to the course, students, and university standards

Promoting Student Success

- Acceptance of the responsibility of the College of Science and Mathematics to academically orient and foster success of new students from all colleges as most (especially those in the polytechnic majors) take their initial courses at Cal Poly in the College of Science and Mathematics
- Orienting and guiding students to academic success in all courses at all levels of the curriculum
- Fostering faculty/student interactions and providing student access to instructor
- Advising and mentoring of students
- Commitment to students and their personal and academic growth
- Promoting student success in all aspects of teaching

Contributions to the Curriculum

- Willingness to teach in all levels of the curriculum appropriate to the faculty member's expertise
- Respect for general education, support, major and elective courses and willingness to contribute in each area
- Contributions to curriculum and pedagogy development

B. Scholarship

Faculty members are expected to initiate, develop, and maintain career-long programs of scholarly and creative activities. These programs should be effective in maintaining connection, involvement, excitement, and life-long learning in one's field(s). Collaborative efforts involving students, such as in undergraduate research, are especially valued as are collaborative pursuits with faculty colleagues within departments and interdisciplinary pursuits across the college and university.

Many forms of scholarship are valued including those presented in Boyer's Carnegie Foundation report, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. We value all four types of scholarship described by Boyer: Teaching, Discovery, Integration, and Application. It is recognized that professional pursuits change and evolve during a career and could involve more than one of the following:

- The Scholarship of Teaching: involves not only transmitting knowledge, but transforming, extending and disseminating it as well
- The Scholarship of Discovery involves research focused on contributing to the stock of human knowledge
- The Scholarship of Integration involves the work of interpreting, drawing together, and bringing new insight to original research
- The Scholarship of Application involves using knowledge and new research discoveries to solve problems

Scholarship programs are expected to demonstrate sustainability and external validation. External validation can take many forms including refereed publications and books, invited and competitively accepted papers/presentations, national or regional publication of educational materials such as textbooks and software, and receipt of patents. Other activities that may contribute to faculty professional development and lead to external validation of scholarship include applying for competitive grants, receipt of competitive grants, membership on appointed science advisory councils or editorial boards, significant leadership activities in professional societies, and productive collaborations with the public or private sector.

Normally, peer reviewed scholarly publication is required for tenure and promotion.

C. Service and University Citizenship

An engaged and committed faculty is essential to the strength and vitality of the university community. All faculty members are expected to engage in meaningful service activities in a way that emphasizes active involvement, achievement, and leadership. Service can be at the department, college, and university level and career or discipline related service in the community.

It is important for all faculty members to participate in service at the department level and be active participants in department affairs including governance, decision-making, and committee work, all of which are essential to the strength and development of the department and the personal growth and success of students, the staff, and members of the faculty. Every faculty member should make meaningful contributions in service to the department throughout their careers.

Expectations in service increase with experience and rank. Tenured associate and full professors are expected to contribute periodically at the college and university levels and exhibit increasing levels of leadership and accomplishment.

Faculty members are expected to become respected university citizens and involved members of the campus community who participate in activities such as seminars and colloquia, academic orientation and advising of students, fall conference, commencement, functions of student clubs and honor societies, and other important events at the department, college, and university levels. University citizenship also assumes collegial consideration of different points of view, diversity, and inclusivity.

Service to the community beyond Cal Poly is also of significant value. Linking the expertise of faculty and students to our broader community builds the reputation of our institution, creates professional opportunities for students, and more fully realizes the potential of the academy to do good for our society. Service in this capacity can take on many forms including serving on non-profit boards, government advisory committees and panels, agency proposal review committees, the editorial boards of scholarly journals, and by communicating science to the public (e.g., public lectures and events).

II. Special Considerations for Evaluation of School of Education Faculty

The School of Education (SOE) differs from departments within the College of Science and Mathematics (CSM) in a number of ways. It is the only professional school within the university, and its student population consists exclusively of post-baccalaureate and graduate students. Also, unlike other CSM departments that are accountable to the university, the SOE is also directly accountable to and governed by external agencies. This dual accountability requires SOE faculty to respond to initiatives from the CSM and the university, the California Department of Education (CDE), the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC), and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

A. Teaching

When assessing SOE faculty teaching performance, several unique characteristics of their work should be considered, including:

- SOE faculty members prepare courses for and instruct post-baccalaureate and graduate students.
- SOE faculty members teach, supervise, and evaluate students engaged in field work assignments. These supervision duties are a regular part of faculty instructional performance and involve recruiting supervising teachers for student teaching candidates and interns, and supervising students over a large region requiring significant travel time.
- SOE faculty members routinely engage in the creation and administration of unique agency-required assessments (e.g. CDE, CCTC and NCATE requirements); these duties are a regular part of faculty instructional performance.
- Unlike most undergraduate courses where quizzes and examinations are a regular part of the assessment of student performance, SOE faculty normally use a system of formative and summative assessments that consider students' field work, projects, examinations, and reports. Tests and quizzes are not primary methods of assessment in the SOE.

The grading scale commonly applied for SOE students differs from the traditional undergraduate model (A-F). All SOE students are post-baccalaureate and graduate students who are pre-selected using rigorous standards and required to maintain a 3.0 GPA. Because most do student teaching or internships in area classrooms, a high level of preparation is required and non-performing students are not allowed to continue. As a result, the more commonly applied grade scale for SOE students is: A A- B+ B B- CR/NC (a grade of B or higher is required to award a student a CR grade).

Special Considerations for Evaluation of School of Education Faculty

B. Scholarship

The School of Education applies the scholarship standards as described in the College of Science and Mathematics personnel document.

C. Service and University Citizenship

Because of the unique nature of each program within the SOE, Program Coordinator activities should be valued as necessary unit-level service and weighed more heavily than membership on departmental or university committees. SOE Program Coordinators are responsible for the range of departmental-level functions such as student recruitment, admission, advisement, field placements and supervision, academic program review, and assessments mandated by CDE, CCTC, NCATE.

Chapter 3

Appointment of Tenure Track Faculty Members

I. Appointment of Tenure Track Faculty Members

The College of Science and Mathematics will recruit faculty members who have the potential to be outstanding and dedicated teachers and scholars and who demonstrate talent, currency, and creativity in their fields. A commitment to students and student learning and success is critical. Also important are the willingness to share expertise in service functions at the university and in the community, the ability to interact thoughtfully and successfully with a diverse university community, and the potential to attain tenure and promotion in a timely manner.

Cal Poly and the College of Science and Mathematics are committed to the development of a diverse faculty, staff, and student body. In recruiting for tenure track faculty members, efforts will be made to attract a diverse applicant pool.

A Ph.D. in the discipline or a closely related discipline is the required educational background for appointment except in unusual cases. A terminal degree of like level (such as an MD) may be considered.

The departments will devise development programs for each new faculty member that include mentoring, assistance in initiating a program of scholarship, and assignment of a teaching schedule designed to promote the development of an outstanding instructor.

Authorizations for tenure-track recruitments and appointments are made by the dean after consultation with the appropriate faculty units and the provost. Recruitment announcements will be written to require applicants to submit: letter of application, completion of the Cal Poly Applicant Information form, professional CV, statement on teaching philosophy and interests, statement on scholarship and proposed scholarly activities, statement of diversity and inclusion, and letters of recommendation.

II. Procedure for Evaluation of Tenure Track Candidates

- **Election of a Peer Review Search Committee:** The entire tenured and tenure track faculty is normally expected to participate in recruitment of tenure track faculty members and is thus expected to be on the peer review search committee. Participation by probationary faculty, however, requires approval by the dean.

Each department or equivalent unit shall elect a peer review search committee of tenured employees for the purpose of reviewing and recommending individuals for probationary appointments. [CBA article 12.22].

- **Selection of a Screening Committee:** A screening committee can be selected from the elected committee for the purpose of selecting semifinalists to be considered for subsequent interviews.
- **Selection of Semifinalists for Telephone or Video Interviews:** Any members of the elected committee can become involved in the selection of those for telephone or video interviews if they agree to read the applications of the semi-finalists and participate in discussions. Telephone or video interviews are strongly encouraged.

- **Selection of Finalists:** Telephone or video interviews may be conducted to determine finalists for on-campus interviews. Any member of the elected Peer Review Committee can participate in determining the finalists for on-campus interviews if they agree to read the applications and participate in the telephone or video interviews.
- **On-Campus Interviews:** Finalists will be invited for on-campus interviews. A comprehensive program that may include an agenda of seminars, classroom presentations, interviews by committees, visitation with faculty members, and meetings with students will constitute the interview. The interview should be robust and designed to glean impressions of potential teaching effectiveness, ability to develop a sustainable program of scholarship capable of external validation, and the probability of sincere university citizenship. The interview also must provide the candidate with a view, vision, and information about the department, college, and university. Appropriate feedback by constituent groups is encouraged.
- **Recommendation of Candidate for Appointment:** It is expected that the entire elected committee will participate in this step and that each member will have reviewed the applications of the on-campus interview finalists and been involved in the interview process. Rankings (see chapter for ranking procedure) and voting by the entire committee should occur first. This is followed by a vote of the tenured faculty members on the committee to accept, reject or modify the determination of the entire committee. Both votes and rankings should be presented to the dean.
- **Action by the Dean:** The dean makes the offers of appointment. Ideally, communication among the recommending groups and the dean will result in a mutually agreeable decision.

The departments will devise development programs for each new faculty member that include mentoring, assistance in initiating a program of scholarship, and assignment of a teaching schedule designed to promote the development of an outstanding instructor.

III. Inter-Departmental or Inter-College Transfer of Tenured Faculty Members or Granting of Retreat Rights

Proposed transfers of faculty members between departments or colleges or granting of retreat rights will be considered on a case by case basis by the receiving department. The tenured faculty and department chair will make a recommendation to the dean. The dean will forward this recommendation with his/her own recommendation to the president for the final decision.

Chapter 4

Personnel Policies and Procedures for Periodic Review of Probationary Faculty Members and Evaluation of Probationary and Tenured Faculty Members for Retention, Promotion and Tenure

I. Evaluation Schedule for Retention, Promotion and Tenure

A. *Application for Promotion and Off-Schedule Personnel Actions:*

Faculty members who wish to be evaluated for promotion to full professor or early promotion to associate professor prior to tenure consideration, or for early tenure must notify the dean in writing (email is suitable) with a copy to the department chair by October 15 of the RPT cycle. A tenured assistant professor wishing promotion consideration must also apply in this manner by October 15. Early tenure and early promotion are considered only under extraordinary conditions of performance and achievement.

B. *Required Personnel Actions: Retention and Tenure of Probationary Faculty Members*

Retention and tenure evaluations are required as described in this section. Schedules and deadlines are announced each year by the university.

All probationary faculty members will undergo either a performance evaluation or periodic review each year. A periodic review will be conducted during the first full year of employment.

A performance evaluation is defined as an evaluation process that results in a personnel action such as retention, promotion or tenure. A periodic review is an evaluation process that does not result in a formal personnel decision, but that can be used to support future personnel decisions.

Probationary Faculty Members on a Six-Year Tenure Cycle:

Probationary faculty members in this category will receive an initial appointment of two years. They are expected to undergo performance evaluations in their 2nd, 4th, and 6th probationary years and periodic reviews in their 1st, 3rd, and 5th probationary years. Normally, the 2nd and 4th year performance evaluations are for retention consideration to the 3rd-4th and 5th-6th probationary years respectively but, alternatively, can be for only one additional probationary year. If retention is for one additional probationary year, a performance evaluation rather than periodic review will be required during that probationary year. The 6th year performance evaluation is for tenure consideration. Leaves may impact the scheduling of performance and periodic evaluations.

Initial appointment is for two probationary years.

Probationary Year Typical Schedule for Evaluations

1	Periodic review for guidance
2	Performance evaluation for retention to 3rd and 4th probationary years
3	Periodic review for guidance
4	Performance evaluation for retention to 5th and 6th probationary years
5	Periodic review for guidance
6	Performance evaluation for tenure consideration

Probationary Faculty Members on a Five-Year Tenure Cycle:

Probationary faculty members in this category will receive an initial appointment of two years with one year credit towards tenure; their first year will be designated as their 2nd probationary year. They are expected to undergo performance evaluation in their 3rd, 5th, and 6th probationary years and periodic review in their 2nd and 4th probationary years. Normally the 3rd year performance evaluation is for retention consideration to the 4th-5th probationary years but, alternatively can be to only the 4th probationary year. In the latter case, a performance evaluation rather than periodic review will be required during the 4th probationary year. The 6th year performance evaluation is for tenure consideration.

Initial appointment is for two probationary years with one year credit towards tenure.

Probationary Year Typical Schedule for Evaluations

- | | |
|---|--|
| 2 | Periodic review for guidance |
| 3 | Performance evaluation for retention to 4th and 5th probationary years |
| 4 | Periodic review for guidance |
| 5 | Performance evaluation for retention to a 6th probationary year |
| 6 | Performance evaluation for tenure consideration |

Probationary Faculty Members on a Four-Year Tenure Cycle:

Probationary faculty members in this category will receive an initial appointment of two years with two years credit towards tenure; their first year will be designated as their 3rd probationary year. During their first year (3rd probationary year) they will undergo periodic review. In the 4th and 5th probationary years they will be subject to performance evaluation for retention to an additional probationary year. The 6th year performance evaluation is for tenure consideration.

Initial appointment is for two probationary years with two years credit towards tenure.

Probationary Year Typical Schedule for Evaluations

- | | |
|---|---|
| 3 | Periodic review for guidance |
| 4 | Performance evaluation for retention to a 5th probationary year |
| 5 | Performance evaluation for retention to a 6th probationary year |
| 6 | Performance evaluation for tenure consideration |

Probationary Faculty Members Starting Winter or Spring Quarter:

Probationary faculty members in this category will receive an initial appointment for winter/spring or spring quarter plus two complete academic years (WS or S / FWS / FWS) which will be designated as the first two years of a six year probationary cycle.

Pursuant to the faculty unit contract and the College of Science and Mathematics Personnel Document, no evaluation will be conducted during the late start academic year. A periodic review will be conducted in their first full probationary year and a performance review during their second full academic year as part of our normal procedures for retention of tenure-track faculty members.

These faculty members are expected to undergo performance evaluations in their 2nd 4th and 6th probationary years and periodic reviews in their 1st, 3rd and 5th probationary years. Normally, the 2nd and 4th year performance evaluations are for retention consideration to the 3rd-4th and 5th-6th probationary years respectively but, alternatively, can be for only one additional probationary year. If retention is for one additional probationary year, a performance evaluation rather than periodic review will be required during that probationary year. The 6th year performance evaluation is for tenure consideration.

Initial appointment for winter/spring or spring quarter plus two complete academic years (WS or S / FWS / FWS); this seven or eight quarter period is designated as the first two years of a six year probationary cycle.

Probationary Year Type of Evaluation

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 | Winter or Spring Start: No Evaluation |
| 1 | Periodic review for guidance |
| 2 | Performance evaluation for retention to 3rd and 4th probationary years |
| 3 | Periodic review for guidance |
| 4 | Performance evaluation for retention to 5th and 6th probationary years |
| 5 | Periodic review for guidance |
| 6 | Performance evaluation for tenure consideration |

II. Periodic Review of Probationary Faculty Members

Periodic review is an opportunity to provide mentoring and guidance verbally and in writing to probationary faculty members. It is not a performance evaluation and does not result in a personnel decision.

A. Materials for Review

1. **First Periodic Review:** Probationary faculty members must check their Personnel Action File (PAF) for completeness and accuracy. They must prepare a Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) with the following materials:

- **Index of Materials**
- **Teaching Materials:** Course syllabus, exams and quizzes, and significant or representative prepared materials from each lecture and laboratory course during the first quarter(s) at Cal Poly
- **Grading Patterns:** Faculty members must begin the table tabulating grading patterns that will be required for each evaluation:

Summary table of grades assigned in all graded courses each quarter. See Appendix A, Part 1C for format. Graded courses or labs are to be reported in percents of A, B, C, D, F / WU, and W / I.

- **Student Evaluations:** Faculty members must begin the table tabulating student evaluations that will be required for each evaluation:

Summary table of student evaluations should include all courses. See Appendix A, Part 1D for format and chapter 9 for frequency and procedure. Numerical student evaluations are required for every lecture and lab section for the question “**Overall this instructor was educationally effective**”.

- **CV, Teaching and Scholarship Statements submitted with application materials for appointment:** It is not necessary to submit revised teaching and scholarship documents as evaluators will provide guidance for presentation of these for the first performance review.

2. **Subsequent Periodic Reviews of Probationary Faculty:** The faculty member will submit Part 1 of the Working Personnel Action file (described in the Appendix) from the previous year’s performance evaluation with the following modifications:

Part 1 of the Working Personnel Action File (Part 2 is not required for Periodic Reviews of probationary faculty members).

- **Index of Materials**
- **Updated CV**
- **Summary Table of Grades Assigned:** Faculty members must continue to update the table of grading patterns that is required for each review.

- **Summary Table of Student Evaluations:** Faculty members must continue to update the table of student evaluations that is required for each review.
- **Professional Plan:** Report progress on the professional plan for teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship.
- **Response:** Respond to any major concerns or suggestions from the previous performance review.

B. Levels of Review (for Periodic Review of Probationary Faculty Members)

Following are the responsibilities at each level of review. Results of subsequent levels of review may be forwarded to previous levels of review.

At each level the review will be provided to the candidate who will be given a 10 day response period [10 calendar days, excluding the first day and including the last, unless the last day is a holiday or weekend].

The committee will consider any responses received and may revise its review. The committee chair must inform the candidate of its action (or non-action). Any response or rebuttal statement shall be incorporated into the WPAF and will be available to all previous levels of review (*MOU 15.5*).

1. Department Peer Review Committee

The Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) for periodic review of probationary faculty members consists of at least three members of the tenured* faculty elected** by the probationary and tenured faculty.

*A tenured Associate Professor may serve on an Assistant Professor's periodic review PRC, even if the tenured Associate Professor is undergoing their 3rd year Associate Professor periodic review. They may not, however, serve on another Associate Professor's 3rd year periodic review, or on a full professor's post tenure review.

**The tenured and probationary faculty may vote on each eligible PRC member for each candidate, or on the PRC as a whole. The vote shall be determined by simple majority.

Committee members will review the Personnel Action File (this will contain the CV, teaching philosophy, and professional plan from the previous performance evaluation) and Working Personnel Action File (Part 1) and perform any other appropriate reviews such as classroom visitation.

Based on these reviews, the committee will produce a single document that provides evaluative and guidance comments that will be useful to the faculty member in pursuing the probationary years and preparing for the next performance evaluation. Guidance on the professional plan is an important part of the peer review.

The committee must give at least a five (5) day notice before classroom visitation of classroom and laboratory teaching for the purpose of evaluation of teaching effectiveness. There shall be consultation between faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits (15.14).

Entire DPRC must review PAF and WPAF and sign signature log in PAF. All DPRC members must sign the DPRC report or a minority report. The elected committee is not required to report to the tenured faculty at large.

2. Department Chair

The department chair will have the same responsibilities as the DPRC and provide additional evaluation and guidance statements from the chair's perspective or further explain or endorse the evaluation of the DPRCs.

3. Dean

The dean will have the same responsibilities as the DPRC and provide additional evaluation and guidance statements from the dean's perspective or further explain or endorse the reviews generated at the department level.

III. Performance Evaluation: Evaluation Procedures for Retention, Promotion and Tenure

A. Application for Personnel Action

See chapter 4, section I.A. Early tenure or early promotion is considered only under extraordinary conditions of performance and achievement.

B. Materials for Review: Personnel Action File and Working Personnel Action File

Candidates for retention, promotion or tenure will prepare materials for evaluation as described in this section.

1. Personnel Action File

The Personnel Action File (PAF) is the official employment record of a faculty member and is maintained in the dean's office. It generally contains:

- **Initial Appointment:** original appointment materials including CV, teaching and scholarship statements, and the letter of offer and acceptance.
- **Materials from Periodic Reviews and Performance Evaluations:** Generally this includes part 1 of the Working Personnel Action File (see Appendix A), written evaluations and recommendations from each level of review, and the document describing the final action (in the case of performance evaluations).
- **Student Evaluations:** numerical results as required by this document. Results of student evaluations are stored in electronic format and incorporated by extension into the Personnel Action File.

- **Other Significant Documents:** special and important documents of both a positive and negative nature.

The candidate may examine his/her Personnel Action File (PAF) for accuracy and completeness, and sign and date the log prior to the commencement of the review. Any required modifications should be requested of the dean well in advance of the time that the file is to be made available to evaluators. After the stated deadline, the file will be considered to be complete.

2. Working Personnel Action File (for Performance Evaluation)

The Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) is a special file used during a specific personnel action cycle. The candidate must develop a WPAF which contains materials important to the evaluation of the candidate for personnel action including:

Part 1 – Index of materials, current CV, summary table of grades assigned, summary table of student evaluation results, statement of teaching philosophy and approach, professional plan (for teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship), case for tenure and promotion (*if applicable*), and response to previous evaluations (if any significant suggestions, guidance or criticism appeared in previous evaluations, a response is important).

Part 2 – Supporting materials in teaching, scholarship, service, and university citizenship. A comprehensive outline for developing the Working Personnel Action File is presented in Appendix A.

Other materials may be requested by the dean in the memo initiating a personnel cycle.

The professional plan is an especially important part of the WPAF. Criteria for personnel action in the College of Science and Mathematics are purposefully general. They are applied to each faculty member via the faculty member's individual professional plan that is developed to demonstrate career-long commitment in teaching, scholarship with external validation, and active service, university citizenship and participation in the university community. The plan is evaluated as to whether or not it is an appropriate guide towards promotion and tenure and thus serves as the faculty member's own personalized set of criteria.

The WPAF will be submitted by the faculty candidate by the prescribed deadline and considered to be complete at that time. An index of materials contained in the file will be submitted with WPAF for eventual inclusion in the PAF. By this reference, the WPAF will be considered to be incorporated into the PAF. Materials, other than evaluation and related documents generated during the process, cannot be added to either file following the deadline except in unusual circumstances and with authorization by the CPRC. Such authorization may be based on information not accessible prior to the deadline.

Evaluation materials and recommendations generated at each level of review will be transmitted to subsequent levels via the WPAF.

C. Levels of Review (for Performance Evaluation)

Following are the responsibilities at each level of review. Results of subsequent levels of review may be made available to previous levels of review.

At each level of review the recommendation/response will be provided to the candidate who will be given a 10 day response period [10 calendar days, excluding the first day and including the last, unless the last day is a holiday or weekend].

The committee will consider any responses received and may revise its evaluation and recommendation. The committee chair must inform the candidate of its action (or non-action). Any response or rebuttal statement shall be incorporated into the WPAF and will be available to all previous levels of review (*MOU 15.5*).

In addition to their carefully documented recommendation, department PRCs, department chairs, college PRCs and the dean shall submit a ranking of those promotion applicants who were positively recommended at their respective level.

1. Department Peer Review Committee

The Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) for evaluating candidates for retention, promotion and tenure will be comprised of tenured faculty members elected* by probationary and tenured faculty members (MOU 15.41). For each promotion candidate the peer review committee members must have a higher rank than those being considered for promotion. Faculty members being considered for promotion may not serve on promotion or tenure PRCs but can serve on those for retention.

Generally all eligible faculty members are expected to participate on all department peer review committees unless not elected, cannot serve because of a conflict of interest (such as evaluation of a close relative), or, for other reasons, choose not to serve (for example, associate professors who may not feel comfortable making a retention or tenure recommendation on a full professor).

For retention and tenure reviews, DPRC members [and the department chair] must be full-time tenured faculty employees; they may be of any rank. For promotion reviews DPRC members [and the department chair] must have higher academic rank than those being considered for promotion.

* The tenured and probationary faculty may vote on each eligible DPRC member for each candidate, or on the DPRC as a whole. The vote shall be determined by simple majority.

The committee has the following responsibilities.

- a. Review of Submitted Materials:** Each committee member will carefully review the candidate's submitted materials and qualifications by examining the:

- **Personnel Action File** with emphasis on materials generated by levels of review subsequent to the DPRC in a previous year's personnel action and before, and the original appointment letter for expectations.
 - **Working Personnel Action File** including CV, summary table of grading patterns, summary table of student evaluations, statement of teaching philosophy and approach, case for tenure and promotion (if applicable), professional plan, responses to previous evaluations, and materials submitted for examination.
- b. Direct Observation of Teaching:** The committee will arrange for visitation of classroom and laboratory teaching of each candidate for the purpose of evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Committee must give at least a five (5) day notice of classroom visit and there shall be consultation between faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits. (15.14).
- c. Evaluation Responsibilities:** The committee will produce a single written performance evaluation for the candidate in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship which includes strengths, accomplishments, guidance, and suggestions for improvement. This report will also include evaluation of the professional plan. In producing evaluations, the criteria in chapter 2, section I must be considered and commented upon as appropriate. The evaluative statement should include the following:
- **Teaching:** In addition to other comments the committee chooses to include, the written evaluation should address the appropriateness of course content, organization, and level; course materials including the course syllabus; quality of presentation; quality, level, and appropriateness of exams and evaluation methods; comments on grade distributions; and comments on student evaluations.
 - **Scholarship:** Professional achievements should be evaluated and validated so that those in subsequent levels of review can understand the significance of the achievements.
 - **Service and University Citizenship:** Report and evaluate participation in department responsibilities. Evaluate contributions in terms of active involvement, achievement, leadership, and level of service (department, college, and university level). Comment on involvement in the campus community and participation in events important to the department, college, and university.

- **Review of the Professional Plan:** The committee will review and evaluate the professional plan in teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship and provide guidance as necessary.

For probationary faculty members working towards tenure, the committee will make a definitive statement as to whether the professional plan is appropriate for eventual achievement of tenure.

For the performance evaluation of a candidate for associate professor, the committee will provide evaluation and guidance on the submitted professional plan for eventual promotion to professor.

For the performance evaluation of a candidate for full professor, the committee will evaluate and provide guidance on the submitted professional plan in teaching, scholarship, and service and university citizenship from the standpoint of its demonstrated commitment to career-long teaching effectiveness, a productive program of scholarship capable of external validation, and a record of active service and participation in the university community. See Appendix A, Part 1F for details on the professional plan.

For each candidate for retention, promotion and tenure the DPRC will select a subcommittee to produce the written evaluation (it is permissible to use the same subcommittee for all candidates). It is the responsibility of the entire DPRC to ensure that the candidate's qualifications have been seriously considered. Entire DPRC must review PAF and WPAF and sign signature log in PAF. The subcommittee must provide a reliable and substantive process for gathering information and evaluative input from the DPRC prior to writing the evaluation. This can be accomplished by soliciting written comments (these will not become part of the WPAF or PAF) and/or by scheduling discussion meetings.

The subcommittee must produce a written evaluation for each candidate that can be supported by a majority of the DPRC. It is required that the DPRC meet as a group to discuss, propose changes, and approve the written evaluation. Minority reports are permissible from individuals or groups within the DPRC who do not agree with the committee report. All DPRC members must sign the DPRC report or a minority report.

Recommendation on Proposed Action: The DPRC must recommend for or against the proposed action by voting. The numerical results of the vote must be reported as for, against, or abstain. The votes of individual committee members are not reported. The DPRC will provide the committee evaluation and recommendation to each candidate for the required response period.

The committee will consider any responses received and may revise its evaluation and recommendation. The committee chair must inform the candidate of its action (or non-action). Any response or rebuttal statement shall be incorporated into the WPAF and will be available to all previous levels of review (*MOU 15.5*).

The final recommendations with the files will be forwarded to the next level of review, the department chair. The DPRC must rank candidates it positively recommends for promotion.

2. Department Chair

The department chair will oversee the entire department review process to ensure that required actions are accomplished according to schedule and in a fair and equitable manner.

The department chair is a separate level of review with responsibilities that are essentially the same as the DPRC. In addition to the materials submitted by the candidate, the department chair will consider the evaluation and recommendation of the DPRC and any responses by the candidate.

The campus "Faculty Personnel Actions – Cal Poly, SLO" document, approved 9/1/2009, stipulates 'Department Chairs must use Form AP109 (Faculty Evaluation Form) to evaluate faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure. Comments regarding student evaluations must be included in section 1 of AP109.'

The department chair will provide the evaluation/recommendation to each candidate for the required response period. The chair should share the recommendation with the DPRC during this response period if the evaluation/recommendation is substantially different. The chair will consider any responses received and may revise the evaluation and recommendation and inform the candidate of any action (or non-action). The final chair level evaluation/recommendation with the files will be forwarded to the next level of review. The department chair must rank candidates he/she positively recommends for promotion.

3. College Peer Review Committee

The College Peer Review Committee (CPRC) will evaluate and make recommendations on faculty members who are candidates for tenure and promotion. In fulfilling its functions the committee has the responsibility to determine whether evaluations at preceding levels by each department have been carried out responsibly and in accordance with college criteria (chapter 2, section I).

- a. **Election of the College Peer Review Committee:** The probationary and tenured faculty in each department will elect one tenured full professor to serve on the CPRC. The elected faculty members will not participate in any other levels of review in tenure or promotion actions, but can participate in reviews for retention.
- b. **Evaluation Responsibilities:** The CPRC will review the PAF and WPAF of each tenure and promotion candidate including evaluation and recommendation materials from previous levels of review and any responses and rebuttals received. Based on this review and considering the criteria stated in chapter 2, section I of this document and the previously submitted professional plans of the candidate, the committee will generate an evaluation statement for each candidate covering teaching, scholarship, service, and university citizenship.

- c. Evaluation of Professional Plans for the Future:** For the performance evaluation of a candidate for associate professor, the committee will provide evaluation and guidance on the submitted professional plan for eventual promotion to professor. For the performance evaluation of a candidate for full professor, the committee will evaluate and provide guidance on the submitted professional plan in teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship from the standpoint of its demonstrated commitment to career-long teaching effectiveness, a productive program of scholarship capable of external validation, and a record of active service and participation in the university community. See Appendix A, Part 1F for details on the professional plan.
- d. Recommendation:** The committee will recommend for or against the action under consideration and report the vote as for, against, or abstain. The votes of individual committee members are not reported. The committee will provide a written report with substantiating reasons. Written evaluations by individual committee members (minority report) are authorized in cases where agreement cannot be reached on the content of the committee report. CPRC members must sign the CPRC report or a minority report.

The CPRC will provide the evaluation/recommendation to the candidate for the required response period. The CPRC should share the evaluation/recommendation with previous levels of review during this response period if substantially different. The CPRC will consider any responses received and may revise its evaluation/recommendation. The committee chair must inform the candidate of its action (or non-action). Any response or rebuttal statement shall be incorporated into the WPAF and will be available to all previous levels of review (MOU 15.5).

The final evaluation with the files will be forwarded to the next level of review, the dean, with a ranking of those promotion applicants who were positively recommended by the CPRC (see chapter 5 for ranking procedures).

4. College Dean

The dean will prepare evaluations and recommendations on each candidate for retention, promotion and tenure after reviewing the Personnel Action File, Working Personnel Action File, and evaluations and recommendations from previous levels of review including any responses and rebuttals received. The dean's report will include evaluative statements regarding the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship and the candidate's professional plan. The dean will make a recommendation for or against the action under consideration.

For probationary faculty members working towards tenure, the dean will make a definitive statement as to whether the professional plan is appropriate for eventual achievement of tenure. For the performance evaluation of a candidate for associate professor, the dean will provide evaluation and guidance on the submitted professional plan for eventual promotion to professor. For the performance evaluation of a candidate for full professor, the dean will evaluate and provide guidance on the submitted professional plan in teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship from the standpoint of its demonstrated commitment to career-long teaching effectiveness, a productive program of scholarship capable of external validation, and a record of active service and university citizenship. See Appendix A, Part 1F for details on the professional plan.

The dean will provide the evaluation and recommendation to each candidate for the required response period. The dean should share the recommendation with previous levels of review during this response period if the evaluation/recommendation is substantially different. The dean will consider and act upon, as appropriate, any responses received and then forward the evaluations and recommendations with the files and all priority rankings to the next level, the Provost and Executive Vice-President for academic affairs and the President.

5. President and Provost

At the time of approval of this document, by university policy, the Provost makes decisions on Retention, Promotion and Tenure.

Chapter 5

College of Science and Mathematics Voting Procedure

for

Prioritizing Candidates for Appointment and Promotion

College of Science and Mathematics Voting Procedure for Prioritizing Candidates for Appointment and Promotion

I. Appointment

In tenure track recruitments, if there are multiple finalists for one position it is necessary to rank the finalists. Ranking must be done in a way that ensures integrity of the process. Preliminary categorizations such as “acceptable”, “maybe”, and “not acceptable” are permitted to simplify the final ranking process. Final rankings must be determined by the aggregate majority process as described in the following paragraph.

A ballot is conducted for the first position. If no one receives greater than 50% of the vote, the candidate(s) who are not part of an aggregate majority are eliminated and another ballot is taken on the remaining candidates. (An aggregate majority is the smallest set of candidates who together have over half of the votes, and each of whom has more votes than any individual not in the aggregate majority). The process is repeated until a candidate receives a majority vote. The second place is determined in a like manner and so on until all positions have been determined.

II. Promotion

In promotion actions a priority list is required. The aggregate majority method for ranking as described in this section is required for determining the priority order. If previous levels of review have prepared promotion priority lists, these will be considered as recommendations in preparing the promotion priority list. A candidate's personal ranking will be revealed to the candidate verbally upon request, with copies to the Working Personnel Action File only if the request is in writing and placement in the file is specifically requested.

Chapter 6

Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty Members

I. Periodic Review of Third Year Tenured Associate Professors

The purpose of this periodic review is to evaluate progress and provide mentoring to associate professors in their quest to achieve promotion to full professor.

When a faculty member is awarded tenure, it is with the expectation that the capability exists of meeting the requirements for full professor at some timely point during her or his career. Tenure expresses a belief in the future and the role of the tenured faculty in shaping it. Achieving tenure is an honor and privilege, an accomplishment of tremendous significance and with it come responsibilities and expectations of immense importance to the university. A full professor is an effective and respected teacher who has a sustainable, career-long, creative program of scholarship, and who demonstrates thoughtful leadership in issues of shared governance including personnel decisions, curriculum and pedagogy development, utilization of resources, and matters of student welfare and success.

Normally, tenured associate professors become eligible for consideration for promotion to full professor during their fifth year in rank. Early promotion is considered only under extraordinary conditions of performance and achievement. Tenured associate professors will be subject to periodic review during fall quarter of their third year in rank to review progress and performance on the proposed professional plan in teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship for promotion to full professor from the standpoint that it demonstrates commitment to career-long teaching effectiveness, a productive program of scholarship capable of external validation, and a record of active service and participation in the university community.

Tenured associate professors who do not achieve timely promotion to full professor must undergo post tenure periodic evaluation every five years using the procedure in section II of this chapter.

Candidates for retention, promotion or tenure will prepare materials for evaluation as described in this section.

A. Materials for Examination: Personnel Action and Working Personnel Action File

Personnel Action File: The personnel action file will be available after the faculty member has had the opportunity to check it for completeness and accuracy.

Working Personnel Action File: This file is to be initiated and submitted by the faculty member under review. It should contain materials described in Appendix A, Part 1, sections A through F, and H to include: Index of materials, current CV (distinguish new work as associate professor), summary table of grades assigned as associate professor, summary table of student evaluation results as associate professor, statement of teaching philosophy and approach, professional plan*, and any needed response to evaluation for promotion to associate professor. Selected materials from Part 2 of Appendix A should also be included. As a minimum, course materials from representative courses taught during the first two years as associate professor should be made available for examination.

* Revisit and update the professional plan you submitted with your tenure and promotion package. This plan should continue to propose activities and projected achievements during your years as associate professor that will guide you to promotion to full professor. Please refer to the guidance in Appendix A, section F.

B. Levels of Review:

Following are the responsibilities at each level of review. Results of subsequent levels of review may be forwarded to previous levels of review.

At each level of review the recommendation/response will be provided to the candidate who will be given a 10 day response period [10 calendar days, excluding the first day and including the last, unless the last day is a holiday or weekend]. Any response or rebuttal statement shall be incorporated into the WPAF and will be available to all previous levels of review (*MOU 15.5*).

Reviewers will consider any responses received and may revise their evaluation and recommendation. Reviewers must inform the candidate of their action (or non-action).

Department Peer Review Committee

The Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) for the periodic review of third year associate professors is composed of all eligible tenured full professors of the department elected by the tenured faculty. It is acceptable to have subcommittees (minimum three members) do an in-depth review of submitted materials (*the entire DPRC must review PAF and WPAF and sign signature log in PAF*) and write evaluative statements on the appropriateness of the professional plan and performance in teaching, scholarship (including opportunities for external validation), service and university citizenship for eventual promotion to full professor. All DPRC members must sign the DPRC report or a minority report. It is required that the findings and statements of these subcommittees are shared with the entire DPRC of full professors and that a discussion meeting be held for input, comment, and approval.

Department Chair

The department chair is a separate level of review with responsibilities identical to those of the DPRC.

Dean

The dean may make additional evaluative statements or endorse those of the previous levels of review.

II. Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty Members

This section is for tenured assistant, associate and full professors who have not been evaluated for five (5) years.

For third year associate professor periodic reviews, see section I of this chapter.

The purpose of periodic review of tenured faculty members is to ensure that the ideals and responsibilities of tenure are respected and faithfully pursued by each member of the tenured faculty, and to provide constructive feedback to assist tenured faculty members in fulfilling their responsibilities throughout their careers as described in the following statement:

Tenure is the most important of all personnel actions. It is an expression of confidence in a faculty member's intellect, creativity, initiative, work ethic, and career-long value to Cal Poly. It presumes a loyalty and responsibility on the part of the faculty member to the university, students, and curriculum. With tenure comes the expectation that a faculty member will, during his or her career, accomplish a body of work in teaching, scholarship, service and as a respected citizen of the university that is of recognizable value and importance and which constitutes a meaningful contribution to the mission of the university. Tenure expresses a belief in the future and the role of the tenured faculty in shaping it. Achieving tenure is an honor and privilege, an accomplishment of tremendous significance and with it come responsibilities and expectations of immense importance to the university.

A. Frequency of Evaluation

Tenured faculty members shall be subject to periodic review at least every five years*. The periodic review process will be replaced by a performance evaluation if the faculty member is being considered for promotion. Policies and procedures for performance evaluation are described in chapter 2, section I. Periodic reviews are performed to ensure maintenance and improvement of a tenured faculty member's effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship.

Faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) are not required to undergo post-tenure review unless requested by the FERP or appropriate administrator.

*Third year Associate Professor periodic review re-starts five (5) year count.

B. Materials for Evaluation: Personnel Action and Working Personnel Action File

Tenured faculty members subject to periodic evaluation will establish a Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) by submitting an updated and current CV, a personal statement which focuses on activities and accomplishments during the previous five years in teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship, and a professional plan that demonstrates commitment to career-long teaching effectiveness, a productive program of scholarship capable of

external validation, and a record of active service and participation in the university community including events important to the department, college, and university. In addition, a summary table of grading patterns and a summary table of student evaluations are to be submitted (see Appendix A, Part 1 C and D for format). The CV, personal statement, professional plan, grading summary table and student evaluation summary table will become part of the Personnel Action File at the end of the review. The faculty member should ensure that sufficient materials are available for a meaningful evaluation such as course materials from representative courses during the previous five years and examples of professional accomplishment (see Appendix A, Part 2 for guidance).

C. Levels of Review

Following are the responsibilities at each level of review. Results of subsequent levels of review may be provided to previous levels of review.

At each level of review the recommendation/response will be provided to the candidate who will be given a 10 day response period [10 calendar days, excluding the first day and including the last, unless the last day is a holiday or weekend].

Reviewers will consider any responses received and may revise their evaluation. Reviewers must inform the candidate of its action (or non-action). Any response or rebuttal statement shall be incorporated into the WPAF and will be available to all previous levels of review (*MOU 15.5*). The final evaluation with the files will be forwarded to the next level of review.

Department Peer Review Committee

The committee is composed of tenured full professors of the department elected by the tenured faculty. It is acceptable to have subcommittees do an in-depth review submitted materials and write evaluative statements, however, *the entire DPRC must review PAF and WPAF and sign signature log in PAF*. The evaluation should address performance in teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship and the appropriateness of the professional plan from the standpoint of its demonstrated commitment to career-long teaching effectiveness, a productive program of scholarship capable of external validation, and a record of active service, university citizenship and participation in the university community including events important to the department, college, and university. It is required that the findings and statements of these subcommittees be shared with the entire DPRC in a discussion meeting for input, comment, and approval. All DPRC members must sign the DPRC report or a minority report.

Department Chair

The department chair is a separate level of review with responsibilities identical to those of the DPRC.

Dean

The dean can make additional evaluative statements or endorse those of the previous levels of review.

Chapter 7

Criteria and Procedures for Appointment and Evaluation of Lecturers

I. Appointment of Lecturers

Lecturers are essential and valued members of the faculty of the College of Science and Mathematics. Teaching is the main responsibility of Lecturers and likewise the primary focus of annual evaluations. The professional responsibilities of all faculty members including Lecturers include scholarly activities which contribute to their currency and contributions to the classroom and profession. Teaching effectiveness, a firm understanding of the teaching and learning process and currency in the subject matter of teaching assignments are expected. Educational attainment and experience are considered in making appointments and teaching assignments.

Educational Preparation: Normally the following degrees relevant to the discipline are required for appointment:

Lecturer A: Bachelor's Degree or Master's Degree

Lecturer B: Ph.D. (or terminal degree appropriate to teaching in discipline in which appointed per CBA 31.16)

Lecturer C, D: Ph.D.

Assignment: Lecturers are generally appointed to teach. Course assignments are made based on the Lecturer's experience, background, and expertise. Lecturers can also be assigned to engage in scholarly activity, service and university citizenship. Assignments other than teaching will be specified in the appointment letter.

II. Criteria for Evaluation of Lecturers

Lecturers will be evaluated according to the category or categories (teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship) relevant to the assignment.

Expectations in all areas of evaluation increase with rank.

Continuous improvement in performance and currency in the discipline as described in the following paragraphs are critical criteria.

- **Teaching:** Lecturers must demonstrate evidence of sustainable excellence in teaching, currency in the discipline, ability to teach at appropriate levels of the curriculum and continuous improvement in performance.
 - **Excellence in Teaching:** Evidence includes strong student and peer evaluation profiles, high quality course syllabi and materials, appropriate use of technology, and appropriate levels of student learning and success. Excellence in teaching is characterized by a learning environment that fosters excitement and curiosity, critical and creative thinking, and intellectual stimulation and development. Course topics and materials should be current and challenging, appropriate in scope and level, and

show a thoughtful balance between theory and application. Academic standards consistent with the mission of the university are expected as is a classroom atmosphere and teaching approach that encourages student engagement and success.

- **Currency in the Discipline:** Evidence could include making significant contributions to the curriculum such as incorporating current topics and relevant material into courses, engaging students with innovative pedagogies, and developing new and modern laboratory experiences. Currency can also be established by presenting at educational conferences and workshops, publication of textbooks and other educational materials, or publishing in peer reviewed education journals.
- **Ability to Teach at Appropriate Levels of the Curriculum:** Lecturers in Range A are normally expected to teach at the lower levels of the curriculum. Lecturers in Ranges B, C, and D are expected to have the expertise to increasingly teach more fully in the curriculum including upper division lecture and laboratory courses.
- **Continuous Improvement in Performance:** Increasing excellence in teaching, currency in the discipline, and ability to teach at appropriate levels of the curriculum are expected.
- **Scholarship:** Lecturers are normally employed to support the teaching function of the college. A documented and continuing program of scholarship with external validation though desirable is not normally required. In some cases, lecturers can be appointed to a position that includes teaching and scholarship. In these cases, evaluation involves both teaching and scholarship. Success in scholarship is normally demonstrated by external validation. Scholarship programs are expected to demonstrate sustainability and external validation. External validation can take many forms including refereed publications and books, invited and competitively accepted papers/presentations, national or regional publication of educational materials such as textbooks and software, and receipt of patents. Other activities that may contribute to faculty professional development and lead to external validation of scholarship include applying for competitive grants, receipt of competitive grants, membership on appointed science advisory councils or editorial boards, significant leadership activities in professional societies, and productive collaborations with the public or private sector.
- **Service and University Citizenship:** Active and productive service strengthens a Lecturer's case for appointment but is not normally required unless specified in the appointment.

Additional evaluative criteria for the above categories that may be of use to lecturers are described in chapter 2.

III. Policies and Procedures for Periodic Evaluation of Part-Time and Full-Time Lecturers

Student Teacher Supervisors: See Section IV for WPAF Guidance

A. Criteria

Lecturers will be evaluated according to the category or categories (teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship) relevant to the assignment. See section II of this chapter for criteria guidance.

B. Frequency of Evaluation

- Full-time and part-time lecturers appointed for the entire academic year, including CBA 12.3 entitled appointments, must be evaluated annually.
- Full-time and part-time lecturers (without academic year entitlement) teaching only one or two quarters in an academic year, must be evaluated the first year and, at a minimum, at least every three years thereafter. The lecturer, department chair or dean may request more frequent reviews.
- Cumulative Evaluation for 12.12 and 12.13 Eligible Lecturers (per CBA articles 12.12 and 12.13):

Sixth Year Evaluation: Full-time and part-time lecturers who have taught two or more quarters per academic year, for six consecutive years, will be evaluated during the sixth year [using criteria and procedures in section V of this chapter].

Third Year Evaluation: Full-time and part-time lecturers holding three year appointments (per *MOU Article 12.13*) must be evaluated in the third year of their three-year appointment [using criteria and procedures in section V of this chapter]; lecturers holding a three year appointment may be evaluated more frequently at the request of the employee or President (or Dean as designee).

C. Materials for Evaluation

Lecturers should inspect the Personnel Action File (PAF) for completeness and accuracy before the evaluation process begins.

Lecturers will develop a Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) that will serve to characterize the teaching responsibilities of the faculty member.

The Working Personnel Action File shall include:

- **Index of Materials**

- **Current CV:** The CV should be organized according to original education preparation, previous experience, and activities and accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service as appropriate. See Appendix A, Part 1B for guidance.
- **Grading Patterns:** Summary table of grades assigned in all courses taught. For continuing Lecturers, an on-going table should be kept and included for the time in employment or, for long term Lecturers, at least the previous five years. See Appendix A, Part 1C for format.
- **Student Evaluations:** Summary table of student evaluations for all courses evaluated during the evaluation period. For continuing Lecturers, an on-going table should be kept and included for the time in employment or, for long term Lecturers, at least the previous five years. See Appendix A, Part 1D for format and chapter 9 for frequency and procedure
- **Teaching Philosophy**
- **Course Materials for Examination:** For courses that characterize the Lecturer's teaching assignments, submit course materials including course syllabi, handouts, and exams. See Appendix A, Part 2A for guidance.
- **Other Materials:** If relevant, materials that characterize activities in scholarship and service should be submitted. See Appendix A, Part 2 B-D for guidance.
- **Response to Previous Evaluations**

D. Levels of Review

Following are the responsibilities at each level of review. Results of subsequent levels of review may be provided to previous levels of review.

At each level of review the evaluation/recommendation will be provided to the candidate who will be given a 10 day response period [10 calendar days, excluding the first day and including the last, unless the last day is a holiday or weekend].

Evaluators will consider any responses received and may revise their evaluation/recommendation. Evaluators must inform the candidate of action (or non-action).

Any response or rebuttal statement shall be incorporated into the WPAF and will be available to all previous levels of review (*MOU 15.5*). The final evaluation and file will be forwarded to the next level of review.

Department Peer Review Committee

Department peer review committee (DPRC) participation is required in the evaluation of full-time, full-year lecturers; it is optional with part-time lecturers, although the opportunity must be provided for peer input (by full-time tenured faculty members). It is required for all lecturers eligible for a three-year appointment (based on articles 12.12 or 12.13 of the faculty unit contract) in the academic year preceding the issuance of a three-year appointment (see criteria and procedures in section V of this chapter).

The DPRC is composed of tenured faculty members elected by the probationary and tenured faculty. It is recommended that the committee be three tenured faculty members with the opportunity for input from the tenured faculty.

The DPRC will prepare a written evaluation (using the format in section III.E of this chapter) based on PAF and WPAF and any other appropriate reviews. The *entire DPRC must review the PAF and WPAF, sign signature log in the PAF, and sign the DPRC report or a minority report.*

Department Chair

The department chair will participate in evaluations of lecturers. The chair can be the sole departmental evaluator for part-time lecturers except in the academic year preceding the issuance of a three-year appointment (see section V of this chapter).

When a peer evaluation is not required, full-time tenured faculty should be given the opportunity to provide evaluative statements which must be written and signed.

The department chair will review the PAF and WPAF and perform any other appropriate reviews such as classroom visitation and interview of the candidate. Based on this review, the department chair will write an evaluative statement (using the format in section V of this chapter) or endorse the statement of the peer review committee.

Assistance with Department Chair Level Reviews

Departments Chairs may select tenured faculty who have been elected to the broader DPRC to assist with the review of lecturers for whom a DPRC is not required. The assistance may include a classroom visit and report, and/or additional input which must include review of the PAF and submitted materials in the WPAF. Faculty member(s) providing input should be identified in the evaluation.

Alternatively, the department chair may identify one or more members of the elected broader DPRC to assist in preparing an evaluation for review, modification and signature by the department chair, or to provide a separate level of review. If a separate level of review is conducted, the procedures described in this section under *Department Peer Review Committee* sub heading must be followed.

Dean

The dean can make additional evaluative statements or endorse those of the previous levels of review.

E. Evaluation Format

Evaluators should use the following format for evaluation of Lecturers and provide statements under each of the following categories that validate the appropriateness of materials and performance, or provide guidance for needed improvement. The format is devised to provide efficient and effective evaluation and guidance.

- Comments on Course Syllabus and Course Materials
- Comments on Grading Schemes and Grade Assignments
- Comments on Course Content and Level, and Level/Difficulty of Exams
- Analysis of Student Evaluation Results
- Comments on Teaching Performance
- Other Comments as Applicable (such as scholarship, professional accomplishments and service and university citizenship)

IV. Policies and Procedures for Periodic Evaluation of Student Teacher Supervisors

The evaluation of Clinical Practice Supervisors (also referred to as University Supervisors) will follow CSM procedures for each type of part-time lecturer review as defined in this document. The working personnel action file (WPAF) materials to be provided by Clinical Practice Supervisors differ slightly and are defined below. The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) requires that Clinical Practice Supervisors be systematically evaluated and demonstrate competency against the following criteria: Current knowledge of the content; Knowledge of current context of public schooling; Knowledge of diversity in society; and Demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning. According to our CTC Accreditation, the School of Education can only hire and employ Clinical Practice Supervisors that demonstrate these qualifications and maintain current knowledge of these areas and skills.

A. Required WPAF Materials for Clinical Practice Student Teacher Supervisor Reviews:

Clinical Practice Supervisors will develop a Working Personnel Action File that will serve to characterize the work and associated responsibilities of Clinical Practice supervision. The Clinical Practice Supervisors' Working Personnel Action File shall include:

- **Index of Materials**
- **Current CV:** The CV should include education and professional preparation, previous experience, and activities and accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service as appropriate. See Appendix A, Part 1B for guidance.

- **Mentoring Philosophy Statement:** Clinical Practice Supervisors should submit a one-page mentoring philosophy statement, which explains your thinking regarding the mentoring and evaluation of teacher candidates. The purpose of mentoring teacher candidates is to support their development as educators while in the field. Describe how you, as a supervisor, enable teacher candidates to set and achieve goals, make decisions and solve problems.
- **Evidence of Mentoring:** A log of School Site Visits indicating all visits made to observe each candidate should be included. Supervisors should also include examples of class observations, quarterly reflections, and examples of feedback or advice offered to student teachers. Samples or records of communications with District Employed Supervisors (DES). Evidence of timely submission of Clinical Practice observation documents.
- **Evidence of Professional Development Activities:** CTC Accreditation requires that Clinical Practice Supervisors demonstrate ongoing professional development in four areas: (1) Current knowledge of the content; (2) Knowledge of current context of public schooling; (3) Knowledge of diversity in society; and (4) Demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning. Supervisors should include evidence of commitment to ongoing professional development activities in these four areas. Examples of professional development activities include, but are not limited to: participation in workshops, attendance at panels and events, reflecting on professional readings, engaging in online independent learning, attendance at conferences, or attendance at local education related events.
- **Evidence of Service Activities:** Examples of service include, but are not limited to, participating in SOE committees, leading professional development workshops (i.e., Co-Teach), and/or organizing events for SOE or Cal Poly (i.e., credential celebrations, fundraisers, community related educational events).
- **Response to Previous Evaluations**

B. Additional items required in the WPAF for the Cumulative Review or Lecturer Range Elevation Review of Clinical Practice Supervisors:

- **Case for Three Year Appointment or Case for Range Elevation:** It is important to prepare a well-organized case for a three-year appointment or for range elevation (as appropriate to review) that demonstrates growth and achievement consistent with the category or categories relevant to the assignment.
- **Professional Plan:** A professional plan must be presented that describes future plans for growth and continuous improvement as well as sustainability of effort and contribution. Professional Plans should address ongoing professional development in the four areas identified by CTC: (1) Current knowledge of the content; (2) Knowledge of current context of public schooling; (3) Knowledge of diversity in

society; and (4) Demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning.

- **Other Materials:** Materials that characterize activities in professional development, service and university citizenship should be submitted as appropriate. See Appendix A, Part 2 B-D for guidance.

V. Cumulative Evaluation for 12.12 and 12.13 Eligible Lecturers: Criteria and Procedures

Student Teacher Supervisors: See Section IV for WPAF Guidance

A. Evaluation Criteria:

Lecturers will be evaluated according to the category or categories (teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship) relevant to the assignment. See section II of this chapter for criteria guidance.

B. Frequency of Evaluation

Lecturers eligible for a three-year appointment (based on articles 12.12 or 12.13 of the faculty unit contract) must be evaluated in the academic year preceding the issuance of a three-year appointment.

Article 12.12 Temporary faculty unit employees (excluding coaches) employed during the prior academic year and possessing six (6) or more years of prior consecutive service on that campus shall be offered a three-year temporary appointment following an evaluation conducted pursuant to provisions 15.20(d) and 15.28, where there is a determination by the appropriate administrator that a temporary faculty unit employee has performed the duties of his/her position in a satisfactory manner; and absent documented serious conduct problems.

Article 12.13 Temporary faculty (excluding coaches) holding three-year appointments shall be reappointed to a subsequent three-year appointment following an evaluation conducted pursuant to provisions 15.20(d) and 15.29, where there is a determination by the appropriate administrator that a temporary faculty unit employee has performed the duties of his/her position in a satisfactory manner; and absent documented serious conduct problems.

C. Materials for Submission

Lecturers should inspect the Personnel Action File for completeness and accuracy before the evaluation process begins.

The Working Personnel Action file for cumulative evaluation of lecturers eligible for a three-year appointment should include materials reflecting activities completed during employment at Cal Poly and specifically during the qualifying period* for a three-year appointment based on articles 12.12 and 12.13.

* Qualifying period for an **initial** three-year appointment is the six year period including the current evaluation year and previous five years.

* Qualifying period for a **subsequent** three-year appointment is the current three year appointment period.

- **Index of Materials**
- **Current CV:** See Appendix A, Part 1B for guidance. The CV should be organized according to original education preparation, previous experience, and activities and accomplishments in teaching, (and scholarship and service as appropriate). The CV should be specific, include dates, and emphasize activities completed during employment at Cal Poly and specifically during the period within the qualifying period for a 12.12 or 12.13 three-year appointment.
- **Grading Patterns:** Summary table of grades assigned in all courses each quarter during the current range (or at least the previous five years and the current year). See Appendix A, Part 1C for format.
- **Student Evaluations:** Summary table of student evaluations should include all years (or at least the previous five years and the current year). See Appendix A, Part 1D for format and chapter 9 for frequency and procedure.
- **Teaching Philosophy**
- **Course Materials for Examination:** For courses that characterize the Lecturer's teaching assignments, submit course materials including course syllabi, handouts, and exams. See Appendix A, Part 2A for guidance.
- **Case for Three Year Appointment:** It is important to prepare a well-organized case for a three-year appointment that demonstrates growth and achievement consistent with the **category or categories (teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship)** relevant to the assignment.
- **Professional Plan:** A professional plan must be presented that describes future plans for growth and continuous improvement as well as sustainability of effort and contribution.
- **Other Materials:** Materials that characterize activities in scholarship, **service** and **university citizenship** should be submitted as appropriate. See Appendix A, Part 2 B-D for guidance.
- **Response to Previous Evaluations**

Evaluation Process

Following are the responsibilities at each level of review. Results of subsequent levels of review may be forwarded to previous levels of review.

At each level of review the evaluation will be provided to the candidate who will be given a 10 day response period [10 calendar days, excluding the first day and including the last, unless the last day is a holiday or weekend].

Any response or rebuttal statement shall be incorporated into the WPAF and will be available to all previous levels of review (*MOU 15.5*). Evaluators will consider any responses received and may revise evaluation. Evaluators must inform the candidate of action or non-action.

The final evaluation with the files will be forwarded to the next level of review.

D. Levels of Review

All levels of review must use the AP109-L Lecturer Evaluation Form

Department Peer Review Committee

The Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) will be comprised of tenured faculty members elected by *probationary* and *tenured* faculty members. Generally all eligible faculty members are expected to participate on all department peer review committees unless not elected, cannot serve because of a conflict of interest (such as evaluation of a close relative) or for other appropriate reasons.

Department Peer Review Committee has the following responsibilities:

- a. **Review of Submitted Materials:** Each committee member will carefully review the candidate's submitted materials and qualifications by examining:
 - **Personnel Action File:** Review with emphasis on subsequent levels of review in previous evaluation cycles. Each member must sign the signature log in the PAF.
 - **Working Personnel Action File:** Review CV, summary table of grading patterns, summary table of student evaluations, teaching philosophy, course materials submitted for examination, case for advancement and professional plan, and other materials submitted.
- b. **Direct Observation of Teaching:** The committee will arrange for and ensure visitation of classroom and laboratory teaching of each candidate for the purpose of evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Committee must give at least a five (5) day notice of classroom visit and there shall be consultation between faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits (15.14).
- c. **Recommendation on Proposed Action:** For each candidate, the DPRC may select a subcommittee to produce the written evaluation (it is permissible to use the same subcommittee for all candidates). It is the responsibility of the entire DPRC to ensure that the candidate's qualifications have been seriously considered and to review and sign the signature logs in the personnel action file. The subcommittee must provide a reliable and substantive process for gathering information and evaluative input from the DPRC prior to writing the evaluation. This can be accomplished by soliciting written comments (these will not become part of the Working Personnel Action File or Personnel Action File) and/or by scheduling discussion meetings.

The subcommittee must produce a written evaluation for each candidate that can be supported by a majority of the DPRC. Minority reports are permissible from individuals or groups within the DPRC who do not agree with the committee report. All DPRC members must sign the DPRC report or a minority report.

The DPRC does not rate the lecturer using the "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory" ratings, nor recommend for or against a three-year appointment, but must use the 1-4 ratings on the AP109-L.

The DPRC will provide the committee evaluation to each candidate for the required response period.

The committee will consider any responses received and may revise its evaluation. The committee chair must inform the candidate of its action (or non-action). Any response or rebuttal statement shall be incorporated into the WPAF and will be available to all previous levels of review (*MOU 15.5*).

The final evaluation with the files will be forwarded to the next level of review, the department chair.

Department Chair

The department chair will oversee the entire department review process to ensure that required actions are accomplished according to schedule and in a fair and equitable manner.

The department chair is a separate level of review with responsibilities that are essentially the same as the DPRC. In addition to the materials submitted by the candidate, the department chair will consider the evaluation of the DPRC and any responses by the candidate.

The Department Chair does not rate the lecturer using the “Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory” ratings, nor recommend for or against a three-year appointment, but must use the 1-4 ratings on the AP109-L.

The department chair will provide the evaluation to each candidate for the required response period. The chair should share the evaluation with the DPRC during this response period if evaluation is substantially different.

The chair will consider any responses received and inform the candidate of any action (or non-action).

The final chair level evaluation with the files will be forwarded to the next level of review.

College Peer Review Committee

For lecturers eligible for an initial three-year appointment the cumulative sixth year evaluation will include review by the College Peer Review Committee (CPRC). The CPRC is not involved in subsequent three-year appointment cumulative reviews.

- a. Election of the College Peer Review Committee:** Normally this is the same CPRC elected for tenure and promotion cases in an academic year. The probationary and tenured faculty in each department will elect one tenured full professor to serve on the CPRC. The elected members of the CPRC will not participate in cumulative lecturer reviews at the department level.

- b. Evaluation Responsibilities:** The CPRC will review the PAF and WPAF of each candidate eligible for an initial three-year appointment, including evaluation materials forwarded from previous levels of review and any responses and rebuttals submitted by the candidates. All members must sign the signature log in the PAF. Based on this review, the committee will generate an evaluation for each candidate.
- c. Recommendation:** The committee will not rate the lecturer using the “Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory” ratings, nor recommend for or against a three-year appointment, but must use the 1-4 ratings on the AP109-L. Evaluations by individual committee members are authorized in cases where agreement cannot be reached on the content of the committee report. All CPRC members must sign the CPRC report or a minority report.

The CPRC will provide the committee evaluation to each candidate for the required response period. The committee should share the evaluation with previous levels of review during this response period if the evaluation is substantially different. The committee will consider any responses received and may revise its evaluation. The committee chair must inform the candidate of its action or non-action.

The final evaluation and files will be forwarded to the next level of review, the dean.

College Dean

The dean will make a determination of "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory" with a statement of rationale after reviewing the Personnel Action File, Working Personnel Action File, and evaluations from previous levels of review including any responses and rebuttals received. The dean will provide the evaluation to each candidate for the required response period. The dean should share the evaluation with previous levels of review during this response period if the evaluation is substantially different. The dean will consider and act upon, as appropriate, any responses received and either confirm or modify the evaluation.

VI. Lecturer Range Elevation

[Student Teacher Supervisors: See Section IV for WPAF Guidance]

A. Eligibility and Application

Lecturer range elevation eligibility is established by the California State University (CSU) and the California Faculty Association (CFA – Unit 3) and current information, along with the process and timelines, is stated in the Academic Personnel Range Elevation Eligibility Guidelines document.

B. Criteria for Evaluation

Lecturers will be evaluated according to the category or categories (teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship) relevant to the assignment. See section II of this chapter for criteria guidance.

C. Materials for Submission

Lecturers should inspect the Personnel Action File for completeness and accuracy before the evaluation process begins.

The Working Personnel Action file for lecturers being evaluated for Lecturer Range Elevation should include materials reflecting activities completed during employment at Cal Poly and specifically during the period within the current lecturer range.

- **Index of Materials**
- **Current CV:** See Appendix A, Part 1B for guidance. The CV should be organized according to original education preparation, previous experience, and activities and accomplishments in teaching, (and scholarship and service and university citizenship as appropriate). The CV should be specific, include dates, and emphasize activities completed during employment at Cal Poly and specifically during the period within the current lecturer range.
- **Grading Patterns:** Summary table of grades assigned in all courses each quarter (or for at least the period within the current lecturer range). See Appendix A, Part 1C for format.
- **Student Evaluations:** Summary table of student evaluations should include all years (or at least the period within the current lecturer range). See Appendix A, Part 1D for format and chapter 9 for frequency and procedure.
- **Teaching Philosophy**
- **Course Materials for Examination:** For courses that characterize the Lecturer's teaching assignments, submit course materials including course syllabi, handouts, and exams. See Appendix A, Part 2A for guidance.
- **Case for Lecturer Range Elevation:** It is important to prepare a well-organized case for range elevation that demonstrates growth and achievement consistent with the category or categories (teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship) relevant to the assignment.
- **Professional Plan:** A professional plan must be presented that describes future plans for growth and continuous improvement as well as sustainability of effort and contribution.
- **Other Materials:** Materials that characterize activities in scholarship and service should be submitted as appropriate. See Appendix A, Part 2 B-D for guidance.
- **Response to Previous Evaluations**

Evaluation Process

Following are the responsibilities at each level of review. Results of subsequent levels of review may be provided to previous levels of review.

At each level of review the recommendation/response will be provided to the candidate who will be given a 10 day response period [10 calendar days, excluding the first day and including the last, unless the last day is a holiday or weekend]. Any response or rebuttal statement shall be incorporated into the WPAF and will be available to all previous levels of review (MOU 15.5).

D. Levels of Review

Department Peer Review Committee

The Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) will be comprised of tenured faculty members elected by *probationary* and *tenured* faculty members. Generally all eligible faculty members are expected to participate on all Lecturer Range Elevation DPRCs unless not elected, cannot serve because of a conflict of interest (such as evaluation of a close relative), or, for other appropriate reasons.

The Department Peer Review Committee has the following responsibilities:

- a. **Review of Submitted Materials:** Each committee member will carefully review the candidate's submitted materials and qualifications by examining the:
 - **Personnel Action File:** Emphasis on subsequent levels of review in previous personnel cycles. Each member must sign the signature log in the PAF.
 - **Working Personnel Action File:** CV, summary table of grading patterns, summary table of student evaluations, teaching philosophy, course materials submitted for examination, case for advancement, professional plan, and other materials submitted.
- b. **Direct Observation of Teaching:** The committee will arrange for and ensure visitation of classroom and laboratory teaching of each candidate for the purpose of evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Committee must give at least a five (5) day notice of classroom visit and there shall be consultation between faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits. (15.14).
- c. **Recommendation on Proposed Action:**

For each candidate, the DPRC may select a subcommittee to produce the written evaluation (it is permissible to use the same subcommittee for all candidates). It is the responsibility of the entire DPRC to ensure that the candidate's qualifications have been seriously considered and to review the PAF and WPAF, and sign signature log in the PAF.

The subcommittee must provide a reliable and substantive process for gathering information and evaluative input from the DPRC prior to writing the evaluation. This can be accomplished by soliciting written comments (these will not become part of the Working Personnel Action File or Personnel Action File) and/or by scheduling discussion meetings.

The subcommittee must produce a written evaluation for each candidate that can be supported by a majority of the DPRC. Minority reports are permissible from individuals or groups within the DPRC who do not agree with the committee report. All DPRC members must sign the DPRC report or a minority report.

The DPRC must recommend for or against range elevation by voting. The numerical results of the vote must be reported as for, against, or abstain. The votes of individual committee members are not reported.

The DPRC will provide the committee evaluation and recommendation to each candidate for the required response period.

The committee will consider any responses received and may revise its evaluation and recommendation. The committee chair must inform the candidate of its action (or non-action). Any response or rebuttal statement shall be incorporated into the WPAF and will be available to all previous levels of review (*MOU 15.5*).

The final recommendations with the files will be forwarded to the next level of review, the department chair.

Department Chair

The department chair will oversee the entire department review process to ensure that required actions are accomplished according to schedule and in a fair and equitable manner.

The department chair is a separate level of review with responsibilities that are essentially the same as the DPRC. In addition to the materials submitted by the candidate, the department chair will consider the evaluation and recommendation of the DPRC and any responses by the candidate.

The department chair will provide the evaluation/recommendation to each candidate for the required response period. The chair should share the recommendation with the DPRC during this response period if the evaluation/recommendation is substantially different. The chair will consider any responses received and may revise the evaluation and recommendation and report any action (or non-action).

The final chair level recommendations with the files will be forwarded to the next level of review.

College Peer Review Committee

- a. **Election of the College Peer Review Committee:** Normally this is the same CPRC elected for tenure and promotion cases in an academic year. The probationary and tenured faculty in each department will elect one tenured full professor to serve on the CPRC. The elected members of the CPRC will not participate in Lecturer Range Elevation reviews at the department level.
- b. **Evaluation Responsibilities:** The CPRC will review the PAF and WPAF of each candidate including evaluation and recommendation materials forwarded from previous levels of review and any responses and rebuttals received. All members must sign the signature log in the PAF. Based on this review, the committee will generate an evaluation statement for each candidate.
- c. **Recommendation:** The committee will recommend for or against lecturer range elevation and report the vote as for, against, or abstain. The votes of individual committee members are not reported. Written minority reports (evaluations) by individual committee members are authorized in cases where agreement cannot be reached on the content of the committee report. All CPRC members must sign the CPRC report or a minority report.

The CPRC will provide the evaluation/ recommendation to the candidate for the required response period. The CPRC should share the recommendation with previous levels of review during this response period if evaluation/recommendation is substantially different.

The committee will consider any responses received and may revise its evaluation and recommendation. The committee chair must inform the candidate of its action (or non-action). Any response or rebuttal statement shall be incorporated into the WPAF and will be available to all previous levels of review (MOU 15.5).

The final evaluation with the files will be forwarded to the next level of review, the dean.

College Dean

The dean will make a determination to grant or deny Lecturer Range Elevation with a statement of rationale after reviewing the PAF, WPAF, and evaluations and recommendations from previous levels of review, including any responses and rebuttals received. The dean will provide the determination and evaluation to the candidate for the required response period. The dean should share the recommendation with previous levels of review during this response period if evaluation/recommendation is substantially different. The dean will consider and act upon, as appropriate, any responses received and either confirm or modify the determination or evaluation.

Chapter 8

Appointment and Evaluation of Teaching Associates

I. Appointment and Evaluation of Teaching Associates

A. Appointment

Appointment of Graduate Teaching Associates will be made by the dean based on recommendations by the department chair. Recommendations and appointments will be made of graduate students who are determined to have the interest, knowledge, and potential ability to be good instructors.

B. Training and Mentoring Program

Departments will provide a required training program for Graduate Teaching Associates which will be completed prior to commencement of teaching duties. Among topics to be covered are course content, preparation of a course syllabus, teaching methods and techniques, course assignments and exams, grading and evaluation, grading procedures and patterns, and other academic content and delivery issues. For Teaching Associates with laboratory assignments, safety issues will be carefully covered. Proper relationships with students will also be a required topic. Teaching Associates will be assigned a faculty member or course coordinator who will serve as a monitor, consultant, and mentor. The Teaching Associate and mentor/coordinator will meet weekly (the meetings can be less frequent for experienced Teaching Associates).

C. Evaluation

Periodic evaluations of Teaching Associates [TA] are performed by the department chair (or designee) and are based on classroom performance, course materials including course syllabus and exams, grading patterns, and student evaluations which must be performed in every course, every term. Informal inspection and evaluation using the materials described above are normally expected each term.

Formal written evaluations will be provided annually for submission to the dean. Evaluation material is normally due from the TA by the end of the fourth week of the quarter in which evaluations are conducted.

Within 14 days of appointment period the department or hiring unit shall communicate, in writing, evaluation criteria, schedule and procedures for written employment evaluations. [CSU-UAW CBA Art. 8.2]

A draft evaluation will be provided for review five (5) days before being placed in the personnel action file. Upon request, the TA will be provided the opportunity to meet with an appropriate administrator to discuss the draft evaluation. If a meeting is requested, it shall take place within ten (10) days of the request. Following the meeting, the administrator shall consider all information provided by the TA concerning the relevancy and accuracy of the employment evaluation prior to making a final decision to place the final evaluation in the file. If a TA disagrees with the content of the final evaluation, they may within 14 days of receipt of the evaluation submit a rebuttal statement that shall be attached to the evaluation. A copy will be provided to the TA within 5 days after placement in personnel file (CSU-UAW CBA Article 8.D).

The College of Science and Mathematics Personnel Policies, Procedures and Evaluation Criteria are available on the college website at:

www.cosam.calpoly.edu/content/cosam_docs

Chapter 9

Student Evaluation of Teaching

I. Student Evaluation of Teaching

A. Requirement

The Academic Senate requires that student evaluations include university-wide questions and the opportunity for students to provide written comments on teaching and course effectiveness" (AS-759-13). Required university wide questions:

- a. Overall, this instructor was educationally effective
- b. Overall, this course was educationally effective

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

B. General Criteria

Student evaluations are required for all classes taught by each faculty unit employee except for the following:

- a. **Courses with low enrollment** (fewer than five students) such as individual senior projects and independent study.*

***Clinical Practice Seminars:** Exception to allow University Supervisors to be evaluated although enrollments are below five.

- b. **Capstone senior project classes** will be evaluated if there are more than 5 students enrolled.
- c. **Individually supervised senior projects** will not have student evaluations.
- d. **Cooperative Education courses** that do not include direct instruction shall not be evaluated using the student evaluation process. Academic departments or the Career Services Office may use a survey to evaluate the students' co-op experience, but this is not part of the student evaluation process.
- e. **Team-taught classes:** In situations when classes are team-taught, the instructor of record (IOR) shall conduct student evaluations. If there is more than one IOR, copies of the evaluation results shall be incorporated in each instructor's personnel files by extension; evaluation results will indicate the course was team-taught. A faculty member who team-teaches a course and believes the results are not representative of his/her contributions to the course may request that the dean not include the results associated with the team-taught course in his/her PAF. After reviewing this request, the dean has the

discretion to determine if the student evaluation results of the team-taught course shall be placed in the instructor's file.

C. Timing

Evaluations for courses occur during the last week of instruction as defined by the official academic calendar.

D. Placement in Personnel Action File

Results of student evaluations are stored in electronic format and incorporated by extension into the PAF. The dean is the custodian of the PAF and provides secure access information. [Any student communications or evaluations provided outside regular evaluation process must be identified by name to be included in the PAF ([MOU 15.17b](#)). Such communications or evaluations may be included in the WPAF as informational only items.

Chapter 10

Professional Leaves with Pay

I. Professional Leaves with Pay

A. Application

Applicants for professional leaves with pay, either sabbatical or difference in pay leaves, should prepare the application using appropriate university forms, with consideration of the guidelines for professional leave applications presented in this section, and with submission by announced deadlines.

A. Department Review

A professional leave committee of tenured faculty members will be elected by the probationary and tenured faculty. Applicants for professional leaves cannot serve on the committee. The committee will recommend for or against the leave based on the quality of proposal. The department chair makes a recommendation for or against the leave based on the ability of the department to offer the curriculum and meet student needs in the absence of the faculty member. If the department chair is a professional leave applicant, the department committee will make this judgment.

C. College Professional Leave Committee

The probationary and tenured faculty members of each department will elect a representative to the College Professional Leave Committee (CPLC). Applicants for professional leaves cannot serve on the committee. The CPLC will review the applications for sabbatical and difference in pay leaves, interview the applicants, recommend for or against each based on quality of proposals, and rank order the recommended applications. Applicants should be recommended to the dean in categories such as recommend enthusiastically, recommend, recommend with reservations, not recommended.

D. Decision

The dean recommends candidates to the provost who makes the final decision.

E. Guidelines for Professional Leave Applications

The foremost consideration for any professional leave is its potential benefit to the university.

Leaves with pay are intended to provide a benefit to the university through research, scholarly and creative activity, instructional improvement, or faculty retraining. Lower priority will be given to leaves for other purposes unless the applicant can demonstrate significant potential benefits to the university or show a significant relationship of the activities to research or scholarship.

Proposals will be reviewed on scholarly merit and potential benefit to the university. The proposal should show thoroughness of planning and clearly present the following information:

- A detailed description of the proposed plan including a justification of the time requested.

- Supporting documentation from sponsors or hosts for the applicant or the proposed project.
- Statement of benefit which will accrue to the university, to the applicant's scholarship and/or to students.
- Applicant's background in relation to the project.
- Urgency of the proposed leave in relation to the university's program or mission.

In the case of all other considerations being equal, the review committees may consider other factors including: weighing the benefits of collaborations, giving preference to applicants with fewer or no professional leaves and giving preference to projects that can lead to continued and sustainable increase in collaboration, research, scholarly or creative activity. Preference will be given to applications that appear to have a high probability of completion.

Appendix A

Working Personnel Action File

Appendix A: Working Personnel Action File

Outline for Faculty Members Preparing Working Personnel Action Files

PART 1: Index of Materials, CV, Summary Table of Grades Assigned, Summary Table of Student Evaluation Results, Statement of Teaching Philosophy and Approach, Professional Plan, Case for Tenure/Promotion / Three-Year Appointment / Lecturer Range Elevation, Response to Previous Evaluations.

A. Index of Materials

B. Curriculum Vitae (CV): Please provide a full professional CV using the following outline, distinguishing work accomplished prior to appointment at Cal Poly from Cal Poly accomplishments, beginning with most recent.

1. **Educational Preparation: higher education since high school**
2. **Employment: since Ph.D. unless prior employment is relevant**
3. **Teaching Related Activities:**
 - Courses taught (prefix, number, title, quarters)
 - Honors/Awards
 - Special contributions to the curriculum, course coordination
 - Undergraduate research and senior projects (list grants, presentations, publications in the next section “Scholarship”)

4. **Scholarship:**

- a. **Publications:** Publications: List under “Publications” only those actually published, in press, or accepted for publication. Under each compose a short description that unambiguously addresses the following:
 - **Date of Work:** Distinguish work done at Cal Poly from work done prior to arrival at Cal Poly. For example, a publication from a Ph.D. dissertation based solely on work done at the graduate institution but dated in the journal subsequent to arrival at Cal Poly should not be attributed to work done at Cal Poly. A publication that is from prior work but with significant enhancement at Cal Poly can be listed as work at Cal Poly with proper explanation. For associate professors being considered for promotion to professor, it is important to indicate accomplishments resulting from work performed since promotion to associate professor. For example, a paper accepted for publication while an assistant professor but with a publication date after promotion to associate professor should not be counted as an accomplishment while in rank of associate professor. However, any manuscript submission (and subsequent acceptance for publication) that occurs after a faculty member has submitted materials for promotion would be used in consideration for their next promotional step.
 - **Journal:** Briefly describe type of journal (affiliation, peer-reviewed, etc.)
 - **Authors:** Clearly identify Cal Poly student co-authors and indicate whether they are graduate or undergraduate students, and the major. Identify other co-authors (title, institution, relationship) and the extent of collaboration. Describe your role in the work.
- b. **Manuscripts:** List manuscripts in the categories of “Manuscripts Submitted” (indicate journal and date of submission) or “Manuscripts In-Preparation” (indicated projected date for submission).
- c. **Educational Materials:** This section is for textbooks and other educational materials. Provide date of publication and publisher. If textbook is under contract but not yet published, indicate the expected date of publication.
- d. **Project and Technical Reports:** Reports on work done for a company, government agency, or professional laboratory should be listed in this category.
- e. **Articles:** This category should contain non-refereed articles.
- f. **Patents:** Clearly identify collaborators and indicate whether they are graduate or undergraduate students, and the major. Identify other collaborators (title, institution, relationship) and the extent of collaboration. Describe your role in the work. Refer to <https://research.calpoly.edu/policyIP> for campus policy on intellectual property.

g. Presentations

External Presentations:

- **Date of Work:** Distinguish work presented from that done at Cal Poly as opposed to work completed prior to arrival at Cal Poly. Similarly, distinguish work done as assistant professor from that done as associate professor (see guidelines under publications).
- **Type:** Distinguish among talks, posters, and symposia.
- **Professional Meeting:** Indicate the venue of the presentation such as national or regional professional society meeting, invited or refereed, presentation at another university, and date.
- **Presenter(s):** When listing a presentation with multiple authors, indicate who actually did the presentation, identify the co-authors, and especially identify Cal Poly students and indicate whether they are undergraduate or graduate and the major.
- **Proceedings and Abstracts:** A pre-conference abstract probably should not be listed as a publication. A substantial and refereed article in a conference proceedings publication might qualify as a publication.
- **Short Courses and Workshops:** Give title or description of the workshop, whether on- or off-campus, and if the presentation is to a mostly external constituency. Provide dates, location, and approximate number of participants.

Cal Poly Presentations:

On-campus professional presentations to members of the campus community should be listed but done so separately. Examples would be department seminars and student presentations of research you mentored at the CSM Student Research Conference. Guest lecturers in Cal Poly classes generally would not be listed.

Community Presentations:

A community presentation related to your discipline and expertise should be listed here.

h. Grants and Contracts

- External: List each grant or contract separately and identify the date, purpose, source, and amount. Describe your role: PI, researcher, and relative proportion of the grant in which you participated or are participating either by giving a percentage or by description, such as ‘a majority’ or ‘shared between 4 colleagues’ so that reviewers at all levels will be able to determine your contribution. Identify other PI’s/participants. Are Cal Poly students involved? Distinguish graduate and undergraduate and give names and majors.
- Grant Applications: List external grant applications and submission dates that were not funded on which you were a PI or co-PI.
- Internal: List internal grants received such as the State Faculty Support Grants.

i. Consulting Activities

j. **Professional Honors and Leadership Activities:** Please list and describe awards from professional organizations and leadership activities such as officer in a professional society or journal editor.

k. **Other:** Please list any other important activities that are part of your accomplishments under scholarship.

5. **Service and University Citizenship:** This is the primary documentation of service. Arrange as best describes your contributions. A common organization uses the headings of department, college, university, professional, community. Please include evidence of university citizenship such as attending/organizing seminars and colloquia, academic orientation and advising of students, fall conference, commencement, functions of student clubs and honor societies, and other important events at the department, college, and university levels.

C. Summary Table of Grades Assigned: Please develop and keep up to date annually a summary table for the entire period in rank for graded courses and labs in which you were responsible for assigning student grades for official student transcripts. Grades should be reported in percent in the following format. Reporting course gpa is optional. Sample table below:

Quarter/Year	Student Count	%	%	%	%	%	%
		A	B	C	D	F/WU	W/I
Course (prefix and #)	##	#	#	#	#	#	#

D. Summary Table of Student Evaluation Results: Please develop and keep up to date annually a summary table for the entire period in rank of student evaluation scores. Please report by year and quarter and by course/lab (prefix and number; be sure to distinguish lab from lecture/studio courses). Report the score (indicate point base; all departments are 5.00) for the overall instructor rating (Academic Senate required question: “**Overall, this instructor was educationally effective**”).

Sample table below:

<i>Quarter/Year</i>	<i>Course Prefix</i>	<i>Course #</i>	<i>Lec / Lab</i>	<i>Over-all Instructor Academically Effective Rating (# point scale)</i>	<i># Students Participating</i>
---------------------	----------------------	-----------------	------------------	--	---------------------------------

E. Statement of Teaching Philosophy and Approach: In this essay, describe the role you have established for yourself in teaching, guiding students in the learning process, and promoting student success.

F. Professional Plan:

1. Required Professional Plans:

A professional plan is required for the following personnel actions:

- **Probationary faculty members being considered for retention:** The plan should propose activities and achievements leading to tenure. The best time to first present this plan is early the second year during the first performance evaluation for retention. It is reasonable to consult with tenured colleagues in preparing the plan. It is important to put together a strong plan to gain approval since professional plans cannot be practically approved during the following year’s periodic review.
- **Probationary faculty members up for periodic review:** Submitted materials should have the professional plan from the previous performance evaluation for retention. However, since periodic review doesn’t involve the entire tenured faculty and does not involve the provost, gaining approval is not possible.
- **Probationary faculty members being considered for tenure and promotion to associate professor:** The plan should propose future activities and achievements leading to timely promotion to full professor (plan should be for five years).The professional plan should demonstrate sustainability of effort and continued growth and achievement in the future.

- **Probationary faculty members being considered for tenure and promotion to full professor:** The plan should propose future activities and achievements (plan should be for five years). The professional plan should demonstrate sustainability of effort and continued growth and achievement in the future.
- **Probationary faculty members being considered for early promotion to associate professor before tenure:** The plan should propose future activities and achievements leading to timely promotion to full professor (plan should be for five years). The professional plan should demonstrate sustainability of effort and continued growth and achievement in the future.
- **Periodic Review during Third Year as Associate Professor:** Revisit and update the professional plan you submitted with your tenure and promotion package. This plan should continue to propose activities and projected achievements during your years as associate professor that will guide you to promotion to full professor.
- **Tenured associate professors being considered for promotion to full professor:** The plan should propose future activities and achievements beyond full professor (plan should be for five years). The professional plan should demonstrate sustainability of effort and continued growth and achievement in the future.
- **Lecturers being considered for three year appointment:** The plan should describe future plans for growth and continuous improvement as well as sustainability of effort and contribution. A case for a three year appointment is also required; see chapter 7, section C.
- **Lecturers being considered for range elevation:** The plan should describe future plans for growth and continuous improvement as well as sustainability of effort and contribution. A case for range elevation is also required; see chapter 7, section C.
- **Tenured faculty undergoing post tenure review:** A professional plan that demonstrates commitment to career-long teaching effectiveness, a productive program of scholarship capable of external validation, and a record of active service and participation in the university community including events important to the department, college, and university.

2. Description of the Professional Plan

Applicable for all plans, including plans for the future required for faculty being considered for tenure and/or promotion:

The professional plan is an especially important part of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). Criteria for personnel action in the College of Science and

Mathematics are purposefully general. They are applied to each faculty member via the faculty member's individual professional plan that is developed to demonstrate career-long commitment in teaching, scholarship with external validation, active service and university citizenship. An approved plan is a faculty member's own personalized set of criteria for tenure and promotion and thus provides security as one pursues such goals. The plan may undergo change as long as the final achievements are reasonably comparable to those proposed and previously approved and/or clearly appropriate for tenure or promotion.

In the professional plan the faculty member should propose significant achievements in the areas of evaluation: teaching, scholarship, and service and university citizenship. Teaching, scholarship and university citizenship should be the emphasis for assistant professors with the expectation of increasing levels of service for associate and full professors.

If you are being considered for promotion to associate professor, write a professional plan leading to promotion to full professor. If you are being considered for promotion to full professor, or you are a full professor being considered for tenure, write a professional plan for the first five years following the advancement. Guidelines for expressing a professional plan follow:

Professional plans should be presented in two sections:

Section 1 of Professional Plan: One page (or two)

This section concisely lists proposed achievements for tenure and/or promotion in teaching, scholarship, and service and university citizenship. The prospective achievements should be described with reasonable specificity for a diverse audience, but need not be fully explained. This part will be read by many evaluators at all levels, some without expertise in the discipline (for example, the College Peer Review Committee (CPRC) has representatives from each department and the School of Education).

Here are some examples:

Teaching

- Teach introductory course sequence X,Y, Z.
- Teach upper division courses T, U, and V.
- Professional growth in teaching by attending (suggest meetings, workshops), consulting with colleagues, etc.
- Develop/improve lab experiments for course C.
- Join committee to study content (amount/level) and student success in first year course sequence.
- Contribution to the curriculum.

Scholarship

Using a Research Example: Each research project should be described with a title and one to two short sentences and the journal(s) likely to be targeted for eventual publication including a possible title. This is followed by a brief description of how the achievement will be pursued such as establishing a student research group, seeking grant support, and involving students and the faculty member in presentations at professional meetings. The plan can include a timeline but this is not necessary. Following is an example. This should be done for each distinct research proposal.

Determination of the Influence of AB on YZ

Possible journal: The Journal of Alphabetical Influences

Possible title: Influence of AB on YZ under the Conditions of TUV

Short Paragraph (include a couple of sentences here describing the research as much as possible for a diverse audience).

Brief outline of plan for pursuit of the achievement such as:

- Establish a student research group and/or collaboration with colleagues.
- Seek internal and/or external grant funding throughout from the following proposed granting agencies.
- Involve students in the College of Science and Mathematics Student Research Conference.
- Student/faculty presentations at regional and/or national professional meeting.
- Publication.

Service and University Citizenship

(This particular example is more focused on assistant professors; associate and full professors would add examples to these that enhance level of service.)

- Attend commencement and Fall Conference each year.
- Serve on department committee (give name)
- Become academic advisor
- Participate in Summer Advising and Academic Day of Week of Welcome.
- Participate in New Student Day of Open House.

Section 2 of Professional Plan: (Multiple pages okay)

In section 2, you can elaborate on your proposed achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service. This is important as the department peer review committee needs to fully understand the pursuits and be able to validate them as worthy and reasonable. This does not have to be written for a diverse audience and should be more complete than what is described in section 1.

G. Case for Tenure / Promotion / Three Year Appointment / Lecturer Range Elevation

Description of the Case for Tenure/Promotion: It is important to prepare a well-organized case for tenure and/or promotion in teaching, scholarship, and service and university citizenship. The case should demonstrate growth and achievement in rank.

Description of the Case for Three-Year Appointment: It is important to prepare a well-organized case for a three-year appointment that demonstrates growth and achievement consistent with the category or categories (teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship) relevant to the assignment.

Description of the Case for Advancement (Lecturer Range Elevation): It is important to prepare a well-organized case for range elevation that demonstrates growth and achievement consistent with the category or categories (teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship) relevant to the assignment.

Achievements: Usually one or two pages.

This section of the case concisely lists achievements under the headings of teaching, scholarship, and service/university citizenship. The achievements should be described with reasonable specificity, but need not be fully explained. Organize so the achievements are obvious and not lost in verbiage explaining the activity. This part will be read by many evaluators at all levels, some without expertise in the discipline.

Teaching: List major achievements such as courses taught, contributions to the curriculum, and professional growth in teaching.

Scholarship: *Using research as an example.* List manuscripts accepted or published with journals, co-authors (and who they are), your role, date of publication. Provide the same type of information with grants (including amount), presentations and other activities. It is okay to list manuscripts submitted (not necessary) but not in preparation as they will be part of your plan for the future. See other parts of this appendix for more information on expressing professional achievements.

Service and University Citizenship: List significant examples of service (with dates and role) and university citizenship such as attendance at commencement, fall conference and other important university, college and department events.

H. Response to Previous Evaluations: A response should be made to a significant suggestion, statement of guidance, or criticism that was made in the previous year's evaluation cycle.

PART 2: Materials for Examination in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service/University Citizenship.

A. Teaching:

Retention Candidates: For each different lecture, studio, or laboratory course taught in the previous two years, submit a complete set of materials, specifically: syllabus including grading scheme, quizzes, and all exams including the final exam. If there are other materials you think would be useful to examiners that you would like to present, such as sample handouts, representative power points, description of website etc. please do include these. In addition, please submit the materials for courses taught in previous years that differ from those of the past probationary year; use the most recent example only.

Tenure, Tenure and Promotion, or Promotion Only Candidates: For those up for tenure or promotion, please submit the above materials for teaching assignments representative of your service in rank or for the previous five years (for example, you should have examples from every course taught; if you have taught multiple sections of a course, submit materials for only a single experience, preferably the most recent).

B. Scholarship: Please submit examples of achievements as practical and appropriate. For example, copies of publications are usually helpful. Submitting a textbook is cumbersome; alternatively, a copy of the cover and a short section like the introduction or preface may give evaluators an idea of the work. Complete grant applications are not necessary but the introductory or summary statement is helpful.

C. Service and University Citizenship: If there is something significant you would like to share that supports the entries in Part 1, please do so.

Appendix B

Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) Composition, Election and Duties Tables

Appendix B: Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) Composition, Election and Responsibilities

Summary Tables of DPRC Sections of the CSM Personnel Document

A. Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty Reviews

Review Type	DPRC Composition	Elected by	Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) Responsibilities
General Periodic Review of Probationary Faculty	<p>At least 3 tenured faculty members</p> <p>Faculty members being considered for promotion can serve on DPRCs for retention.</p> <p>*A tenured associate professor may serve on an assistant professor's periodic review DPRC, even if undergoing their 3rd year associate professor periodic review. They may <u>not</u>, however, serve on another associate professor's 3rd year periodic review, or on a full professor's post tenure review.</p>	<p>Probationary & Tenured faculty (MOU 15.41)</p> <p>May vote on each eligible PRC member for each candidate, or on PRC as a whole.</p> <p>Vote shall be determined by simple majority.</p>	<p>Purpose of general periodic review: Provide mentoring and guidance verbally and in writing to probationary faculty members. Not a performance evaluation; does not result in a personnel decision.</p> <p>Committee members will review Personnel Action File (will contain CV, teaching philosophy, and professional plan from previous performance evaluation) and Working Personnel Action File (Part 1) and perform any other appropriate reviews.</p> <p>When PRCs conduct visitation of classroom and laboratory teaching for the purpose of evaluation of teaching effectiveness, committee must give at least a five (5) day notice of classroom visit and there shall be consultation between faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits. (15.14).</p> <p>Based on these reviews, produce single document that provides evaluative and guidance comments useful in pursuing probationary years and preparing for next performance evaluation. Guidance on professional plan is important part of peer review.</p> <p>Entire DPRC must review PAF and WPAF and sign signature log in PAF. All DPRC members must sign DPRC report or a minority report.</p> <p>Elected committee not required to report to tenured faculty at large.</p>

Review Type	DPRC Composition	Elected by	Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) Responsibilities
<p>Performance Evaluation: Retention, Promotion and Tenure</p>	<p>Tenured faculty members.</p> <p>For each <u>promotion</u> candidate, DPRC members must have <u>higher rank than candidates</u> being considered for <u>promotion</u>.</p> <p>Faculty members being considered for promotion may not serve on promotion or tenure DPRCs (<i>MOU 15.43</i>) but can serve on those for retention.</p> <p>Generally all eligible faculty members expected to participate on all DPRCs unless not elected, conflict of interest (e.g. close relative), or, for other reasons, choose not to serve (e.g., associate professors not comfortable making retention or tenure recommendation on full professor).</p> <p>For retention and tenure reviews, DPRC members [and department chair] must be full-time tenured faculty employees; may be of any rank.</p> <p>For promotion reviews PRC members [and department chair] must have higher academic rank than those being considered.</p>	<p>Probationary & Tenured faculty (<i>MOU 15.41</i>)</p> <p>* May vote on each eligible DPRC member for each candidate, or on DPRC as a whole. Vote may be determined by simple majority.</p>	<p>Purpose of general performance review: Evaluate and make recommendation for candidates for retention, promotion and/or tenure.</p> <p>Review Submitted Materials: Each DPRC member must carefully review candidate's submitted materials & qualifications by examining:</p> <p>Personnel Action File with emphasis on materials generated by levels of review subsequent to DPRC in previous year's personnel action and before, and original appointment letter for expectations.</p> <p>Working Personnel Action File including CV, summary table of grading patterns, summary table of student evaluations, statement of teaching philosophy and approach, case for tenure and promotion (if applicable), professional plan, responses to previous evaluations, and materials submitted for examination.</p> <p>Direct Observation of Teaching: Committee arranged visitation of classroom and laboratory teaching for evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Committee must give at least a five (5) day notice of classroom visit and there shall be consultation between faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits. (15.14).</p> <p>Evaluation Responsibilities: Committee produces single written performance evaluation in areas of teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship which includes strengths, accomplishments, guidance, and suggestions for improvement. Evaluation will include evaluation of professional plan. In producing evaluations, criteria in chapter 2, section I must be considered and commented upon as appropriate. Evaluative statement should include:</p> <p>Teaching: In addition to other comments committee chooses to include, written evaluation should address appropriateness of course content, organization, and level; course materials including</p>

Review Type	DPRC Composition	Elected by	Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) Responsibilities
<i>Performance Evaluation: Retention, Promotion and Tenure (continued)</i>			<p>course syllabus; quality of presentation; quality, level, and appropriateness of exams and evaluation methods; comments on grade distributions; and comments on student evaluations.</p> <p>Scholarship: Professional achievements evaluated and validated so subsequent levels of review can understand significance of achievements.</p> <p>Service and University Citizenship: Report and evaluate participation in department responsibilities. Evaluate contributions in terms of active involvement, achievement, leadership, and level of service (department, college, and university level). Comment on involvement in campus community, and participation in events important to department, college, and university.</p> <p>Review Professional Plan: review and evaluate professional plan in teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship, and provide guidance.</p> <p>For probationary faculty members working towards tenure, make definitive statement as to whether professional plan is appropriate for eventual achievement of tenure.</p> <p>For performance evaluation of candidate for associate professor, provide evaluation and guidance on submitted professional plan for eventual promotion to professor.</p> <p>For performance evaluation of candidate for full professor, evaluate and provide guidance on submitted professional plan in teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship from standpoint of its demonstrated commitment to career-long teaching effectiveness, a productive program of scholarship capable of external validation, and a record of active service and participation in university community. See Appendix A, Part 1F for details on professional plan.</p> <p>For each candidate for retention, promotion and tenure, DPRC will select a sub-committee to produce</p>

Review Type	DPRC Composition	Elected by	Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) Responsibilities
<i>Performance Evaluation: Retention, Promotion and Tenure (continued)</i>			<p>written evaluation (permissible to use same subcommittee for all candidates).</p> <p>Responsibility of entire DPRC: ensure candidate qualifications have been seriously considered; entire DPRC must review PAF and WPAF, and sign signature log in PAF.</p> <p>Subcommittee must provide reliable and substantive process for gathering information and evaluative input from DPRC prior to writing evaluation (can be accomplished by soliciting written comments however these will not become part of WPAF or PAF), and/or by scheduling discussion meetings.</p> <p>Subcommittee must produce written evaluation for each candidate that can be supported by majority of DPRC. Required that DPRC meet as group to discuss, propose changes, and approve written evaluation. Minority reports permissible from individuals or groups within DPRC who do not agree with committee report. All DPRC members must sign the DPRC report or a minority report.</p> <p>Recommendation on Proposed Action: DPRC must recommend for or against proposed action by voting. Numerical results of vote must be reported as for, against, or abstain. Votes of individual committee members not reported. DPRC will provide each candidate with copy of evaluation and recommendation for required response period. Committee will consider any responses received and may revise evaluation and recommendation.</p> <p>The committee chair must inform the candidate of its action (or non-action). Any response or rebuttal statement shall be incorporated into the WPAF and will be available to all previous levels of review (MOU 15.5). Final recommendations with files will be forwarded to next level of review (department chair).</p> <p>DPRC must rank candidates it positively recommends for promotion.</p>

Review Type	DPRC Composition	Elected by	Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) Responsibilities
<p>Associate Professor 3rd Year Periodic Review</p>	<p>All eligible tenured full professors; Acceptable to have subcommittees (min. 3) do in-depth review of materials and write evaluative statements.</p> <p>Entire DPRC must review PAF and WPAF and sign signature log in PAF.</p>	<p>Tenured faculty (MOU 15.41) [by simple majority]</p> <p>May vote on each eligible DPRC member for each candidate, or on DPRC as a whole.</p>	<p>Purpose of Third year associate professor periodic review: Evaluate progress and provide mentoring in their quest to achieve promotion to full professor.</p> <hr/> <p>When a faculty member is awarded tenure, it is with the expectation that the capability exists of meeting the requirements for full professor at some timely point during her or his career. Tenure expresses a belief in the future and the role of the tenured faculty in shaping it. Achieving tenure is an honor and privilege, an accomplishment of tremendous significance and with it come responsibilities and expectations of immense importance to the university. A full professor is an effective and respected teacher who has a sustainable, career-long, creative scholarship program, and who demonstrates thoughtful leadership in issues of shared governance including personnel decisions, curriculum and pedagogy development, utilization of resources, and matters of student welfare and success.</p> <hr/> <p>Evaluation should include evaluative statements on appropriateness of professional plan and performance in teaching, scholarship (including opportunities for external validation), service and university citizenship for eventual promotion to full professor.</p> <p>Subcommittee findings and statements must be shared with entire DPRC in discussion meeting for input, comment, and approval.</p> <p>Entire DPRC must review the PAF and WPAF, and sign signature log in PAF. All DPRC members must sign the DPRC report or a minority report.</p>
<p>Post Tenure Periodic Review of tenured Assistant, Associate and Full Professors not evaluated for 5 years.</p> <p>Periodic review is replaced by</p>	<p>Tenured full professors; Acceptable to have subcommittees (min 3) do in-depth review of materials and write evaluative statements, however entire DPRC must review PAF and WPAF and sign signature logs.</p>	<p>Tenured faculty [by simple majority]</p>	<p>Purpose of periodic review of tenured faculty: Periodic reviews performed to ensure maintenance and improvement of a tenured faculty member's effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship. Ensure ideals and responsibilities of tenure are respected and faithfully pursued, and provide constructive feedback to assist tenured faculty members in fulfilling their responsibilities throughout careers as described in following statement:</p> <hr/> <p>Tenure is the most important of all personnel actions. It is an expression of confidence in a faculty member's intellect, creativity, initiative, work ethic, and career-long value to Cal Poly. It presumes a</p>

Review Type	DPRC Composition	Elected by	Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) Responsibilities
<p><i>Post Tenure Reviews continued</i></p> <p>Performance review if reviewed for promotion</p> <p>Not required for FERPs unless requested by FERP or administrator</p>	<p>Subcommittee findings and statements must be shared with entire DPRC in discussion meeting for input, comment, and approval.</p> <p>All DPRC members must sign the DPRC report or a minority report.</p>		<p>loyalty and responsibility on the part of the faculty member to the university, students, and curriculum. With tenure comes the expectation that a faculty member will, during his or her career, accomplish a body of work in teaching, scholarship, service and as a respected citizen of the university that is of recognizable value and importance and which constitutes a meaningful contribution to the mission of the university. Tenure expresses a belief in the future and the role of the tenured faculty in shaping it. Achieving tenure is an honor and privilege, an accomplishment of tremendous significance and with it come responsibilities and expectations of immense importance to the university.</p> <hr/> <p>Evaluation should address performance in teaching, scholarship, service and university citizenship, and appropriateness of professional plan from standpoint of its demonstrated commitment to career-long teaching effectiveness, a productive program of scholarship capable of external validation, and a record of active service, university citizenship and participation in university community including events important to department, college, and university.</p> <p>Subcommittee's findings and statements must be shared with entire DPRC of full professors in discussion meeting held for input, comment, and approval.</p> <p>Entire DPRC must review PAF and WPAF, and sign signature log in PAF. All DPRC members must sign the DPRC report or a minority report.</p>

PRC General Notes:

DPRC Elections: Requirement for a vote by the tenured and tenure track faculty to elect RPT committees is per MOU 15.41:

“The probationary and tenured faculty unit employees of the department or equivalent unit shall elect a peer review committee of tenured faculty unit employees for the purpose of reviewing and recommending faculty unit employees who are being considered for retention, award of tenure and promotion. Probationary and tenured faculty unit employees shall elect tenured faculty unit employees to serve on higher level peer review committee(s). When there are insufficient eligible members to serve on the peer committee, the department shall elect members from a related academic discipline(s). At the request of a department, the President may agree to permit faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program to run for election for membership on any level peer review committee....”

Review Type	DPRC Composition	Elected by	Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) Responsibilities
<p>Classroom Visits: Committee will arrange for visitation of classroom and laboratory teaching for the purpose of evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Committee must give at least a five (5) day notice of classroom visit and there shall be consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits (15.14).</p> <p>Recommendation/response to candidate: Give 10 day response period [10 calendar days, excluding first day and including last, unless last day is holiday or weekend]. Committee will consider any responses received and may revise evaluation and recommendation. The committee chair must inform the candidate of its action (or non-action). Any response or rebuttal statement shall be incorporated into the WPAF and will be available to all previous levels of review (MOU 15.5). Final recommendations with files will be forwarded to next level of review.</p> <p>Promotion Actions: Rank ordered lists forwarded by departmental elected DPRC with evaluations.</p>			


B. Lecturer Reviews

Lecturer Review DPRC Participation Requirements: Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) participation is *required* in evaluation of *full-time, full-year* lecturers; it is *optional* with *part-time* lecturers, although opportunity must be provided for peer input (by full-time, tenured faculty members). It is *required* for *all* lecturers *eligible* for a *three-year appointment* (based on articles 12.12 or 12.13 of the faculty unit contract) in the *year preceding issuance* of a *three-year appointment* (criteria and procedures in chapter 7, section V) and for all lecturers reviewed for **Lecturer Range Elevation**.

Review Type	DPRC Composition	Elected by	DPRC Responsibilities
Full-time, full-year Lecturers	[DPRC required] Tenured faculty members; Recommended size: Three (3) tenured faculty members with opportunity for input from and tenured faculty	Probationary and tenured faculty members	Prepare written evaluation (using format in chapter 7, section E of this document) based on PAF, WPAF and any other appropriate reviews. Entire DPRC must review PAF and WPAF and sign signature log in PAF. All DPRC members must sign the DPRC report or a minority report.
Part-time Lecturers	[DPRC *optional*] although opportunity must be provided for peer input (by full-time tenured faculty members). If DPRC used, composition is the same as for full-time, full-year lecturers (see above)	Probationary and tenured faculty members	Prepare written evaluation (using format in chapter 7, section E of this document) based on PAF, WPAF and any other appropriate reviews. If DPRC is used, entire DPRC must review PAF and WPAF, and sign signature log in PAF. All DPRC members must sign the DPRC report or a minority report.
Third Year Cumulative Review (During Three-Year Appointment) Sixth Year Cumulative Review* (In 6th consecutive year of teaching two or more quarters per academic year)	DPRC required for both; DPRC review required for 6th Cumulative Year. Tenured faculty members; generally all eligible expected to participate on DPRC unless not elected, conflict of interest, or other appropriate reasons.	Probationary and tenured faculty members	Review of Submitted Materials: Each member carefully reviews candidate's submitted materials and qualifications by examining PAF (emphasis on subsequent levels of review of previous evaluation cycles) and WPAF including CV, summary table of grading patterns, summary table of student evaluations, teaching philosophy, course materials, case for three-year appointment and professional plan, and other materials submitted. Entire DPRC must review PAF and WPAF and sign signature log in PAF. Direct Observation of Teaching: Arrange and ensure visitation of classroom and laboratory teaching to evaluate teaching effectiveness.

Review Type	DPRC Composition	Elected by	DPRC Responsibilities
<p><i>Third Year Cumulative Review (During Three-Year Appointment) (continued)</i></p> <p><i>Sixth Year Cumulative Review* (In 6th consecutive year of teaching two or more quarters per academic year) (continued)</i></p>			<p>Recommendation on Proposed Action: For each candidate DPRC may select subcommittee to produce written evaluation (permissible to use same subcommittee for all candidates). Responsibility of entire DPRC to ensure candidate's qualifications are seriously considered</p> <p>Subcommittee must provide reliable and substantive process for gathering information and evaluative input from DPRC prior to writing evaluation; can be accomplished by soliciting written comments (these will not become part of WPAF or PAF) and/or by scheduling discussion meetings. Sub-committee must produce written evaluation that can be supported by majority of DPRC. Minority reports permissible from individuals or groups within DPRC who do not agree with committee report. DPRC members must sign DPRC report or a minority report.</p> <p>DPRC does not rate lecturer using Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory ratings nor recommend for or against 3-year appointment but must use 1-4 ratings on AP109-L.</p> <p>Provide candidate with committee evaluation for required response period. Consider any responses received; may revise evaluation. Committee chair must inform candidate of action (or non-action). Any response or rebuttal statement shall be incorporated into WPAF and will be available to all previous levels of review (MOU 15.5). Forward final evaluation to next level of review (Chair).</p>
<p>Lecturer Range Elevation Review Candidates</p>	<p>DPRC & CPRC required; tenured faculty; generally <u>all</u> eligible expected to participate unless not elected, conflict of interest, or other appropriate reasons.</p>	<p>Probationary and tenured faculty members</p>	<p>Same as for Cumulative Reviews, with the following <u>addition</u>: <u>DPRC must recommend for or against range elevation by voting</u>. Numerical results of vote must be reported as for, against, or abstain. Votes of individual committee members not reported.</p>

TO: Kathleen Enz Finken, Provost
Academic Affairs

FROM: Dean Wendt, Dean 
College of Science and Mathematics

SUBJECT: CSM Personnel Document Update September 2018

DATE: August 8, 2018

CC: Al Liddicoat

The updated College of Science and Mathematics *Personnel Policies, Procedures and Evaluation Criteria* (reflecting our updates and changes recommended by Al Liddicoat following his review) is attached for your consideration. In addition to editorial and formatting changes the modifications include:

- Chapter 3, Appointment of Tenure Track Faculty: Added 'statement on diversity and inclusivity' to list of materials required from tenure track applicants for appointment
- Chapter 4, section II, Materials for Review: Added note following Summary Table of student evaluations confirming the required student evaluation question:
"Overall this instructor was educationally effective"
- Chapter 5, section B.I: Revised paragraph describing classroom visitations to clarify that classroom visitations are required in CSM
- Chapter 7 Lecturer Range Elevation: replaced with verbiage provided by Academic Personnel
- Chapter 7, section IV: Added section re: SOE Student Teacher supervisor reviews/evaluations
- Chapter 7, Cumulative and LRE sections: Split single bullet regarding "Case" and "Plan" into two bullets.
- Chapter 7, under Student Evaluation of Teaching, General Criteria, added:
"Clinical Practice Seminars: Exception to allow University Supervisors to be evaluated although enrollments are below five." [approval by Al Liddicoat]
- Appendix G: Revised section heading to read "Case for Tenure / Promotion / Three Year Appointment / Lecturer Range Elevation" and added: Description of Case for Three-Year Appointment and Description of Case Lecturer Range Elevation (following Description of Case for Tenure/Promotion). Descriptions copied from relevant sections in chapter 7.
- Classroom visits: All references revised to read:
When PRCs conduct visitation of classroom and laboratory teaching for the purpose of evaluation of teaching effectiveness, committee must give at least a five (5) day notice of classroom visit and there shall be consultation between faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits (15.14).
- Throughout document: Revised references indicating previous requirement that evaluators were required to sign the PAF and WPAF to PAF only.
- Throughout document: Revised language to remove references to WPAF binders
- Throughout document: Replaced full terms to acronyms (following first full reference in each section) for: PAF, WPAF, DPRC and CPRC

Attachment: 2018 CSM *Personnel Policies, Procedures and Evaluation Criteria*



OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

MEMORANDUM

To: Dean Wendt
Dean, College of Science and Mathematics

Date: August 10, 2018

From: Kathleen Enz Finken, Ph.D. *KEF*
Provost and Executive Vice President

Copies: Al Liddicoat
Sharon Arnold

Subject: College of Science and Mathematics Personnel Policies, Procedures and Evaluation Criteria

The subject document, revised in August 2018, is approved for immediate implementation. Please provide the College of Science and Mathematics faculty access to the document as soon as possible.