University Faculty Personnel Policies

AY 2023–2024

Written by the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Approved by the Academic Senate
Maintained by Academic Personnel

The policies contained in this document arose from shared governance between the Cal Poly Academic Senate and Academic Personnel. Final policy text is in effect for the academic year listed above until superseded by revisions to prevailing policy.

Draft policy not yet in effect but provided in this document for reference is marked in red typeface with titles indicating the status of the draft.

Table of Contents

1. Preface

1.1. Summary

1.1.1.   The prefatory materials in the document include a general statement of Cal Poly's vision and mission statements, along with Cal Poly's commitment to the teacher-scholar model. It states the hierarchy of policy in the CSU. It also includes the formal statement of the Senate personnel policy revision process by which portions of this document are composed and revised. Colleges and departments can put in the preface of their personnel policies documents their own mission/vision statements, any guiding principles that inform their understanding and implementation of the teacher/scholar model, and any policies or procedures for revising their policy documents.

1.1.2.   Chapter 1 is established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-865-19.

1.2. Vision Statement

1.2.1.   Cal Poly will be the nation's premier comprehensive polytechnic university, an innovative institution that develops and inspires whole-system thinkers to serve California and help solve global challenges. (CAP 110.2)

1.3. Mission Statement

1.3.1.   Cal Poly fosters teaching, scholarship, and service in a Learn by Doing environment in which students, staff, and faculty are partners in discovery. As a polytechnic university, Cal Poly promotes the application of theory to practice. As a comprehensive institution, Cal Poly provides a balanced education in the arts, sciences, and technology, while encouraging cross-disciplinary and co-curricular experiences. As an academic community, Cal Poly values free inquiry, cultural and intellectual diversity, mutual respect, civic engagement, and social and environmental responsibility. (CAP 110.1, AS-650-06)

1.4. Teacher-Scholar Model

1.4.1.   Cal Poly faculty have adopted the Teacher-Scholar Model defined as participation in both teaching and scholarship (AS-725-11). The Teacher-Scholar Model includes, when possible, meaningful student engagement in faculty scholarly activity and inclusion of scholarship in teaching to create vibrant learning experiences for students. The resolution defined scholarship in general terms as the scholarships of discovery, application, integration, and teaching/learning (Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered*, 1990), implemented in a discipline-specific manner while mindful of Cal Poly's mission. The Teacher-Scholar Model allows for individual variations in the balance between teaching and scholarly activities. The personnel policies in this document promote the development of teacher/scholars.

1.5. Purpose and Scope of this Document

1.5.1.   University level personnel policies for faculty are contained in this document, titled "University Faculty Personnel Policies" (abbreviated as UFPP). It includes the University statement of policy, criteria and university-wide procedures for faculty personnel actions. This document is based on Title V, Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA), and the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). If Title V, HEERA and/or the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement is in

conflict with the provisions in these criteria and procedures, the terms of Title V, HEERA and/or the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement, and not the provisions of these procedures and criteria, shall govern.

1.5.2. Policies in this document are derived largely from the 2013 revision of University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA), which is included in the appendices to this document. Policies stated in UFPP supersede their prior formulations in UFPA. Until superseded by policies in UFPP, the policies in UFPA remain in effect.

1.5.3. Personnel policies established by Academic Senate resolutions are commonly cited throughout this document following the form of "AS-XXX-YY". Since each chapter of UFPP is established by Academic Senate action, the formulation of policies in UFPP supersedes the formulations of those policies in prior Academic Senate resolutions.

1.5.4. Policy statements contained in UFPP are also derived from sources beyond the scope of the Academic Senate, such as provisions in the CBA, HEERA, or Title V. Policies derived from the Collective Bargaining Agreement (i.e. the CSU faculty contract) are cited by CBA article and section. Policies from Cal Poly's Campus Administrative Policies (CAP) are cited by their CAP numbers. Other documents establishing policies are cited by descriptive titles (e.g. administrative memos cited by their source and date). In these cases, the verbal formulation of the policy is approved by the Senate, but the statement of these policies in their original source governs.

1.5.5. Colleges and the library shall have their own personnel policy documents to extend, develop, and apply university level policies in ways that are suited to the programs within the college. In the case of any conflict between college and university policies, the university policy shall govern. College personnel policies should remain current in relation to the policies that govern over the college policies, including university policies, the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement, HEERA, and Title V. Colleges shall define a process for reviewing and updating their personnel policies. College personnel policies must be approved by the dean and the provost. College personnel policies that are currently in effect shall be made available on the Academic Personnel website.

1.5.6. Departments may also have personnel policy documents. Department level personnel policies extend, develop, and apply college level policies in ways that are suited to the disciplines within the department. In the case of any conflict between a department's policies and college or university policies, the college or university policies shall govern. Departments opting to draft their own personnel policies shall define the process for composing and approving such policies. Department level personnel policies shall be approved by their college dean and the provost. Department personnel policies that are currently in effect shall be made available on the Academic Personnel website.

1.6. Procedure for Updating University Faculty Personnel Policies

1.6.1. This section of the Preface states the policies related to the composition and revision of sections of UFPP. The policies in this section are established by AS-865-19 which is based on the following Academic Senate resolutions: AS-650-06, AS-725-11, AS-752-12, and AS-859-18. It supersedes AS-829-17.

1.6.2. Cal Poly's university-level faculty personnel policies are composed and approved by means of shared governance between faculty and administration. Personnel

policies are established or revised either by means of Academic Senate resolutions or consent agenda items, both of which must be ratified by the university President.

1.6.3.   The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee proposes university level faculty personnel policies to the Senate in the form of chapters or portions of chapters of the University Faculty Personnel Policies document (UFPP).

1.6.4.   University-wide faculty personnel policy proposals from the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee may appear on the Academic Senate meeting agenda as consent items at the discretion of the Academic Senate Executive Committee. The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee submits the personnel policy proposals to the Academic Senate Executive Committee. The Academic Senate Executive Committee determines whether and how the personnel policy proposals shall be placed on the Academic Senate agenda.

1.6.5.   When the Academic Senate Executive Committee places personnel policy revisions on the Academic Senate consent agenda, any senator may request an item be removed from the consent agenda no later than one week prior to the meeting. Items removed from the Academic Senate consent agenda will be placed on the Senate agenda as business items. Items not removed from the consent agenda are considered approved by the Academic Senate on the meeting date of the consent agenda.

1.6.6.   Personnel policy revisions that are on the Senate agenda shall consist of reports attached to resolutions. The report contains the proposed revision to university policy and all background or explanatory information about the change in policy. The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee chair (or designee) is responsible for presenting the policy proposal to the Academic Senate Executive Committee and to the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate Chair (or designee) may invite interested parties concerning the policy proposals to be present at the meetings where pulled proposals will be discussed. Queries from senators regarding policy proposals are directed to the chair of the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee.

1.6.7.   Proposed revisions to university-wide faculty personnel policies should include as many of the following as are relevant to the proposal:
- The text of the proposed policy.
- The text of superseded policy (if available).
- Summary of the proposed changes noting especially any revisions to reflect existing policy stated elsewhere, or any proposed changes in policy.
- Citation of relevant documents, which may include: Academic Senate resolutions, provisions in the collective bargaining agreement, administrative memos, existing policy documents in need of revision, superseded policy statements.
- Expected effects of the policy change on faculty units.
- The nature of consultation with affected faculty units.
- The timeline and nature of implementation.

2. Faculty Appointments

2.1. Summary

2.1.1.   This chapter provides university-wide recruitment and appointment policies for faculty. Policies in this chapter refer to but do not include the more detailed hiring procedures maintained by Academic Personnel. Colleges and departments include in this chapter any specific hiring policies that go beyond the university-level policies, including any statements of their own specific criteria and requirements for their faculty appointments.

2.1.2.   Policy in chapter 2 established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-866-19. Portions revised by Academic Senate Consent 12/3/2019.

2.2. Tenure-Track Recruitment

2.2.1.   Current University tenure-track recruitment procedures, as well as information about contract updates concerning academic appointments, are accessible at the Academic Personnel website.

2.2.2.   Advertising and Recruitment: Tenure-track positions must be advertised nationally. Academic Personnel will place an advertisement for all tenure-track searches in publications listed in documents on the Academic Personnel website. These advertisements meet the requirement to advertise the position nationally. Departments must also place all additional advertisements listed in the required recruitment plan. A minimum 30-day period is required between the latest of all ad publication dates (whether online or print) and the closing date or review begin date. For online advertising the 30 days is counted from the first day of appearance.

2.2.3.   Applications for tenure-track faculty positions must be submitted to the university's applicant tracking system. Applicants must submit a current CV, a cover letter, and names and contact information of at least three references. Unofficial transcripts may be requested at time of application; official transcripts are required for appointment. Additional materials that may be requested by the college or department. A list of standard application materials is included in *Procedure for Recruiting Tenure-Track Faculty* maintained and distributed by the Office of Academic Personnel.

2.2.4.   The Search Committee, consisting of elected tenured or probationary faculty, shall use procedures as determined by the University's Procedure for Recruiting Tenure-Track Faculty and any approved college or departmental recruitment policies and procedures in addition to those listed below. With the department's recommendation and the dean's permission, FERP faculty may serve on the Search Committee. With the department's recommendation and the dean's permission, probationary faculty may serve on the Search Committee (CBA 12.22.a).

2.2.5.   Each search committee must have one trained Employment Equity Facilitator (EEF) who shall normally be a tenured faculty member and may not be the department chair/head or the chair of the Search Committee. Information about the role of the EEF and about training for the EEF positions is available on the website of the Office of Equal Opportunity.

2.2.6.   The Search Committee members shall give careful consideration to temporary employees who have been evaluated by the department or equivalent unit. The search committee members, or screening sub-committee members, and

department chair/head shall review and sign the Personnel Action File for these candidates.

2.2.7.   The Search Committee shall provide a list of acceptable candidates as finalists to the department chair/head. The department chair/head shall provide appointment recommendations to the dean.

2.3.   Tenure-Track Qualifications

2.3.1.   Normally, a doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree shall be required for appointment to a tenure-track position. The appropriate terminal degree will be determined by the department and approved by the dean. In the areas where a doctorate is required, candidates who have completed all doctoral requirements but the dissertation (ABD) may also be considered during the recruitment process. However, all minimum degree requirements must be completed prior to the appointment start date.

2.3.2.   Colleges and departments shall specify the relevant evidence of potential for excellence in university-level teaching, scholarship and service. Evidence of potential for teaching excellence in the department and/or college may include experience or potential to teach using learn by doing, project-based learning, service learning and other teaching methods that are common at Cal Poly. Evidence of potential for ongoing research, scholarship, and/or creative activity should show how candidates will remain current and contribute to the knowledge and developments within their discipline/professional field, and obtain promotion. Evidence of service should show potential to make substantive contributions to the department, college, and/or university.

2.3.3.   Applicants for appointment with tenure shall normally be tenured professors or tenured librarians at other universities. Exceptions to this provision must be carefully documented. The President may award tenure to any individual, including one whose appointment and assignment is in a management position, at the time of appointment. Appointments with tenure shall be made only after an evaluation and recommendation by tenured faculty in the appropriate department (CBA 13.17).

2.4.   Lecturer Recruitment

2.4.1.   Department chairs make the hiring recommendation to the deans who are the appointing authorities in the colleges responsible for approving and hiring lectures. Department faculty may be involved in screening or vetting applicants for the part-time pools or by serving on search committees for full-time lecturer recruitments.

2.4.2.   Full-time lecturer appointments require a search with a process similar that of tenure-track searches. Colleges or departments determine the appropriate interview format for the full-time lecturers.

2.4.3.   Advertisements need to be posted and the requisition must be open for a minimum of 30 days before review of applicants can begin.

2.4.4.   Applications for full-time lecturer faculty positions must be submitted to the university's applicant tracking system. Applicants must submit a current CV, a list of CSU courses taught, and names and contact information of at least three references. Unofficial transcripts may be requested at time of application; official transcripts are required for appointment. Additional materials may be requested by the college or department.

2.4.5. Criteria for appointment for full-time lecturers are determined by the college or department. Initial appointment is for 1 academic year with a possible 1-year extension. Full-time lecturer appointments are unconditional and their work assignment cannot be reduced once these appointments are made. The department must meet the entitlements of other lecturers listed in the order of assignment in article 12.29 of the CBA.

2.4.6. Most departments create a part-time lecturer pool that allows candidates to apply for consideration for appointments throughout the academic year as needed to fill positions. Applicants may apply at the start of the academic year for consideration of work assignments in any quarter or they may apply prior to the winter or spring terms. These pools are opened in April for the subsequent academic year after the spring quarter appointments have been made. Department chairs may review qualifications of the applicants and make quarter-by-quarter appointments following the order of assignment in accordance with article 12.29 of the CBA. Applicants who have worked for the department and been evaluated should be given careful consideration according to article 12.7 of the CBA. Those who have had a part-time assignment for all three quarters of an academic year and are appointed to teach in the fall quarter of the following academic year shall be appointed with a one-year part-time entitlement per article 12.3 of the CBA.

2.4.7. Advertisements must to be posted and the lecturer pool must be open for a minimum of 14 days before review of candidates can begin. Part-time pools stay open until the first week of spring quarter.

2.4.8. Applications for part-time lecturer pools must be submitted to the university's applicant tracking system. Applicants must submit a current CV, a list of CSU courses taught, and names and contact information of at least three references. Unofficial transcripts may be requested at time of application; official transcripts are required for appointment. Additional materials may be requested by the college or department.

2.4.9. Criteria for appointment and level of appointment are determined by colleges or departments. Initial appointments for part-time pool lecturers can be for 1, 2 or 3 quarters. Initial appointment for 3 quarters should be for less than 45 units.

2.4.10. Emergency lecturer appointments may occur for urgent and unplanned needs when no qualified candidates are available in the part-time lecturer pool and there isn't time to run a part-time lecturer pool recruitment. Such urgent and unplanned needs to appoint a lecturer may arise from another faculty member's unplanned leave of absence or a last-minute course section being opened. If this need is expected to continue, the department should plan ahead for future terms and either run a recruitment or advertise to increase the part-time pool to meet the anticipated needs of the department.

2.5. Other Faculty Recruitments for Library, Counseling, and Athletics

2.5.1. Other faculty units should identify in their personnel policy documents the recruitment policies pertinent to their assignments.

2.5.2. Other faculty recruitments should conform at least with the policies for instructional lecturer recruitments.

3. Personnel Files

3.1. Summary

3.1.1.   This chapter defines the university-wide requirements and policies for the Personnel Action File (PAF) and Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). Colleges and departments may augment these university-level requirements to address their discipline-specific needs.

3.1.2.   Policy in chapter 3 established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-868-19. Portions revised by Academic Senate Consent 12/3/2019.

3.2. Personnel Action File (PAF)

3.2.1.   The Personnel Action File (PAF) is the one official personnel file for employment information and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or personnel actions regarding a faculty unit employee. (CBA 11.1)

3.2.2.   The college dean or equivalent supervising administrator is the custodian of the PAF. Contents of the Personnel Action File stored in electronic format shall be stored securely, and access to the file shall be limited to those individuals authorized to view the file under the terms of the CBA. (CBA 11.1)

3.2.3.   Contents of the PAF include:
- Hiring materials/letters of appointment
- CV retained from WPAF
- Index retained from WPAF
- Professional Development Plan from WPAF
- Performance and periodic evaluation reports (AP 109, dean and provost letters)
- Leaves/grants/awards reports
- Results of student evaluations of faculty
- Institutional data about teaching assignments
- Other personnel related material.

3.3. Purpose of Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)

3.3.1.   During the time of periodic evaluation and performance review of a faculty unit employee, the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), which includes all information, materials, recommendations, responses and rebuttals, shall be incorporated by reference into the Personnel Action File. (CBA 11.8).

3.3.2.   The WPAF is compiled by the applicant to support consideration for a periodic evaluation or performance review. Contents of the WPAF stored in electronic format shall be stored securely, and access to the file shall be limited to those individuals authorized to view the file. All supporting materials in the WPAF should be referenced and clearly explained.

3.3.3.   The WPAF for retention and tenure reviews shall cover the entire employment period at Cal Poly. The WPAF for promotion and lecturer range elevation shall cover the period at rank or range at Cal Poly.

3.3.4.   The provost establishes a specific deadline by which the WPAF is declared complete for each type of personnel action. Insertion of materials after that date must have the approval of the college peer review committee (CPRC) and is limited to items that became accessible after the deadline. The table of contents or index should be

updated to reflect any material added to the file during the course of the evaluation cycle.

3.4. Contents of WPAF

3.4.1. Contents of Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) for all instructional faculty include:
- Index of WPAF
- CV
- Evidence appropriate to the nature of the appointment

3.4.2. Probationary and tenured faculty shall include a Professional Development Plan in the form of a written narrative as a guide to evaluators for understanding the candidate's short and long-term goals and values as a teacher-scholar.

3.4.3. Colleges and departments shall specify any additional required elements their faculty must include in their WPAFs.

3.4.4. Colleges shall define in their personnel policies the appropriate evidence for teaching, professional development, and service suited to the nature of different faculty appointments.

3.4.5. The library, counseling, and athletics shall define in their personnel policies the appropriate evidence categories for their faculty.

3.4.6. Any student communications or evaluations provided outside of the regular student evaluation process must be identified by name to be included in a PAF or WPAF (CBA 15.17). Candidates may summarize their own assessment of any unofficial anonymous student surveys in their narrative documents.

4. Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes

4.1. Summary

4.1.1. Faculty evaluation processes have various definable functions that are common across the university, such as the roles of candidates undergoing evaluation, Department Peer Review Committees, Department Chair/Heads, College Peer Review Committees, and administrators such as the deans and the provost. This chapter defines the responsibilities of these roles in faculty evaluation. Colleges and departments may specify additional responsibilities of the various roles within the college or department in faculty evaluation.

4.1.2. Policy in chapter 4 established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-894-20.

4.2. Candidates

4.2.1. Faculty subject to evaluation are candidates in the evaluation process. Candidates must provide a complete set of materials that includes evidence appropriate for the nature of the evaluation process and narrative reports pertinent to the purpose of the evaluation. (CBA 15.12)

4.2.2. While faculty scheduled for a mandatory review will be notified by the college, faculty intending to be considered for early promotion to associate professor or professor or early tenure must notify the dean in writing (email is acceptable). This notification shall also be copied to the department chair/head.

4.2.3. Candidates under review must view their own Personnel Action File (PAF) according to access requirements prior to the commencement of an evaluation and sign the PAF Log.

4.2.4. Candidates must assemble and submit a Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) by the University established deadline for their evaluation process.

4.2.5. Candidates must provide an updated curriculum vita for placement in their PAF.

4.2.6. Candidates must provide an updated professional development plan for their WPAF.

4.2.7. The ten days following the receipt of an evaluation report from any level of review comprises a rebuttal period during which the candidates may submit a written rebuttal or request to meet with the evaluator(s) to discuss the evaluation. (CBA 15.5)

4.3. Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC)

4.3.1. For evaluation processes using a Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC), the initial level of review of the candidate is conducted by the DPRC. Evaluation of tenure-track instructional faculty shall commence with a DPRC level of review. Lecturer faculty evaluation may commence with a DPRC level of review, according to college requirements.

4.3.2. For Periodic Evaluations the department's probationary and tenured faculty shall elect members of the tenured faculty to serve on DPRCs. Both tenured and probationary faculty may vote on DPRC membership.

4.3.3. For Retention, Promotion or Tenure Performance Evaluations, the DPRC shall consist of at least three elected members of the tenured faculty. DPRC members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion. At the request of a department, the President may agree that a faculty unit employee participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program may also engage in

deliberations and make recommendations regarding the evaluation of a faculty unit employee. However, faculty committees established for this purpose may not be comprised solely of faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program. Approval shall be obtained from the dean if a department requests to have faculty in FERP participate as an evaluator member of the DPRC. (CBA 15.2)

4.3.4.   Faculty may serve on only one level of review (department PRC, department chair/head, or college PRC). (CBA 15.29) Faculty unit employees being considered for promotion themselves are ineligible for service on promotion or tenure peer review committees (CBA 15.42). A potential DPRC member with a clear conflict of interest with a faculty member scheduled for review should not stand as a candidate for that DPRC. DPRC members typically will be from the candidate's own department. However, DPRC members will sometimes need to be recruited outside the department when there is an inadequate number of faculty in the department who are eligible and available to serve on the DPRC.

4.3.5.   All DPRC members shall review both the PAF and the WPAF, signing the log sheet in each file. At least a subset of the DPRC shall observe classroom instruction. The DPRC shall review any professional development plan and offer guidance to the candidate for any needed modifications to that plan. This feedback on the professional development plan is especially important in helping faculty develop a compelling record for eventual promotion. All deliberations of the DPRC shall be confidential (CBA 15.10).

4.3.6.   The DPRC shall use forms provided by Academic Personnel for their evaluation report. This report shall critically analyze the evidence on each performance dimension (teaching, professional development, service, and other), and offer any suggestions for improvement. The report shall clearly establish the basis for the conclusions of the report and how any recommendations resulted from the assessment of the evidence.

4.3.7.   DPRC evaluation recommendations shall be approved by a simple majority of the committee (CBA 15.45). The DPRC shall vote for or against the proposed action (retention, promotion and/or tenure), or, under very rare circumstances, abstain. Abstentions require written explanation. In cases of split votes, the report should reflect the relevant perspectives on the committee and the rationale for the majority decision. In rare instances when agreement cannot be reached on the content of the committee report, the minority committee member(s) may submit a signed minority report.

4.3.8.   The DPRC may submit to the subsequent levels of evaluation a ranking of those promotion applicants whom they positively recommended (CBA 15.44).

4.3.9.   The DPRC report shall be provided to the candidate at least 10 days before sending the evaluation to the department chair/head. If the candidate requests a meeting concerning a rebuttal to the DPRC report, the DPRC shall meet with the candidate within the 10-day rebuttal period. The DPRC shall review any written rebuttal with the option of revising the recommendation or correcting errors in the original report. No other written response, other than acknowledgment of receipt of the rebuttal, shall be provided to the candidate.

4.3.10. Library, counseling, and athletic faculty units shall specify in their personnel policies the composition of their peer review committees.

4.4.   Department Chair/Head

4.4.1. Department chairs/heads shall conduct their own separate level of review. For evaluation processes using a DPRC, the Department chair/head review shall follow the DPRC review. For evaluation processes not using a DPRC, the Department chair/head level of review initiates the review process.

4.4.2. The department chair/head shall review both the PAF and the WPAF, signing the logs in each file. The department chair/head shall review any DPRC evaluation. The department chair/head shall review any rebuttal to the DPRC evaluation from the candidate. The department chair/head shall review any professional development plan and offer guidance to the candidate for any needed modifications to that plan. This feedback on the professional development plan is especially important in helping faculty develop a compelling record for eventual promotion.

4.4.3. Department chairs/heads shall use forms provided by Academic Personnel for their evaluation report. This report shall critically analyze the evidence on each performance dimension (teaching, professional development, service, and other), and offer any suggestions for improvement. The report shall clearly establish the basis for the conclusions of the report and how any recommendations resulted from the assessment of the evidence. The report from the chair/head shall be provided to the candidate at least 10 days before sending the evaluation to the dean.

4.4.4. If the candidate requests a meeting concerning a rebuttal to the department chair/head's report, the department chair/head shall meet with the candidate within the 10-day rebuttal period. The department chair/head shall review any written rebuttal with the option of revising the recommendation or correcting errors in the original report. No other written response, other than acknowledgment of receipt of the rebuttal, shall be provided to the candidate. (CBA 15.5)

4.4.5. The department chairs/heads may submit to the subsequent levels of evaluation a ranking of those promotion applicants whom they positively recommended (CBA 15.44).

4.5.   College Peer Review Committee (CPRC)

4.5.1. The CPRC provides an additional level of evaluation for candidates undergoing a Performance Evaluation. The CPRC shall consist of up to one full professor from each department. Approval shall be obtained from the dean if departments will not have a representative. Each member of the CPRC shall be elected by their department's tenured and probationary faculty for appointment to the CPRC. Colleges may specify further means of selecting CPRC members.

4.5.2. Each CPRC member shall review both the PAF and the WPAF and sign the logs in each file. Each CPRC member shall review the prior levels of evaluation (DPRC and department chair/head) and any rebuttals submitted. All deliberations of the CPRC shall be confidential (CBA 15.10).

4.5.3. Based on the review of the PAF, WPAF, and prior levels of evaluation, the CPRC shall vote for or against the proposed retention, promotion, and/or tenure, or, under rare circumstances, abstain. Abstentions require written explanation. A simple majority of the voting members constitutes the recommendation of the CPRC.

4.5.4. The CPRC shall produce an evaluation report for each candidate under review. This report will critically analyze the evidence on each dimension of performance (teaching, scholarship, and service), both favorable and unfavorable, and produce

a narrative clarifying how the evidence was weighed and the conclusions and recommended actions derived. In cases of split votes, the report should reflect the relevant perspectives on the committee and the rationale for the majority decision. In rare instances when agreement cannot be reached on the content of the committee report, the minority committee member(s) may submit a signed minority report. The CPRC shall submit a ranking of those promotion applicants whom they positively recommended.

4.5.5.   The CPRC report shall be provided to the candidate at least 10 days before sending the evaluation to the dean (CBA 15.5). Candidates may request a meeting and/or submit a rebuttal to the CPRC report within the 10-day rebuttal period. The CPRC shall review rebuttal material with the option of revising the recommended action or correcting errors in the original report; no other written response, other than acknowledgment of receipt of the rebuttal, shall be provided to the candidate.

4.5.6.   The CPRC shall submit to the subsequent levels of evaluation a ranking of those promotion applicants whom they positively recommended (CBA 15.44). Further specification of the nature of the ranking shall be determined by the college or library in their personnel policies documents.

4.6.   Administrative Evaluators

4.6.1.   Administrative evaluators include college deans, associate deans, library deans, department directors, vice-provosts, or the athletic director. For instructional tenure-track faculty the administrative evaluator is the college dean. For lecturer faculty the dean may designate an associate dean to serve as the final level of administrative evaluation.

4.6.2.   Administrative evaluators shall review both the PAF and WPAF, signing the logs in each file, as well as all previous levels of evaluation and any rebuttals submitted. The dean shall provide a separate written evaluation. The administrative evaluator's report shall be provided to the candidate at least 10 days before placing the evaluation in the faculty member's PAF.

4.6.3.   Candidates may request a meeting and/or submit a rebuttal to the administrative evaluator within the 10-day rebuttal period. The administrative evaluator shall review rebuttal material with the option of revising the recommendation or correcting errors in the original report; no other written response, other than acknowledgement of receipt of the rebuttal statement, shall be provided to the candidate.

4.6.4.   Administrative evaluators shall submit to the provost a ranking of those promotion applicants whom they positively recommended (CBA 15.44).

4.7.   Provost

4.7.1.   The provost is the final level of administrative evaluation for evaluation processes that conclude with the personnel actions of retention, promotion, and/or tenure.

4.7.2.   The provost shall review the candidate's PAF, WPAF and reports from all levels of evaluation for final evaluation for retention, promotion and/or tenure.

4.7.3.   The provost's letter to the candidate constitutes the final decision on retention, promotion and/or tenure.

5. Evaluation Processes

5.1. Summary

5.1.1.   This chapter defines all the evaluation sequences allowed for any sort of faculty evaluation currently used by all the colleges. Standard and familiar evaluation processes include lecturer evaluations and the periodic, retention, promotion, and tenure evaluations of tenure-track faculty. Each of these processes consists of a sequence of different levels of evaluation. The levels of evaluation were defined in Chapter 4, as the responsibilities of various evaluating bodies, such as department and college peer committees, department chairs or heads, or administrative evaluators. University-level definition of these processes allows for colleges to formulate their policy and procedure documents using common definitions of these processes. The scope of the processes covered in this section includes all faculty evaluation processes including instructional faculty, library faculty, counselors, and coaches. Exceptions to the normal sequence of evaluation levels are also covered. Colleges must establish in their personnel policy documents which of the permissible evaluation processes they elect to use in their faculty evaluations.

5.1.2.   Policy in chapter 5 established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-872-19. Portions revised by Academic Senate Consent 12/3/2019.

5.2. Instructional Faculty Evaluation Processes

5.2.1. Two-Stage Part-Time Lecturer Evaluation

5.2.1.1.   Two-Stage Part-Time Lecturer Evaluation provides feedback and guidance to the faculty member.

5.2.1.2.   Two-Stage Part-Time Lecturer Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
- Department Chair/Head
- Dean

5.2.1.3.   Two-Stage Part-Time Lecturer Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for periodic evaluation of part-time lecturers who are neither 12.12 nor 12.13 eligible and who are appointed in all three terms of an academic year.

5.2.1.4.   Two-Stage Part-Time Lecturer Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for periodic evaluation of part-time lecturers who are neither 12.12 nor 12.13 eligible and who are appointed in fewer than three terms of an academic year.

5.2.2. Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation

5.2.2.1.   Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation provides feedback and guidance to the faculty member in support of future personnel actions.

5.2.2.2.   Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
- DPRC
- Department Chair/Head
- Dean

5.2.2.3.   Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is REQUIRED for full-time lecturer evaluation.

5.2.2.4.   Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is REQUIRED for part-time lecturer evaluation for those who are eligible for 12.12 or 12.13 appointments.

5.2.2.5.   Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is REQUIRED for review of probationary faculty who are not subject to performance review.

5.2.2.6.   Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is REQUIRED for post-tenure review.

5.2.2.7.   Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for lecturer range elevation.

5.2.2.8.   Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for periodic evaluation of part-time lecturers who are neither 12.12 nor 12.13 eligible and who are appointed in all three terms of an academic year.

5.2.2.9.   Three-Stage Part-Time Lecturer Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for periodic evaluation of part-time lecturers who are neither 12.12 nor 12.13 eligible and who are appointed in fewer than three terms of an academic year.

5.2.3.   Four-Stage Lecturer Range Elevation Evaluation

5.2.3.1.   Four-Stage Lecturer Range Elevation Evaluation is an evaluation process that results in lecturer range elevation and includes an additional peer review committee between the department and the dean.

5.2.3.2.   Four-Stage Lecturer Range Elevation Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
- DPRC
- Department Chair/Head
- CPRC
- Dean

5.2.3.3.   Four-Stage Lecturer Range Elevation Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for lecturer range elevation.

5.2.4.   Four-Stage Performance Evaluation

5.2.4.1.   Four-Stage Performance Evaluation is a performance evaluation that results in the retention or tenure of tenure-track faculty.

5.2.4.2.   Four-Stage Performance Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
- DPRC
- Department Chair/Head
- Dean
- Provost

5.2.4.3.   Four-Stage Performance Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for tenure of tenure-track faculty.

5.2.4.4.   Four-Stage Performance Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for retention of tenure-track faculty.

5.2.5.   Five-Stage Promotion Evaluation

5.2.5.1.   Five-Stage Promotion Evaluation is a performance evaluation that results in the promotion to a higher rank for tenure-track faculty, and includes a college level peer review committee as an additional level of review between the department and the dean.

5.2.5.2.   Five-Stage Promotion Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
- DPRC
- Department Chair/Head
- CPRC
- Dean
- Provost

5.2.5.3.   Five-Stage Promotion Evaluation is REQUIRED for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

5.2.5.4.   Five-Stage Promotion Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for tenure of tenure-track faculty.

5.2.5.5. Five-Stage Promotion Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for retention of tenure-track faculty.

5.3. Library Faculty Evaluation Processes

5.3.1. Library Faculty Periodic Evaluation

5.3.1.1. Library Faculty Periodic Evaluation is a periodic evaluation that provides feedback and guidance to the library faculty member in support of future personnel actions.

5.3.1.2. Library Faculty Periodic Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
- DPRC
- Associate Dean
- Dean
- Vice-Provost

5.4. Library Faculty Performance Evaluation

5.4.1.1. Library Faculty Performance Evaluation results in retention, promotion, or tenure of library faculty.

5.4.1.2. Library Faculty Performance Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
- DPRC
- Associate Dean
- Dean
- Vice-Provost
- Provost

5.5. Counseling Services Faculty Evaluation Processes

5.5.1. Counseling Services Periodic Evaluation

5.5.1.1. Counseling Services Periodic Evaluation provides feedback and guidance to the counseling services faculty member in support of future personnel actions.

5.5.1.2. Counseling Services Periodic Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
- DPRC (optional)
- Director
- Health Center Director
- Vice President of Student Affairs

5.5.2. Counseling Services Performance Evaluation

5.5.2.1. Counseling Services Performance Evaluation results in retention, promotion, or tenure of counseling services faculty.

5.5.2.2. Counseling Services Performance Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
- DPRC (optional)
- Director
- Health Center Director
- Vice President of Student Affairs
- Provost

5.6. Athletic Faculty Evaluation Process

5.6.1.   Athletic Faculty Periodic Evaluation provides feedback and guidance to the athletic faculty member in support of future personnel actions.

5.6.2.   Athletic Faculty Periodic Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
- Athletic Director

5.7.   Exceptions

5.7.1.   If the department chair/head is not a tenured faculty member or academic administrator, then this level of evaluation is skipped and the evaluation will move to the next level of review. (CBA 15.43)

5.7.2.   If the department chair/head does not hold a higher rank than the faculty member under evaluation for promotion, then this level of evaluation is skipped and the evaluation will move to the CPRC. (CBA 15.43)

5.7.3.   If a conflict of interest exists between the faculty member under review and chair/head or administrator, such as close relationship, prejudice, bias, etc., the chair/head or administrator should withdraw from this level of evaluation and provide a written rationale for withdrawal.

5.7.4.   Deans withdrawing from their level of evaluation may designate an associate dean in their college to perform the duties of the dean's level of evaluation.

5.8.   University Evaluation Process Calendar

5.8.1.   The office of Academic Personnel will publish the annual evaluation process calendar. This process calendar will provide the dates by which levels of review should be concluded.

6. Evaluation Cycle Patterns

6.1. Summary

6.1.1.   Evaluation cycle patterns are multi-year sequences of annual evaluation processes leading to personnel actions. For instance, the sequence of annual evaluations that lead to retention, promotion, and tenure for tenure-line faculty comprise an evaluation cycle pattern, as does the sequence of lecturer evaluations that lead towards a three-year contract or range elevation. This chapter defines all evaluation cycle patterns and allows the colleges and the library to choose the patterns that best serve their needs and expectations.

6.1.2.   Policy in chapter 6 established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-874-19. Portions revised by Academic Senate Consent 12/3/2019.

6.1.3.   Policy in 6.3 revised by Academic Senate Resolution AS-888-20.

6.2. Probationary Faculty Evaluation Patterns

6.2.1.   Evaluation patterns for probationary faculty consist of a sequence of periodic and performance evaluations. The periodic evaluations must consist of Three-Stage Periodic Evaluations. The retention evaluations must be either Four-Stage or Five-Stage Performance Evaluations. Colleges and the library must specify in their personnel policies whether Four-Stage or Five-Stage Performance Evaluations would be used for retention of probationary faculty. In the descriptions of evaluation patterns that follow, "Performance Evaluation" could be either Four-Stage or Five-Stage Performance Evaluation. Tenure and Promotion occurring together in one evaluation requires a Five-Stage Performance Evaluation. "Periodic Evaluation" for probationary faculty is always a Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation.

6.2.2.   A Three-Year Retention Pattern starts with Periodic Evaluations in the first two years of appointment. In the third year of appointment a Performance Evaluation results in a decision of whether to retain the candidate for another three years or to another one year. Candidates retained for three years undergo a Periodic Evaluation in the fourth and fifth years followed by a Promotion and Tenure evaluation in their sixth year. Candidates retained for one year undergo annual Performance Reviews in their fourth and fifth years followed by a Promotion and Tenure evaluation in their sixth year.

6.2.3.   The Three-Year Retention Pattern proceeds as follows for each year of appointment for faculty retained for three years:
- Year 1: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 2: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 3: Retention to fourth, fifth and sixth year
- Year 4: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 5: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 6: Tenure/Promotion

6.2.4.   The Three-Year Retention Pattern proceeds as follows for each year of appointment for faculty retained for one year:
- Year 1: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 2: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 3: Retention to fourth year
- Year 4: Retention to fifth year

- Year 5: Retention to sixth year
- Year 6: Tenure/Promotion

6.2.5.   A Two-Year Retention Pattern starts with a Periodic Evaluation in the first year of appointment. In the second year of appointment a Performance Evaluation results in a decision of whether to retain the candidate for a third and fourth year of appointment. Candidates retained to a third and fourth year undergo a Periodic Evaluation in the third year followed in the fourth year by another Performance Evaluation for retention to a fifth and sixth year of appointment. Candidates retained to a fifth and sixth year undergo Periodic Review in the fifth year, followed by a Promotion and Tenure review in their sixth year.

6.2.6.   The Two-Year Retention Pattern proceeds as follows for each year of appointment:
- Year 1: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 2: Retention to third and fourth year
- Year 3: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 4: Retention to fifth and sixth year
- Year 5: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 6: Tenure/Promotion

6.2.7.   An Annual Retention Pattern starts with a Periodic Evaluation in the first year of appointment. From the second through the fifth year of appointment candidates undergo Performance Evaluation for retention to the next year. In the sixth year of appointment the candidate undergoes Promotion and Tenure evaluation.

6.2.8.   The Annual Retention Pattern proceeds as follows for each year of appointment:
- Year 1: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 2: Retention to third year
- Year 3: Retention to fourth year
- Year 4: Retention to fifth year
- Year 5: Retention to sixth year
- Year 6: Promotion and Tenure

6.2.9.   The Three-Year Retention Pattern shall be the default evaluation cycle pattern for tenure-track professors. Colleges and the library may choose the Two-Year or the Annual Retention Patterns at their discretion, and must state that choice in their personnel policies document.

6.2.10.   Choosing the Two-Year Retention Pattern requires establishing comparable patterns for faculty hired with credit towards tenure. All the evaluation patterns defined above are for faculty hired without service credit. These evaluation patterns provide a basis for the formulation of alternatives for faculty hired with service credit. Alternative evaluation patterns for faculty hired with service credit should be included in the appendices to college-level personnel policy documents.

6.3.   Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Pattern

6.3.1.   A Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation of tenured faculty employees at any rank shall be conducted at least once every five years after promotion or appointment to their respective academic rank. Performance evaluations for promotion can serve in lieu of periodic evaluations.

6.3.2.   More frequent periodic evaluation of a tenured faculty employee may be conducted by request of the faculty member, the department chair/head, or dean. After such a request, the periodic evaluation shall be conducted as soon as possible.

6.3.3.　A Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation may be conducted during the third year in which a tenured faculty employee has served in the academic rank of Associate Professor or Associate Librarian. The purpose of the evaluation is formative and intended to assist and guide the Associate Professor or Associate Librarian in their preparation for subsequent promotion review. Colleges and other faculty units requiring this evaluation shall include that requirement in their personnel policies documents.

6.3.4.　Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) shall not be required to undergo a periodic evaluation unless an evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant or the appropriate administrator (CBA 15.35).

6.3.5.　Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor requires a Five-Stage Performance Evaluation.

6.4.　Instructional Lecturer and Temporary Librarian Evaluation Patterns

6.4.1.　Full-time instructional lecturers and temporary librarians appointed for the entire academic year that do not hold a three-year appointment with a 12.12 or 12.13 entitlement must be evaluated each year by a department PRC, the department chair/head, and dean.
- Years 1–5: Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (Annual)
- Year 6: Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (6 year cumulative)

6.4.2.　Part-time instructional lecturers and temporary librarians appointed for the entire academic year that do not hold a three-year appointment with a 12.12 or 12.13 entitlement must be evaluated each year by the department chair, and dean. Tenured faculty members should be given the opportunity to provide evaluative statements and such statements shall be written and signed (CBA 15.24). Department and college personnel policies may require evaluation by a DPRC in addition to the department chair/head and dean levels of review.
- Years 1–5: Two or Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (Annual)
- Year 6: Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (6 year cumulative)

6.4.3.　Full-time or part-time instructional lecturers and temporary librarians appointed for one or two academic quarters or a partial year for 12-month temporary faculty employees that do not hold a three-year appointment with a 12.12 or 12.13 entitlement may be evaluated at the discretion of the temporary faculty member, department chair/head or dean (CBA 15.25). These evaluations must include the department chair/head and dean levels of review and may include a department PRC. Tenured faculty members not participating on the PRC should be given the opportunity to provide evaluative statements and such statements shall be written and signed (CBA 15.24).

6.4.4.　Full-time and part-time instructional lecturers and temporary librarians that hold a three-year appointment with a 12.12 or 12.13 entitlement must be evaluated at minimum in the third year of their three-year appointment. The temporary faculty member may be evaluated more frequently at the request of the temporary faculty member or dean (CBA 15.26).
- Year 3: Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (Cumulative)

6.4.5.　Part-time instructional lecturers and temporary librarians must be evaluated at least by the department chair/head and dean. Tenured faculty members should be given the opportunity to provide evaluative statements and such statements shall be written and signed (CBA 15.24). Department and college personnel policies may

require evaluation by a department PRC in addition to the department chair/head and dean levels of review.

- Year 3: Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (Cumulative)

6.4.6.   Lecturers eligible for range elevation must undergo at least a Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation. A Four-Stage Lecturer Range Elevation is permissible. Colleges must specify in their personnel policy documents which evaluation process they use for lecturer range elevation.

7. Personnel Action Eligibility and Criteria

7.1. Summary

7.1.1. This chapter covers the eligibility for faculty personnel actions, which consist of retention, promotion, tenure for tenure-track faculty, and range elevation for lecturer faculty. This chapter includes general principles according to which the colleges, library, and departments would specify the criteria warranting personnel actions. These criteria also guide the processes of periodic evaluations, including cumulative evaluations of lecturers for reappointment. Colleges and departments would expand greatly on these policies with their own criteria mindful of how the diversity of disciplines within the college manifest the teacher/scholar model. The library and other non-instructional faculty units would expand on these policies with their own criteria appropriate to the professional responsibilities of their faculty.

7.1.2. Policy in chapter 7 established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-893-20.

7.2. Retention, Promotion and Tenure of Tenure-Track Faculty

7.2.1. The quality of faculty performance is the most important element to consider in evaluating individual achievement. The degree of evidence will vary in accordance with the academic position being sought by the applicant.

7.2.2. Recommendations for retention, promotion, and tenure of instructional faculty are based on the exhibition of merit and ability in each of the following areas:
- Teaching performance
- Professional development
- Service
- Other factors of consideration

7.2.2.1. Teaching effectiveness is the primary and essential criterion for the evaluation of tenure-line instructional faculty, however it alone is not sufficient for retention, promotion, and tenure.

7.2.2.2. The granting of tenure requires stronger evidence of worthiness than retention, and promotion to Professor requires a more rigorous application of criteria than promotion to Associate Professor.

7.2.3. Recommendations for retention, promotion, and tenure of library and non-instructional faculty are based on the exhibition of merit and ability in each of the following areas:
- Professional performance
- Professional development
- Service
- Other factors of consideration

7.2.3.1. Professional performance is the primary and essential criterion for the evaluation of tenure-line librarian and non-instructional faculty, however it alone is not sufficient for retention, promotion, and tenure.

7.2.3.2. The granting of tenure requires stronger evidence of worthiness than retention, and promotion to Librarian requires a more rigorous application of criteria than promotion to Associate Librarian.

7.2.4. Recommendations for retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty may also include criteria set by colleges. Departments may also have additional criteria established in their approved personnel policy documents.

7.2.5. Teaching Performance of Instructional Faculty

7.2.5.1. In formulating recommendations for the retention, promotion, and tenure of teaching faculty, evaluators will place primary emphasis on success in instruction.

7.2.5.2. Evaluators shall consider such factors as the applicant's competence in the discipline, ability to communicate ideas effectively, versatility and appropriateness of teaching techniques, organization of courses, relevance of instruction to course objectives, methods of evaluating student achievement, relationship with students in class, effectiveness of student advising, and other factors relating to performance as an instructor.

7.2.5.3. In their personnel policy documents colleges shall specify how these factors enter into the evaluation of teaching. Colleges and departments may include additional factors in their personnel policies.

7.2.5.4. Evaluators shall consider results of the formal student evaluation in formulating recommendations based on teaching performance.

7.2.6. Professional Performance of Librarians and Non-instructional Faculty

7.2.6.1. In formulating recommendations on the retention, promotion, and tenure of librarians, evaluators shall place primary emphasis on effectiveness as a librarian as evaluated by colleagues and library users.

7.2.6.2. Evaluators shall consider such factors as furthering objectives of the library and the University by cooperating with fellow librarians; applying bibliographic techniques effectively to the acquisition, development, classification, and organization of library resources; initiating and carrying to conclusion projects within the library; demonstrating versatility, including the ability to work effectively in a range of library functions and subject areas; and supervisory and/or administrative abilities.

7.2.6.3. In their personnel policy documents the library shall specify how these factors enter into the evaluation of professional performance. The library may include additional factors in its personnel policies.

7.2.6.4. Evaluation of non-instructional faculty shall consider professional performance appropriate to the position of the faculty under evaluation.

7.2.7. Professional Growth and Scholarly Achievement

7.2.7.1. In formulating recommendations on the retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty, evaluators shall place emphasis on the professional growth and scholarly achievement of the applicant.

7.2.7.2. Evaluators shall consider such factors as the applicant's educational background and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, scholarly and creative achievements, participation in professional societies, publications, presentation of papers at professional and scholarly meetings, external validation, and peer review of scholarly and creative activities.

7.2.7.3. In their personnel policy documents colleges and the library shall specify how these factors enter into the evaluation of professional growth and scholarly achievement. Colleges and departments, and the library may include additional factors in their personnel policies.

7.2.8.   Service

7.2.8.1.   In formulating recommendations on the retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty, evaluators shall place emphasis on the service the applicant performs in relation to the university and the community.

7.2.8.2.   Evaluators shall consider such factors as the applicant's participation in academic advisement; placement follow-up; co-curricular activities; membership of department, college, the Academic Senate and its committees, and University committees; individual assignments; systemwide assignments; and, service in community affairs directly related to the applicant's teaching and/or research areas as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities.

7.2.8.3.   In their personnel policy documents colleges and the library shall specify how these factors enter into the evaluation of service. Colleges and departments, and the library may include additional factors in their personnel policies.

7.2.9.   Other factors of consideration

7.2.9.1.   In formulating recommendations on the retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty, evaluators shall place emphasis on collegiality (working collaboratively and productively with colleagues and participation in traditional academic functions); initiative; cooperativeness; and dependability.

7.2.9.2.   In their personnel policy documents colleges and the library shall specify how these factors enter into the evaluation of other factors of consideration. Colleges and departments, and the library may include additional factors in their personnel policies.

7.3.   Retention Eligibility

7.3.1.   Performance reviews for the purpose of retention shall be in accordance with Articles 13 and 15 of the CBA.

7.3.2.   It is the responsibility of applicants to provide sufficient evidence that they have fulfilled the criteria for retention.

7.3.3.   The normal probationary period is six academic years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment).

7.3.4.   Evaluation of probationary faculty involves a comprehensive assessment of performance during the entire probationary period with retention seen as leading to tenure.

7.3.5.   Faculty who have not demonstrated the potential to achieve tenure should not be retained.

7.3.6.   In the event of a non-retention decision, a probationary faculty employee who has served a minimum of three years of probation (including any credit for prior service) will be extended a terminal year of employment with no further appointment rights.

7.4.   Promotion Eligibility

7.4.1.   Promotion eligibility shall be governed by the terms of Article 14 of the CBA.

7.4.2.   Promotion in rank is not automatic and is granted only in recognition of teaching competency or effectiveness as a librarian, professional growth and scholarly achievement, and meritorious service during the period in rank. The application of criteria will be more rigorous for promotion to Professor or Librarian than to Associate Professor or Associate Librarian.

7.4.3.   Applicants for promotion to the academic rank of Professor or Librarian must be tenured or concurrently be granted tenure.

7.4.4.   An application for promotion to Associate Professor or Associate Librarian is considered normal if the applicant is eligible and both of the following conditions hold:

- The applicant is tenured or the applicant is also eligible for and applying for normal tenure.
- The applicant has completed at least the equivalent of four years in their academic rank at Cal Poly.

7.4.5.   An application for promotion to Associate Professor or Associate Librarian is considered "early" if one of the following conditions holds:

- The applicant is a probationary faculty employee who is not in their sixth probationary year and is not eligible for normal tenure.
- The applicant is a tenured faculty employee and has not satisfied the equivalent service requirements of at least four years in their academic rank at Cal Poly.

7.4.6.   Early promotion will be granted only in exceptional cases. The circumstances and record of performance which make the case exceptional shall be fully documented by the applicant and validated by evaluators.

7.4.7.   The fact that an applicant has reached the maximum salary in their academic rank or meets the performance criteria for promotion does not in itself constitute an exceptional case for early promotion.

7.5.   Tenure Eligibility

7.5.1.   Tenure eligibility shall be governed by the terms of Article 13 of the CBA.

7.5.2.   Applicants for appointment with tenure shall normally be tenured professors or tenured librarians at other universities. Exceptions to this provision must be carefully documented. The President may award tenure to any individual, including one whose appointment and assignment is in a management position, at the time of appointment. Appointments with tenure shall be made only after an evaluation and recommendation by tenured faculty in the appropriate department. Possession of the doctorate or other designated terminal degree from an accredited institution is required for tenure.

7.5.3.   Normal tenure is for applicants who have accrued credit for six academic years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment).

7.5.4.   Early tenure is for applicants who have not yet achieved credit for six academic years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment).

7.6.   Tenure Criteria

7.6.1.   Tenure represents the University's long-term commitment to a faculty employee and is only granted when there is strong evidence that the individual who, by reason of their excellent performance and promise of long-range contribution as a teacher-scholar to the educational purpose of the institution, is deemed worthy of this important commitment. Tenure means the right of a faculty employee to continue at Cal Poly unless voluntarily terminated, terminated for cause, or laid off by factors governed by CBA 38.

7.6.2.   Tenure decisions are considered more critical to the University than promotion decisions.

7.6.3.   An applicant who does not have the potential for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor should not be granted tenure.

7.6.4.   Retention is not a guarantee of tenure.

7.6.5.   Tenure is not a guarantee of promotion.

7.6.6.   Early promotion is not a guarantee of tenure.

7.6.7.   An applicant for tenure must at least fully meet the requirements of their assignment and be making a valuable contribution to the university according to department, college or library criteria for tenure in each of the following performance areas:

- For instructional faculty: teaching, professional growth and scholarship, service, and other factors of consideration.
- For librarian faculty: professional performance, professional growth and scholarship, service, and other factors of consideration.

7.6.8.   An applicant for early tenure must meet department, college, or library criteria for normal tenure and provide evidence of exceptional performance in each of the following performance areas:

- For instructional faculty: teaching, professional growth and scholarship, service, and other factors of consideration.
- For librarian faculty: professional performance, professional growth and scholarship, service, and other factors of consideration.

7.6.9.   An applicant for early tenure should, at a minimum, receive a favorable majority vote from the department peer review committee.

7.7.   Lecturer Range Elevation Eligibility and Criteria

7.7.1.   Policies for lecturer range elevation are governed by CBA 12, and the memo "Amendments to the Range Elevation Procedures 2016." Cal Poly requirements about colleges and faculty units establishing their own lecturer range elevation criteria were established by AS-538-00/FAC, which is superseded by UFPP.

7.7.2.   Colleges and faculty units shall establish range elevation criteria for temporary lecturer faculty. Faculty, including temporary lecturer faculty, shall formulate such policies.

7.7.3.   The university shall notify lecturer faculty in a timely manner of their eligibility to be considered for range elevation.

7.7.4.   Temporary lecturer faculty members shall submit requests to be elevated to a higher range according to the university timeline accompanying the notification of eligibility. Faculty members shall document the reasons for which they believe that they should be elevated in the materials submitted in their WPAF according to their college or faculty unit criteria for lecturer range elevation.

7.8.   Counseling Faculty Eligibility and Criteria

7.8.1.   Eligibility and criteria for counseling faculty with classification of Student Services Professional-Academic Related (SSPAR) shall be modeled after eligibility and criteria for lecturer faculty, and stated in their faculty unit policy document.

8. Evaluation of Teaching and Professional Services

8.1. Summary

8.1.1. This chapter includes general requirements and guiding principles for how the evaluation of teaching for instructional faculty and professional services for other faculty should be conducted by evaluating bodies. University level policies for conducting student evaluation of instruction are also included in this section. Colleges and departments would expand on these requirements presented in this chapter and apply its principles to offer concrete guidance and clear expectations for how teaching would be evaluated. Library, counseling services and athletics would do likewise for the evaluation of their relevant professional services.

8.2. Observation of instruction

8.2.1. Policy in 8.2 established by AS-920-21.

8.2.2. As part of faculty evaluation processes faculty subject to evaluation shall have their instruction of their students observed by evaluators including department peer review committee (DPRC) members and/or department chairs/heads.

8.2.3. Observation of classes is an unobtrusive observation of the instructional environment for the class, which may include any of the following:
- Classrooms, laboratories, studios or any location where classes are normally scheduled.
- Online meetings of the class.
- The current state of online instructional materials as students would encounter them.

8.2.4. Course materials rendered into items included in a faculty member's Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) are not equivalent to the instructional environment. Such materials in the WPAF should be carefully reviewed by evaluators, but such review is not an alternative to observation of the instructional environment.

8.2.5. Per CBA 15.14, class observation requires at least five (5) calendar-day notice of observation coordinated between candidate and evaluator.

8.2.6. Observation of synchronous virtual distance learning conducted in regularly scheduled virtual class sessions may be conducted by attendance of the evaluator of the virtual class session, or, if mutually agreeable between the instructor and evaluator, by the viewing of a recording of a virtual class session.

8.2.7. **Observation of Asynchronous Online Instruction**

8.2.7.1. Observation of asynchronous online instruction should be conducted within a predetermined timeframe established by consultation between the instructor and the evaluator.

8.2.7.2. The evaluator should observe the current instructional environment as students would see it. Evaluators should be granted access to the instructional environment in a mode equivalent to the way students encounter the class and not as the instructor encounters the instructional environment.

8.2.7.3. The instructor may provide the evaluator a guided tour of the instructional environment, and this guided tour may be prerecorded and made available to multiple evaluators. The instructor may grant the evaluator limited access to the online environment of the course so the evaluator may see how students encounter the course on a given occasion for accessing the online instructional environment (e.g. granting the evaluator "observer" status in the learning

management system for a mutually agreeable period sufficient for the observation).

8.2.7.4.   Other reasonable means of observing the online instructional environment may be negotiated by the instructor and evaluator.

8.2.8.   Observation of classes taught in hybrid modalities may include observation of any number of the modalities of instruction.

8.2.9.   Colleges shall specify in their personnel policy documents any further requirements or allowances about observation of teaching.

8.3.   [Reserved] Guidance for Evaluation of Instruction

8.4.   Student Evaluation of Instruction

8.4.1.   Policy in 8.4.2 established by AS-759-13. Policy in 8.3.4 established by Administrative Memo AM-20130222. Policy and procedure in 8.4.4 established by AS-821-16. Formulations of policies in 8.4 approved by Academic Senate Consent 4/16/2019 with additional policies in 8.4.5 established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-898-20.

8.4.2.   Student Evaluation Instruments

8.4.2.1.   All student evaluation instruments must include the following two prompts with responses on an agreement scale:
- "Overall, this instructor was educationally effective,"
- "Overall, this course was educationally effective."

8.4.2.2.   All student evaluation instruments must include an opportunity for students to provide narrative comments. Student evaluation instruments may include additional prompts and opportunities for comments at the discretion of departments and colleges. All student evaluation instruments must be proposed by the department and approved by the college and the office of academic personnel.

8.4.3.   General Criteria for Conducting Student Evaluations

8.4.3.1.   The criteria for conducting student evaluations is established in CBA 15.15-15.19, which allows for Campus Presidents to exempt some courses from student evaluations. Administrative memo AM-20130222 establishes the exceptions for Cal Poly. This subchapter presents those exceptions.

8.4.3.2.   Student evaluations are required for all classes taught by each faculty unit employee except for the following:
- Courses with low enrollment (fewer than five students) such as individual senior projects and independent study.
- Capstone senior project classes will be evaluated if there are more than 5 students enrolled.
- Student evaluations will not be administered for individually supervised senior projects.
- 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.
- Team-taught classes: In situations when classes are team-taught, the instructor of record shall conduct student evaluations. If there is more than

one instructor of record, then copies of the evaluation results shall be placed in each of the instructor's personnel files with a memo indicating that the course was team-taught. Faculty team teaching a course will have the opportunity to write narrative descriptions to accompany the student evaluation results for the team-taught course to add context to the results. Faculty who team-teach a course and believe that the results are not representative of their contributions to the course may request that the dean not include the results associated with this team-taught course in their 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.

8.4.4.   Procedure for Conducting Student Evaluation of Instruction

8.4.4.1.   Student evaluations of instruction occur during the last week of instruction as defined by the official academic calendar. The evaluation period opens the weekend immediately prior to the last week of instruction and closes at the end of the last day of the last week of instruction. The last week of instruction and final exam week are defined by the official academic calendar. This period may be adjusted on an ad hoc basis to accommodate for academic holidays.

8.4.4.2.   For courses whose official final assessment is during the last week of instruction according to the academic calendar (e.g. labs or activities with their own final exam or assessment), their evaluation period may be the penultimate week of instruction according to the academic calendar. Requesting the earlier timeline for the evaluation of courses with early final assessments should occur by means of standard procedures of scheduling evaluations as determined by the office of Academic Personnel and communicated to the relevant college and/or program department staff.

8.4.4.3.   Students shall receive notifications of the opening and closing of the evaluation period, and reminders at appropriate intervals during the evaluation period.

8.4.4.4.   Faculty shall receive response rate reports for their evaluated courses during the evaluation period.

8.4.4.5.   Faculty are encouraged to announce to their classes that the evaluation period is underway, and to address questions from students about the nature of the evaluation process clarifying the role of student evaluations in processes of faculty review.

8.4.4.6.   Faculty may at their discretion reserve time in class for students to complete the evaluation on the student's own computer, phone or tablet. Faculty shall comply with any college level procedures about how to implement student evaluations in their classrooms. Whenever practical realities require faculty to remain in the classroom (e.g. lab safety requirements), completion of the evaluation outside of class time is preferable.

8.4.5.   Student Evaluation Results

8.4.5.1.   Placement of student evaluation results in Personnel Action Files is governed by CBA 11.1, 15.15, 15.17.

8.4.5.2.   Results of student evaluations shall be stored in electronic format and incorporated by extension into the Personnel Action File. The dean is the custodian of the PAF and will provide secure access to this information.

8.4.5.3.   Results of student evaluations consist of reports generated for each course evaluated, including a complete accounting of the quantitative responses and

all the student comments from a given class section of a course. Policies about filing, storage, and disposition of student evaluation results concern only these reports of student evaluation results.

8.4.5.4.   Colleges and departments may summarize or extract selected quantitative student evaluation data into other reports about the teaching history of a faculty member that the college or department may require to be included in the PAF. Any extraction of student evaluation data into other reports for the PAF must be defined in the college or department personnel policies.

8.4.5.5.   Results of student evaluations shall only be retained in the PAF for the prior six complete academic years.

8.4.5.6.   Results of student evaluations from classes taught earlier than the prior six complete academic years shall be removed from the PAF, following standard CSU procedures for legal document disposition. The removal of results of student evaluations from the PAF shall normally occur in summer.

8.5.   [Reserved] Evaluation of Professional Services

9. Evaluation of Professional Development [RESERVED FOR FUTURE USE]

9.1. Summary

9.1.1.   This chapter includes general requirements for how evaluation of professional development should be conducted by evaluating bodies. The function of the professional development plan is the central concern of this chapter, both as constructed by the candidate and as assessed by evaluating bodies so as to guide the candidate towards the next personnel action.

9.1.2.   [CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION].

10. Evaluation of Service
[RESERVED FOR FUTURE USE]

10.1. Summary

10.1.1.   This chapter includes general requirements for how the evaluation of service should be conducted by evaluating bodies. Colleges and departments should augment the university expectations to establish expectations about service appropriate to various faculty assignments and ranks.

10.1.2.   [CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION].

11. Governance

11.1. Summary

11.1.1. This chapter sets university level expectations for the definition of academic program governance at the college and department levels. This chapter will include definitions of department leadership as "chairs" or "heads" and university level requirements for defining any changes between those models of department leadership. This chapter also includes university-level policies concerning departmental recommendations to deans for the appointment of department chairs and heads, and about the appointment of associate deans. Colleges and departments would provide more specific policies and procedures in accord with university-level policies. Colleges and departments would also include in their documents any further policies about their governance, including committees within the college and department.

11.2. [Reserved] Guiding Principles

11.3. [Reserved] College Governance

11.4. Department Governance

11.4.1. Department Leadership

11.4.1.1. Policy in 11.4.1 established by AS-934-22 and revised by AS-940-22.

11.4.1.2. Department chairs and heads are faculty who have administrative functions as part of their assignment. Department chairs and heads serve at the pleasure of the dean. Appointment of chairs and heads are made by the dean after consultation with the faculty, the provost, and the president. Consultation with the faculty includes the departmental selection processes contained in 11.4.2.

11.4.1.3. In exceptional cases MPP administrators may be appointed as chairs or heads on an acting or interim basis. Also, department chairs and heads may be appointed to MPP positions on an interim basis. Acting and interim chair and head appointments are covered further in 11.4.2.

11.4.1.4. Department chairs receive three-year renewable appointments. The definite term of chair appointments allows for a rotation of department leadership providing new leadership, fresh ideas, shorter term action plans, and the opportunity for more faculty to rotate through this leadership role.

11.4.1.5. Department heads receive appointments over an indefinite period, providing long-term continuity of leadership within their department and college.

11.4.1.6. Deans determine whether a department chair or department head appointment best suits the needs of the department and college.

11.4.1.7. Department chairs and heads may have academic year appointments, 12-month appointments. The nature of the appointment depends on the nature of their duties in the academic year and during summer, as determined by the dean, and are compensated accordingly.

11.4.1.8. The responsibilities and priorities of department chairs and heads will vary across colleges, departments, and individuals. Departments have varying models of how the responsibilities listed below will be accomplished. Although there are many items listed among responsibilities of department chairs and heads, some of these items may be delegated to other faculty and staff depending on the size of the department, organizational structure, support

staff and the fraction of the assignment of department chairs or heads that is dedicated to administrative duties. The college deans will help the department chairs and heads understand the prioritization of these duties in conjunction with the college and department's vision and goals.

11.4.1.9. Academic Personnel maintains a document describing in detail the responsibilities and priorities of department chairs and heads, including the following areas of management and leadership for the department:

- Administration of department affairs
- Budget development and administration
- Department personnel
- Academic programs and curriculum
- Student engagement and success
- Advocacy for the department's interests
- Community engagement and development activities

11.4.1.10. Department chairs and heads are subject to annual administrative review. This administrative review is wholly distinct from faculty evaluations that are covered in UFPP 4-6. The administrative review of department chairs and heads is conducted by the dean.

11.4.2. Departmental Role in the Selection Process for Chairs and Heads

11.4.2.1. Policy in 11.4.2 established by AS-940-22 and AM-20171030, editorially revised in AM-20180208.

11.4.2.2. Processes conducted within a department for selection of candidates for department chairs and heads are advisory, providing recommendations from the department faculty to the dean, and shall be specified in department or college faculty personnel policy documents. Departments may recommend to the dean one or more candidates for chair or head.

11.4.2.3. The departmental practice for selecting candidates for department chairs or heads shall involve voting among the department faculty incorporating the voting requirements outlined below. These voting requirements represent a minimum; departments may modify their department chair or head recommendation policies through the joint governance process approved by the dean.

11.4.2.3.1. All 12.12 (3-year) lecturers, including counselors and librarians, with an appointment in the academic term of the vote will be eligible to participate in the vote to recommend a department chair or head, with a full vote in their department voting process. Nothing in the balloting process will differentiate the three-year lecturers' vote from tenured and tenure-track faculty votes for department chair or head recommendations.

11.4.2.3.2. All other lecturers will be granted an advisory vote. These advisory votes will be differentiated and summarized separately from the votes of the 12.12 (3-year) lecturers, tenured faculty, and tenure-track faculty.

11.4.2.3.3. Lecturers shall be notified regarding the department voting process in the same manner as all tenured and tenure-track faculty.

11.4.2.3.4. Lecturers eligible to cast a vote or an advisory vote shall be afforded the same opportunity as tenured and tenure-track faculty to attend

regularly scheduled department meetings when department chair or head recommendation balloting is scheduled.

11.4.2.4.   The results of all departmental voting shall be included in the department's basis for recommendations of suitable candidates from the department to the dean.

11.4.2.5.   An acting chair or head may be appointed from faculty within the department, from faculty not in the affected department, or from administrators. Acting chairs and heads are intended to serve for short periods when the current chair or head is unable to serve (e.g. while on sabbatical or leave). Standardly, acting chair appointments are for periods shorter than one year when the current chair is expected to return. Since appointments of acting chairs and heads can be time sensitive and may occur on occasions when it is not feasible to consult with the affected department ahead of the appointment, deans may use their discretion about whether or not to consult with department faculty in appointment of an acting chair or head.

11.4.2.6.   An interim chair or head may be appointed from faculty within the department, from faculty not in the affected department, or from administrators. Interim chairs and heads are intended to serve until the dean makes a standard appointment of a department chair or head (as covered in 11.4.1). The initial appointment of an interim chair or head shall be for a defined period no longer than one year, and renewed as needed. Since initial appointments of interim chairs and heads can be time sensitive and may occur on occasions when it is not feasible to consult with the affected department ahead of the appointment, deans may use their discretion about whether or not to consult with department faculty in the initial appointment of an interim chair or head. When an extension of an interim appointment is necessary, the dean shall solicit feedback from all department faculty, including all lecturers with an appointment in the academic term when the feedback is collected, for use in the dean's decision about the interim chair or head reappointment.

11.4.2.7.   In exceptional cases the college may undergo a standard faculty recruitment to hire a department chair or head. In addition to all the normal aspects of a faculty recruitment, the chair of the search committee shall solicit feedback from all lecturers with an appointment in the academic term of the search; these lecturers will be granted a full advisory vote, which will be presented to the faculty search committee. This advisory vote shall be included in the basis for recommendations of suitable candidates from the search committee to the dean. The result of a successful search for a new faculty member to serve as chair or head shall be a standard chair or head appointment as covered in 11.4.1.

11.4.3.   Changes in Department Leadership Models

11.4.3.1.   Policy in 11.4.3 established by AS-935-22, superseding AS-801-15.

11.4.3.2.   The dean has discretion over the type of department chair or head appointments appropriate for the college and department.

11.4.3.3.   Changes in department leadership models shall involve a consultative process with department faculty and staff.

11.4.3.4.   Colleges shall specify in their personnel policy documents the process for implementing such a change in departmental leadership.

11.5. Associate Dean Appointments

11.5.1.   Policy in 11.5 established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-884-19.

11.5.2.   Appointment of associate deans is governed by the MPP (Management Personnel Program) policies of the CSU and state law.

11.5.3.   The appointment of associate deans in the colleges or library shall involve a consultative process with faculty and staff.

11.5.4.   Colleges and the library shall specify in their personnel policy documents the nature of the consultation with faculty and staff for standard appointments of associate deans.

12. Workload

12.1. Summary

12.1.1.   This chapter includes policies covering various aspects of faculty workload, including office hours, assigned time for exceptional service to students, and sabbatical and difference in pay leaves.

12.2. Office Hours

12.2.1.   Policy in 12.2 established by AS-886-20 and revised by AS-829-22. This policy supersedes the previous university policy on office hours originally in CAM 370.2.

12.2.2.   Cal Poly's Educational Mission: "Cal Poly is committed to excellence in teaching and learning. In all disciplines, we seek to provide a student-centered, learner-focused education, facilitated by a low student-teacher ratio in classes conducted primarily by full-time, regular faculty. The cornerstone of our educational philosophy is our commitment to Learn by Doing whereby classroom instruction is complemented by practical, hands-on learning in the laboratory, the studio, and the field." (Cal Poly Catalog)

12.2.3.   Each faculty member must schedule and conduct office hours each week for consultation with students. One-on-one, direct, personal engagement between students and their instructors and faculty advisors in regularly scheduled office hours is a vital means of contributing to the student-centered mission of Cal Poly.

12.2.4.   Asynchronous communication (e.g. email) with students and ad hoc appointments to meet with students are expected normal instructional duties distinct from scheduled office hours.

12.2.5.   An office hour is one credit hour (i.e. 50 minutes) of regularly scheduled time for faculty to be available to meet on regularly scheduled days and times.

12.2.6.   Faculty with instructional assignments shall hold scheduled office hours scaled to their instructional assignments. Scheduled office hours should be held during the days and times when classes are normally scheduled, distributed across days and at times suited to the needs of students. During final exam week office hours may be rescheduled as necessary, and should be suited to the needs of the students served in the instructional assignment.

12.2.7.   Colleges that assign duties warranting the holding of office hours shall include office hour policies in their personnel policies documents.

12.2.8.   Scheduled instructional office hours

12.2.8.1.   Minimum weekly office hour scheduling shall be scaled to instructional assignments as follows:

Instructional WTU	Lecturer	Tenure-Line
> 0 up to and including 4	1 office hour	2 office hours
> 4 up to and including 8	2 office hours	3 office hours
> 8 up to and including 12	3 office hours	4 office hours
> 12	4 office hours	

12.2.8.2.   Faculty receiving assigned time for teaching large format classes shall schedule office hours according to the total WTU for the instructional assignment and assigned time related to that course.

12.2.8.3.   Tenure-line faculty whose instructional assignments have been reduced to zero WTU but who are involved in research or other projects involving supervision

of students shall hold a minimum of one regularly scheduled in-person office hour.

12.2.8.4.   If colleges or departments have any further provisions about the scheduling of office hours, those provisions shall be defined in their personnel policy document.

12.2.9.   Scheduled advising office hours

12.2.9.1.   Assigned time for advising duties may have an amount of office hours defined as part of the advising function. Any advising office hours attached to assigned time shall be determined by the instructional unit that issues the assigned time and specified in the assignment. Office hours for advising duties earning assigned time contribute to the total office hour obligation of the faculty member.

12.2.9.2.   Department chair and head responsibilities shall include the requirements for the scheduling of advising office hours required for their assignment. Colleges shall determine the minimum office hours required for department chairs and heads.

12.2.10.   Mode of office hours

12.2.10.1.   The mode of scheduled office hours should meet the needs of students for the instructional or advising function that requires the scheduling of the office hours.

12.2.10.2.   Acceptable modes of holding scheduled office hours include office hours held in-person or held synchronously online using technology readily available to the campus community and generally available to the students served by the office hours (e.g. Zoom).

12.2.10.3.   Scheduled office hours held in-person should be in the faculty member's office or some other definite and regular location.

12.2.10.4.   Colleges and departments shall specify in their office hour policies any general allowances or requirements for alternate locations or synchronous online modes of conducting office hours.

12.2.11.   Notification

12.2.11.1.   Office hours shall be posted by the beginning of the second week of instruction in faculty listings on department websites. Colleges and instructional units can determine additional ways for posting office hours that conspicuously and conveniently inform the university community of when and where office hours shall be conducted, such as common boards at department offices, on placards near faculty offices, or other online directories.

12.2.11.2.   If the university adopts a standard online directory generally accessible to the university community that is capable of presenting faculty schedules, then office hours should be posted in such an online directory.

12.2.11.3.   Faculty should notify enrolled students and department administrators and administrative support staff of any need to cancel, reschedule, or relocate office hours in a timely manner appropriate to the needs of the students served by those office hours.

12.2.12.   Exceptions

12.2.12.1.   Exceptions to the policies about the scheduling of instructional and advising office hours should coordinate the needs of the instructor and the students given the nature of the instructional or advising assignment.

12.2.12.2.   Exceptions require department chair/head and college dean approval.

12.2.12.3.   Exceptions should be temporary and specific.

12.2.12.4.   Exceptions that extend beyond a specific instructor's temporary needs should be treated as a basis for revisiting the college or department office hour policies.

12.2.12.5.   Colleges and departments with standing needs that deviate from university policy should treat those needs as a basis for asking the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee to revisit university level office hour policies.

12.3. Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students

12.3.1.   Policy in 12.3 established by Academic Senate Consent 2/9/2021, and revised by AS-961-23.

12.3.2.   Pursuant to CBA 20.37 and in support of California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo (Cal Poly's) Mission and Strategic Plan, exceptional service awards are intended to recognize faculty who have a demonstrated commitment to working on issues faced by our diverse student population.

12.3.3.   Exceptional Student Service Committee (ESSC)

12.3.3.1.   Each academic college shall be a constituency and shall have a representative on the Exceptional Student Service Committee (ESSC). The Academic Senate chair may assign the functions of the ESSC to a standing Academic Senate committee. When a standing committee takes on the ESSC function, that committee shall adhere to the criteria for ATESS independent of any other charges or mission of that committee.

12.3.3.2.   The committees serving the functions of the ESSC shall include one faculty member from each constituency defined above appointed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee, a student appointed by the Associated Students, Inc., and an ex officio non-voting administrative member appointed by the provost or designee.

12.3.3.3.   Faculty on a committee serving the functions of ESSC who apply for assigned time under ATESS shall recuse themselves from all work involved in ESSC and shall not attend any meetings concerning ESSC work, nor participate in any discussions about ESSC work. The Academic Senate Executive Committee may appoint another faculty member from the recused faculty member's constituency to serve the role of the recused member in relation to the functions of ESSC.

12.3.3.4.   The functions of ESCC shall be:
- Evaluate faculty applications for assigned time for exceptional levels of service to students.
- Make recommendations based on those evaluations to the provost.
- Periodically review and, if needed, make recommendations for changes in this policy to the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC).

12.3.4.   Eligibility and Restrictions

12.3.4.1.   All Unit 3 faculty employees are eligible to submit a proposal to request assigned time for exceptional levels of service to students.

12.3.4.2.   Faculty who have previously received assigned time under this program will be eligible to apply for another assigned time award.

12.3.4.3.   In order to support new or currently unfunded activities, rather than to enhance existing support for ongoing activities, faculty members already receiving other sources of assigned time or compensation for the same

activities on the list of Supported Activities below shall not be eligible for support from this program for that very same activity.

12.3.4.4.   Assigned time shall be used for course release during the academic year (and not in summer). As per 20.37, the course release shall be utilized during the academic year in which the activity is performed, though it may be used in any term of that academic year.

12.3.5.   Timeline for Application Process

12.3.5.1.   Application for assigned time shall be for activities in the subsequent academic year. A timeline for the application process shall be announced in the notification sent to faculty upon the opening of the application period.

12.3.5.2.   The applicant's department chair/head shall submit the application materials to the applicant's dean, who then shall submit the applications to the ESSC. The ESSC reviews applications and submits its recommendations to the provost in time for applicants to be notified of the status of their applications.

12.3.6.   Application Materials

12.3.6.1.   The distribution of application materials concerning assigned time for exceptional levels of service to students should target department chairs/heads, program directors and students to encourage applications from faculty they view as having taken on extraordinary burdens in the related categories of service to students in relation to the aims of the program as stated in UFPP 12.3.3.

12.3.6.2.   An application for assigned time to support exceptional levels of service to students shall include the following:

- Description of the nature of the exceptional service being provided to students and how it goes significantly beyond the normal expectations of the faculty member's assignment.
- Account of direct benefits to students and the student beneficiaries of the exceptional service being provided.
- Description of other assigned time or compensation for exceptional service during the current academic year and expected for the subsequent academic year.
- Justification of how the WTUs requested correlate work effort with course release.
- Account of previous success in comparable service.
  - The faculty applicant's current curriculum vitae (CV), highlighting relevant prior service activities similar to those for which assigned time is being sought;
  - A statement from the department chair or head about the merit of the proposal in relation to the faculty member's assignment, verification that no other source of assigned time or compensation has been provided for the same general activity, an account of the appropriateness of the requested assigned time for course release for the applicant; and
  - The college dean's recommendation.

12.3.6.3.   Incomplete applications will not be reviewed.

12.3.7.   Supported Activities

12.3.7.1. This assigned time is for service to students in relation to the department, college, university, or community that goes significantly beyond the normal expectations of a faculty member's assignment. The following activities may be supported:

- Student mentoring, advising, and outreach that goes significantly beyond the normal expectations of a faculty member's assignment;
- Activities that support underserved, first-generation, and/or underrepresented students, including those caused by cultural taxation;
- Curricular redesign intended to improve student access and success;
- Other extraordinary forms of service to students beyond the normal expectations of a faculty member's assignment.

12.3.8.   Review Criteria

12.3.8.1. The ESSC assesses applications based upon application materials including the narrative description of how the proposed service meets the following criteria:

- A clear delineation of how the service to the students goes beyond the normal expectations of the applicant's assignment;
- Justification for how the amount of assigned time requested correlates the service activity with the requested WTU;
- Demonstrated ability to be successful in accomplishing project goals and previous work in this area.

12.3.9.   Recommendations

12.3.9.1. The ESSC shall rate each proposal based on the established criteria and rank order the proposals by total rubric score.

12.3.9.2. The ESSC shall submit its evaluations and the application materials to the provost who shall make the final determination regarding the approval or denial of the proposals.

12.3.10.   Information Provided to Applicants

12.3.10.1. The provost will forward their approval or denial of assigned time, and the basis for the denial of assigned time, to the applicant.

12.3.11.   Appeals

12.3.11.1. Within 10 days following receipt of the provost's decision, applicants may appeal a denial of assigned time to the associate vice-provost for academic personnel. Appeals will be forwarded to the Faculty Affairs Committee for consideration. The FAC will consider the appeal at their next scheduled business meeting and will respond to the appellant in writing with a copy to the provost. Decisions of the FAC shall be final and binding and are not subject to the grievance procedures specified in Article 10 of the CBA.

12.3.12.   Effective Dates

12.3.12.1. The policies and procedures in this document are an implementation of Article 20, section 37 of the CBA, and dependent upon any successor CBA to include additional awards in future years.

12.3.12.2. Academic Personnel shall maintain an updated calendar for the operations of the ESSC and the awarding of this assigned time for each academic year it is in effect.

12.3.13.   Assigned Time Budget and Reporting

12.3.13.1. There is no CSU allocation provided to support assigned time. Campuses are required to self-fund the assigned time allocations based on the number of full-

time equivalent students at each campus. At Cal Poly, the assigned time will be funded by the provost.

12.3.13.2. As per CBA 20.37 Cal Poly shall expend all assigned time allocated under this program, and Cal Poly shall provide an accounting of assigned time expended for this program for the prior fiscal year by no later than November 1 of the subsequent year to the ESSC, the FAC, the Academic Senate, campus CFA president, and the CSU.

12.3.13.3. All assigned time allocations must be expended in the academic year per restrictions specified in UFPP 12.3. For accounting purposes, costs of assigned time shall be calculated based on the minimum salary for an assistant professor. Awards from appeals shall not exceed 10% of the annual budget for assigned time and shall be funded in the subsequent academic year. During the last year of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, appeals must be funded from the funds for that year, including any rollover from previous years.

12.4. Sabbatical and Difference in Pay Leaves

12.4.1. Policy in 12.4 established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-908-21, with revisions approved by Academic Senate Consent 5/4/2021 and Academic Senate Consent 11/29/2022 item C.

12.4.2. Sabbatical and difference-in-pay leaves are intended to provide a benefit to the university through research, scholarly and creative activity, instructional improvement, or faculty retraining.

12.4.3. Deans or appropriate administrators are responsible for notifying eligible faculty and advising them of the application deadline.

12.4.4. Sabbatical Leave Eligibility

12.4.4.1. Full-time faculty unit employees, except coaches, are eligible to take an approved sabbatical leave after completing six academic years of full-time service within the past seven years, or at least six years after a previous sabbatical or difference-in-pay leave. Service credit granted towards the completion of the probationary period for tenure-track faculty shall also apply towards fulfilling the eligibility requirement for a sabbatical.

12.4.4.2. Eligible academic year faculty unit employees may apply for a sabbatical leave of one quarter in length at full pay, two quarters at 75% pay, or three quarters at 50% pay.

12.4.4.3. Applications for three-quarter sabbatical leaves shall meet the criteria set forth in CBA 27.5-27.8, including consideration of the quality of the proposal, effect on the curriculum and the operation of the department, other campus program needs, and campus and college budget implications.

12.4.5. Difference-in-Pay Leave Eligibility

12.4.5.1. The initial eligibility requirement for a difference-in-pay (DIP) leave is the same as for sabbatical leaves (six years of full-time service within the past seven years).

12.4.5.2. For a subsequent DIP leave, faculty unit employees become eligible after serving full-time for three academic years following the last sabbatical or DIP leave.

12.4.6. Faculty Classifications During Leave Periods

12.4.6.1. Current 12-month faculty who are granted leave with pay may remain in 12-month status for the duration of the approved leave. Eligible 12-month faculty

unit employees may apply for a sabbatical leave of 3 months in length at full pay, 6 months at 75% pay, or 9 months at 50% pay. The start date of a sabbatical leave for a 12-month faculty employee with instructional responsibilities shall coincide with the start date of the appropriate academic term.

12.4.6.2.   Per CBA 27.13 and 31.27, while on sabbatical or difference in pay leave during an appointment as department chair/head the faculty employee shall not receive the department chair/head salary increase. Faculty employees serving as academic year department chair/head (class code 2482) shall be assigned to academic year instructional faculty classification (class code 2360) for the duration of the sabbatical or difference in pay leave. Faculty employees serving as 12-month department chair/head (class code 2481) shall be assigned to 12-month instructional faculty classification (class code 2361) for the duration of the sabbatical or difference in pay leave. An acting chair/head shall be appointed for the duration of the leave period.

12.4.6.3.   Grant-related instructional faculty (GRIF) must be converted to instructional faculty classifications for the duration of leave.

12.4.7.   Sabbatical and DIP leave applications must include clearly stated outcomes that benefit the university or CSU. It is critically important that those involved in reviewing leave applications recommend approval only of those applications that satisfy departmental, college and university criteria and meet the requirements of Articles 27.5-27.7 and 28.7-28.9 of the CBA.

12.4.8.   Colleges, the library, and counseling services shall formalize sabbatical and difference in pay leave policies and procedures consistent with those in UFPP. Any refinement of the relevant criteria for sabbatical and DIP leaves, in conformity with the general principles stated in UFPP 12.4.2., shall be included in the college, library, or counseling services personnel policies document. Any enhancements to the policies, procedures, and responsibilities in a college, the library, or counseling services shall be included in its personnel policies document.

12.4.9.   Department Leave Committee (DLC)

12.4.9.1.   As per CBA 28.7, difference in pay leave requires review by a Department Leave Committee (DLC). DLC members shall be elected by tenured and probationary faculty from that department. Faculty members eligible for membership are tenured, and not applying for a leave with pay. The DLC shall review all DIP leave applications and make a recommendation based on the quality of the leave proposal. The recommendation of the DLC is included in the application sent to the department chair/head.

12.4.9.2.   Departments may choose to have their DLC review applications for sabbaticals. If so, the composition of the committee and its responsibilities are the same as for review of DIP leave applications. Departments choosing to have the DLC review sabbatical applications shall specify this process in their personnel policies.

12.4.9.3.   Departments shall configure their DLC so that their representative to their college's Professional Leave Committee (PLC) is not reviewing leave cases within the department.

12.4.10.   Department Chair/Head Recommendations

12.4.10.1.   Department chairs/heads shall state in a candidate's application whether the department has adequate resources to replace faculty members, and whether such a leave, if approved, would cause undue hardship to offer the

department's program(s), and how the department will meet their teaching and other needs, as per CBA 27.6.

12.4.10.2.   If an applicant is the current department chair/head, the appropriate associate dean shall make the equivalent recommendation.

12.4.11.   Professional Leave Committees (PLC)

12.4.11.1.   Each college, the library, and counseling services shall each convene their own Professional Leave Committees (PLC). As per CBA 27.5, PLC members shall be composed of tenured faculty who are not applying for a sabbatical or DIP leave.

12.4.11.2.   The PLC shall review its leave applications to form recommendations to the dean or appropriate administrator based on the quality of the proposals. The colleges, the library, and counseling services may include PLC interviews of applicants as part of their formal application review process. Sabbatical leave applicants and DIP leave applicants may be separated in any college, library, or counseling services policies on inclusion of PLC interviews in their application review process.

12.4.11.3.   The PLC shall rank order all recommended sabbatical leave applications, and separately rank order any DIP leave applications under the scope of its review. The PLC report shall clearly state to the dean or appropriate administrator the impact of the interviews on the rank ordering of leave applicants and the reasons for recommending denial of an application. This report shall be forwarded to the dean or appropriate administrator along with the leave applications.

12.4.11.4.   College Professional Leave Committee (CPLC) members shall be elected from each department in the college. Tenured and probationary faculty in the department elect one departmental representative to the CPLC. The CPLC shall elect one of its members as chair of the CPLC. Colleges may include in their CPLC policies and procedures allowances that the CPLC also review DIP leave applications within the college. As per 12.4.9.3, when colleges have their CPLC review sabbatical and difference in pay leaves, the faculty involved in the departmental review of DIP leave applications shall not serve on the CPLC.

12.4.11.5.   The Library PLC (LPLC) shall consist of at least two tenured faculty librarians elected by all faculty librarians. The LPLC shall review all sabbatical and DIP leave applications from library faculty.

12.4.11.6.   The Counseling Services PLC (CSPLC) shall include at least two tenured SSP-AR counseling faculty or tenured faculty librarians. Counseling services policies shall determine the appropriate faculty to vote for CSPLC membership. The CSPLC shall review all sabbatical and DIP leave applications from counseling faculty.

12.4.12.   Dean Recommendations

12.4.12.1.   Deans shall review all sabbatical and DIP leave applications in their faculty units and make recommendations to the provost. The director of counseling services shall serve the equivalent role of dean for purposes related to sabbatical and DIP leaves.

12.4.12.2.   Deans shall consider at least the following points when making recommendations for sabbatical and DIP leaves:
- Benefit of the leave to the university
- Merit of the proposal
- Recommendations of the prior levels of review

- Program needs
- Campus budget implications

12.4.12.3. Deans shall verify that post-leave reports have been completed for all previous sabbatical and DIP leaves prior to recommending approval.

12.4.12.4. Deans shall rank order all sabbatical leave applications that are being recommended (including all one, two- and three-quarter sabbatical applications). Deans shall separately rank order all DIP leave applications that are being recommended.

12.4.13. Provost Decision

12.4.13.1. The provost is the final level of administrative evaluation for sabbatical and DIP leave.

12.4.13.2. The provost shall review the candidate's materials and reports from all levels of evaluation.

12.4.13.3. The provost's letter to the candidate constitutes the final decision on sabbatical and DIP leave.

12.4.13.4. As per CBA 27.8 sabbatical leaves denied in the immediately prior year due to factors related to UFPP 12.4.10.1 shall not be denied based on those same factors.

12.4.14. A copy of the completed leave application form with all appropriate signatures and a copy of the leave abstract and detailed leave proposal shall be placed into the candidate's Personnel Action File (PAF).

12.4.15. Leave recipients shall submit a post-leave report to the college dean or appropriate administrator (with a copy to the department chair/head) within two months of their return from leave. The college dean or appropriate administrator is responsible for requesting and ensuring that the required post-leave report is obtained from each faculty member who took sabbatical or DIP leave upon the faculty member's return to teaching. Upon receipt, the post-leave report shall be filed in the faculty member's PAF.

12.4.16. Following the conclusion of faculty sabbatical or DIP leaves, the CBA articles 27 and 28 require recipients to return service to the CSU equivalent to the period of leave taken. Faculty who fail to return to Cal Poly employment will be required to repay the university for the amount of salary and benefits earned for the duration of their leave.

13. Appendices

13.1. Administrative Memos

13.1.1.   UFPP includes an appendix containing copies of various administrative memos relevant to policies in UFPP or subordinate policy documents. Administrative memos state or create policy by administrative action. Gathering them into an appendix provides a convenience of a single location for policy memos cited in UFPP or in subordinate college, library, or department policy documents.

13.1.2.   UFPP Appendix: Administrative Memos shall be contained in a document separate from UFPP, and accessible on the Academic Personnel website along with UFPP.

13.1.3.   Administrative memos are sorted by date and assigned descriptive names typically drawn from their subject lines. To standardize citation of administrative memos, each is assigned a reference number in the following format: AM-YYYYMMDD. Any citation of administrative memos in UFPP or subordinate policy documents should use that reference standard.

13.1.4.   Administrative memos shall be placed in this appendix by Academic Senate Consent or Academic Senate Resolution cited in a list of the memos in UFPP.

13.1.5.   Adding citations of administrative memos to UFPP shall be regarded as wholly editorial and therefore needs no further Academic Senate action.

13.1.6.   List of administrative memos

- AM-19850222: AB85-2 Role and Definition of Professional Growth and Development
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20050111: Faculty Post-Retirement Employment
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20061117: Agreement for Summer Quarter Faculty Assignments
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20130110: New Outside Employment Reporting Requirement for Unit 3 Employees
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20130222: New Student Evaluation Requirement Effective Winter Quarter 2013
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20130919: Self-Support Program Personnel Policies
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20161115: Amendments to the Range Elevation Procedures 2016
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20170530: Guidelines for Special Session Teaching
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20171030: Settlement on Lecturer Voting
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20171101: Employment of Non-Immigrants – Important updates
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20180208: Cal Poly Election Process for Internal Department Heads/Chairs
  - AS-940-22
- AM-20180919: Lecturer Range Elevation Eligibility Guidelines

     ○ Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
     • AM-20190208: Summer Term 2019 Faculty Eligibility
      ○ Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020

13.2. [Reserved] Glossary

To:	Academic Deans	**Date:**	September 8, 2023
From:	Cynthia Jackson-Elmoore, Ph.D.	**Copies:**	Kathryn Rummell
	Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs		Ken Brown
Subject:	University Faculty Personnel Policies AY 2023-2024		

The subject document, written by the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee and approved by the Academic Senate, is approved for immediate implementation. Please provide the university faculty access to the document as soon as possible.