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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 was 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. Chapter 2 was established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-866-19.

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. Application packages must include at least the following items:

- Current Curriculum Vitae (CV)
- At least three letters of reference
- Unofficial transcripts at the time of application (Official transcripts required for appointment)
- Cover Letter (preferred)
- Other materials required by the college or department

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. Required documents for full-time lecturer recruitment:

- Application
- CV
- Cover letter (preferred)
- List of CSU courses taught
- Transcripts
• Name and email address of 3 references.

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. Required documents for part-time lecturer pool recruitment:
• Application
• CV
• Cover letter (preferred)
• List of CSU courses taught
• Transcripts
• Name and email address of 3 references.

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. Chapter 3 was established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-868-19.

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
- 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. Chapter 4 was established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-867-19

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)

4.2.8. To acknowledge receipt of an AP 109 evaluation report, candidates must sign the report within the specified timeframe of ten days.

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 (e.g., partner, very close friend or collaborator) 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 15.44). 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 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.

4.3.9. 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)

4.5. 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. The committee shall also rank the promotion candidates in one list. (CBA 15.44-45)

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.

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.

4.6. 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.

4.7. 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. Chapter 5 was established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-872-19.

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 that results in the retention or tenure for 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 promotion to 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

5.3.2. Library Faculty Performance Evaluation
5.3.2.1. Library Faculty Performance Evaluation results in retention, promotion, or tenure of library faculty.
5.3.2.2. Library Faculty Performance Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
   - DPRC
   - Associate Dean
   - Dean
   - Vice-Provost
   - Provost

5.4. Counseling Services Faculty Evaluation Processes
5.4.1. Counseling Services Periodic Evaluation
5.4.1.1. Counseling Services Periodic Evaluation provides feedback and guidance to the counseling services faculty member in support of future personnel actions.
5.4.1.2. Counseling Services Periodic Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
   - DPRC (optional)
   - Director
   - Health Center Director
   - Vice President of Student Affairs

5.4.2. Counseling Services Performance Evaluation
5.4.2.1. Counseling Services Performance Evaluation results in retention, promotion, or tenure of counseling services faculty.
5.4.2.2. Counseling Services Performance Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
   - DPRC (optional)
   - Director
   - Health Center Director
   - Vice President of Student Affairs
   - Provost

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

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

5.6. Exceptions

5.6.1. 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)

5.6.2. 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)

5.6.3. 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.

5.6.4. 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.

5.7. University Evaluation Process Calendar

5.7.1. 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. Chapter 6 was established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-874-19.

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.

6.3. Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Pattern

6.3.1. A Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation shall 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.

6.3.2. 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 reviews for promotion can serve in lieu of periodic reviews.

6.3.3. 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.

6.3.4. 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
[RESERVED FOR FUTURE USE]

7.1. Summary

7.1.1. This chapter covers the eligibility for personnel actions (including retention, promotion, tenure, range elevation) and the general principles according to which the colleges and departments would specify the criteria for warranting the personnel action. 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.

7.1.2. [CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION].

See Appendix: University Faculty Personnel Actions (2013) for eligibility and criteria related to personnel actions.
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 and Coaches would do likewise for the evaluation of their relevant professional services.

8.1.2. [CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION].

See Appendix: University Faculty Personnel Actions (2013) For evaluation and criteria related to teaching/professional service.

8.2. [Reserved for requirements in the evaluation of teaching or professional service]

8.3. [Reserved for general principles and criteria for evaluation of teaching or professional service]

8.4. Student Evaluation of Instruction

8.4.1. Chapter 8.4 approved by Academic Senate Consent 4/16/2019.

8.4.2. Student Evaluation Instruments

8.4.2.1. The requirements for student evaluation instruments were established by AS-759-13. The formulation in this subchapter supersedes that resolution.

8.4.2.2. 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.”

8.4.2.3. 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. Memo from Provost February 22, 2013, available on the Academic Personnel website, 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. The procedure for conducting student evaluation of instruction was established by AS-821-16. This subchapter presents those procedures and supersedes that resolution.

8.4.4.2. 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.

8.4.4.3. 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.

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

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

8.4.4.6. 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.

8.4.4.7. 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.
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].

See Appendix: University Faculty Personnel Actions (2013) for evaluation of professional development.
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].

See Appendix: University Faculty Personnel Actions (2013) for evaluation of service.
11. Governance

[RESERVED FOR FUTURE USE]

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. 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.

11.1.2. [CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION].

11.2. Guiding Principles

11.2.1. Shared governance

11.3. College Governance

11.3.1. College committees

11.4. Department Governance

11.4.1. Forms of department governance
11.4.2. Department chair selection processes
11.4.3. Transition between forms of department governance
12. Workload

[RESERVED FOR FUTURE USE]

12.1. Summary

12.1.1. This chapter includes policies covering various aspects of faculty workload, including office hours, assigned time, Summer and Extended Education teaching, FERP or PRTB workload.

12.2. Office hours

12.2.1. [CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION]

12.3. Assigned time for exceptional service to students

12.3.1. [CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION]

12.4. Summer Teaching

12.4.1. [CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION]
13. Appendices

13.1. Glossary

13.1.1. [CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION]
13.1.2. [Reserved for future use]
UFPP Appendix: University Faculty Personnel Actions (2013)

Revision History

Approved 9/1/2009;

Editorial Revision 9/29/2011;

Editorial Revision 2/26/2013 to conform with new policies on student evaluations and to eliminate obsolete references to CAP.


Section I. Performance review: retention, promotion, and tenure

A. Performance evaluation procedures

1. Evaluations shall be conducted in accordance with Article 15 of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) [the collective bargaining agreement for faculty employees between The California State University and Unit 3 Faculty] and Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations.

2. Each college or other academic unit shall develop a written statement of procedures and criteria for each type of personnel action. (In this section, the use of the word “college” includes the Library, and use of the word “department” includes equivalent units covered under the MOU such as area, Intercollegiate Athletics, and Counseling.) Departments desiring to develop statements to serve as addenda to the college statement may do so. Full-time probationary and full-time tenured faculty may participate in the development and/or subsequent amendment of these procedures and criteria. College and department statements are subject to review and approval by the college dean and the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. In the event a policy or procedure in a college or department statement is in conflict with a provision of the MOU, the provision in the MOU shall prevail.

3. Timetables for evaluations shall be published annually and shall be developed in consultation with the Academic Senate.

4. A faculty employee subject to performance or periodic review has the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting evidence of their accomplishments to those charged with the responsibility of reviewing and evaluating faculty employees. Applicants should seek advice and guidance from their department chair (in this section, the use of the
words “department chair” also includes department head) and dean to understand how criteria and standards are applied.

5. Evaluators will provide their written evaluation and recommendation to the faculty employee at least ten days before transmitting the evaluation to the next level of review.

6. Personnel Action File (PAF)

The PAF is the official permanent employment record of a faculty employee and resides in the office of the college dean.


The WPAF is initiated by the applicant to support consideration for a performance review for retention, promotion, tenure, or periodic review. The WPAF for tenure or tenure/promotion covers the entire employment period at Cal Poly. The WPAF for promotion shall emphasize the period since the last promotion at Cal Poly or appointment to the current rank. 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. All supporting materials in the WPAF should be referenced and clearly explained.

a. The applicant shall submit the WPAF to the department chair by the established deadline. Materials shall include but be not limited to

   (1) Index of materials contained in the WPAF

   (2) Resume

      (a) The resume should be organized according to the categories to be evaluated including: teaching activities and performance or librarian/counselor effectiveness and performance; professional growth and scholarly achievement; service to the University and/or community; and any other activities which indicate professional commitment, service, or contribution to the discipline, department, college, or library (in the case of librarians).
(b) The resume should be specific and distinguish between publications, submitted manuscripts, and manuscripts in preparation. A brief statement should describe the nature of the publication (type of journal/periodical, refereed or not) and the applicant’s specific role in the accomplishment.

(3) Professional development plan

Professional development is defined as the generation of knowledge or the acquisition of experience, skill, and information that enables one to perform at a higher level of proficiency in one’s profession. Cal Poly recognizes and endorses the following four types of scholarship identified in the Carnegie Foundation report entitled Scholarship Reconsidered: Scholarship of Teaching; Scholarship of Discovery; Scholarship of Integration; and Scholarship of Application.

The professional development plan is a written narrative intended to serve as a guide to evaluators for understanding the faculty employee’s professional goals and values as a teacher-scholar. The plan should include short- and long-term goals and objectives on how the faculty employee intends to provide substantive contributions to their discipline, how those scholarly activities can keep their teaching current and dynamic, and a periodic external validation of those activities.

(a) A probationary faculty employee should emphasize what s/he intends to accomplish by the time s/he is considered for tenure.

(b) Applicants for tenure and/or promotion should articulate a long-term professional development plan noting how they intend to continue making a valuable contribution to the University, its instructional program(s), and the academic community.

(4) Student Evaluations

(a) A summary of results from student evaluations for all courses taught during the period under review shall be included. The only exceptions to this requirement are classes with fewer than 5 students enrolled (such as
individual senior project and independent study courses), and Cooperative Education courses that do not include direct instruction.

(b) Evaluative statements and recommendations, along with any written statement or rebuttal by the applicant, will be added to the WPAF by the PRCs, department chair, and dean. At the end of the review cycle, the index, faculty resume, professional development plan, evaluation summaries, recommendations, and any responses or rebuttal statements will be filed in the permanent PAF.

8. Custodian of Files

During periodic and performance reviews, the department chair is the custodian of the WPAF at the department level (and, if appropriate, the PAF); at the college level, the custodian of the files is the dean; at the University level, the custodian is the Provost. Custodians of the files and members of PRCs shall ensure the confidentiality of the files. Normally, there shall be no duplication of file materials except for copies made for the applicant or appropriate administrator, or for distribution at PRC meetings. At the conclusion of each PRC meeting, the PRC chair is responsible for the collection of all duplicated materials. The only exception to this policy is that copies of an applicant’s resume may be distributed to PRC members for use at times other than PRC meetings. After the PRC has made its recommendations, the copies of the resume shall be collected by the chair. Only the applicant/designee, PRC members, department chair, dean, and the Provost/designee shall have access to the PAF and WPAF files.

9. All evaluators, as described in “8” above, must sign the logs in the PAF and the WPAF before they make their recommendations. It is the professional obligation of all evaluators to review the information in the files before they vote or prepare a written recommendation. Evaluative statements shall be based on information in the files and validated with evidence such as class visitation; course outlines and tests; and significant curricular, scholarly, and committee contributions. If, at any level, the evidence is judged unsatisfactory, or if it does not appear to support the recommendations made, the WPAF shall be returned to the appropriate level for clarification. No one shall have access to the files except the PRC, the applicant/designee, department chair, dean, and Provost.
10. PRCs and department chairs

a. Membership of the PRC

(1) The probationary and tenured department faculty will elect members to serve on PRCs. No one shall serve on more than one level of peer review for each faculty employee under review. For reappointment and tenure reviews, PRC members and the department chair must be full-time tenured faculty employees of any rank. For promotion reviews, PRC members and the department chair must have higher academic rank than those being considered for promotion.

(2) Faculty employees being considered for promotion shall be ineligible to serve on promotion or tenure review committees.

(3) When there are insufficient eligible members to serve on the PRC, the PRC and department chair shall select members from related academic disciplines in consultation with the faculty employee under review.

(4) At the request of the department, the college dean may agree that faculty employees participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program may be eligible to serve on a PRC, by election, as long as such service can be completed during the terms of the Faculty Early Retirement Program assignment. PRCs may not be composed solely of faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program.

b. Responsibilities

Because of the importance of all personnel actions, members serving on a PRC and department chairs are expected to perform due diligence; observe strict confidentiality; review, understand, and apply the relevant criteria; and provide constructive written assessment of the applicant’s performance.

The PRC and department chair’s responsibilities include:

(1) Review University, college, and any departmental personnel policies and procedures;

(2) Review and sign the applicant’s PAF and WPAF;
(3) Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the applicant at least ten days prior to transmittal of the file to the next level of review;

(4) Within ten days following receipt of the recommendation, the applicants may submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing and/or request a meeting be held to discuss the recommendation. The PRC, or department chair at the second level of review, will consider the applicant’s rebuttal statement and meet with the applicant if requested. The committee or department chair will either revise the recommendation in writing or make no change to its prior recommendation. In the case of no change, no further statement is necessary from the committee or department chair. The rebuttal statement of the applicant under review shall be added to the WPAF.

c. PRC evaluations and recommendations

(1) Each PRC evaluation and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of that committee. For purposes of determining a simple majority vote of the PRC, the membership of the committee shall be defined as those committee members casting yes or no votes. If a member of the PRC or the department chair determines that s/he cannot evaluate an applicant for some reason (e.g., conflict of interest, prejudice, bias, etc.), the committee member or department chair shall withdraw from the applicant’s PRC. PRC members or the department chair who abstain from voting are expected to provide written rationale.

(2) Recommendations of a PRC at the college or department level must be accompanied by one of the following:

(a) A majority report and, if applicable, a minority report. Reports must include substantiating reasons for its recommendations and must be signed by those PRC members who support the report and its substantiating reasons.

(b) Individual recommendations from any PRC member must include substantiating reasons and signature.
(c) A combination of (a) and (b) above: a majority report, a minority report (if applicable), and/or individual recommendations. In all cases, each report or recommendation must include substantiating reasons and must be signed by those supporting it.

11. Department chairs shall use Form AP 109 (Faculty Evaluation Form) to evaluate faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure. Department chairs are expected to conduct a separate level of review. Comments regarding student evaluations must be included in Section 1 of Form AP 109. College deans should use the final page of Form AP 109 or similar format appended to Form AP 109 to record their evaluation and recommendation.

Section II. Criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure

A. Standards

The quality of faculty performance is the most important element to consider in evaluating individual achievement. Although teaching effectiveness is the primary and essential criterion, it alone is not sufficient for retention, promotion, and tenure. The degree of evidence will vary in accordance with the academic position being sought by the applicant. For example, 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.

B. University criteria

Recommendations for retention, promotion, and tenure are based on the exhibition of merit and ability in each of the following University criteria as well as those approved for the college/department (See Section I.A.2):

1. Teaching performance or effectiveness as a librarian and/or other professional performance

Consideration is to be given to 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.
In formulating recommendations for the promotion of teaching faculty, evaluators will place primary emphasis on success in instruction. The results of the formal student evaluation are to be considered in formulating recommendations based on teaching performance.

For librarians, consideration is to be given to 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.

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

2. Professional growth and scholarly achievement

Consideration is to be given to 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, and external validation of scholarly activities.

3. Service to University and community

Consideration is to be given to the applicant’s participation in academic advisement; placement follow-up; co-curricular activities; department, college, and University committees; Academic Senate and its committees; individual assignments; systemwide assignments; and service in community affairs directly related to the applicant’s teaching area as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities.

4. Other factors of consideration

Consideration is to be given to such factors as collegiality (working collaboratively and productively with colleagues and participation in traditional academic functions); initiative; cooperativeness; and dependability.
Section III. Performance review of probationary faculty for retention

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

B. It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide sufficient evidence that s/he has fulfilled the criteria for retention.

C. 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).

D. Evaluation of probationary faculty involves a comprehensive assessment of performance during the entire probationary period with retention seen as leading to tenure. It should be understood that if a faculty employee has not demonstrated the potential to achieve tenure, then that individual should not be reappointed. This does not mean that retention is a guarantee of tenure.

E. 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.

Section IV. Performance review for tenure

A. 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 or terminated for cause, lack of funds, or lack of work.

1. To be recommended for tenure, an applicant must be rated during the final probationary year within one of the top two performance categories listed in Section V of Form AP 109 (Faculty Evaluation Form).

2. Tenure decisions are considered more critical to the University than promotion decisions. An applicant who does not have the potential for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor should not be granted tenure. This does not mean that retention is a guarantee of tenure nor is tenure a guarantee of promotion. The fact that a probationary faculty employee has received early promotion is not a guarantee of tenure.

3. Possession of the doctorate or other designated terminal degree from an accredited institution is required for tenure.
B. Tenure eligibility

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

1. Normal tenure

   A tenure award is considered normal if the award is made after the applicant has accrued credit for six academic years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment).

2. Early tenure

   a. A tenure award is considered “early” if the award is made prior to the applicant having achieved credit for six academic years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment).

   b. In addition to meeting department, college, or library criteria for normal tenure, an applicant for early tenure must provide evidence of outstanding performance in each of the following performance areas: teaching or library effectiveness, professional growth and achievement, and service to the University and community.

   c. In order to receive early tenure, an applicant should, at a minimum, receive a favorable majority vote from the department PRC.

3. Tenure upon appointment

   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.

Section V. Performance review for promotion

A. Eligibility

   Promotion eligibility shall be governed by the terms of Article 14 of the MOU. Promotion in rank is not automatic and is granted only in recognition of teaching competency or effectiveness as a librarian, professional performance, 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.

1. Normal promotion
   a. 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:
      (1) The applicant is tenured or the applicant is also eligible for and applying for normal tenure (see Section IV.B.1).
      (2) The applicant has completed at least the equivalent of four years in their academic rank at Cal Poly.
   b. Tenure is required for promotion to the academic rank of Professor or Librarian.

2. Early promotion
   a. An application for promotion to Associate Professor or Associate Librarian is considered “early” if one of the following is true:
      (1) The applicant is a probationary faculty employee who is not in their sixth probationary year and is not eligible for normal tenure (see Section IV.B.1).
      (2) 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.
   b. 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. 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.

B. Ranking

In addition to their carefully documented recommendations, department PRCs, department chairs, college or library PRCs, and deans shall submit a ranking of those promotion applicants who were positively recommended at their respective level.
Section VI. Periodic evaluation of faculty unit employees

A. Definition of periodic evaluation

A periodic evaluation of a faculty unit employee (“faculty employee“) shall normally be required for the following purposes:

1. Evaluation of tenured faculty employees who are not subject to a performance review for promotion.

2. Evaluation of probationary faculty employees who are not subject to a performance review for retention. For example, a probationary faculty employee who receives an initial two-year appointment will undergo a periodic evaluation during their first year.

3. Annual evaluation of temporary faculty employees.

4. Evaluation of lecturers for range elevation.

B. Periodic evaluation procedures and criteria

1. Periodic evaluation of tenured faculty employees

   a. Eligibility

      (1) Tenured Professors, Librarians, and Student Services Professional-Academic Related III (SSPAR III).

      Tenured full Professors shall be subject to a periodic evaluation at least once every five years.

      (2) Tenured Assistant or Associate Professor, Senior Assistant or Associate Librarian; and Student Services Professional-Academic Related II (SSPAR II).

      A periodic evaluation is conducted during the third year in which a tenured faculty employee has served in the academic rank of Associate Professor, Associate Librarian, or SSP-AR II. The purpose of the evaluation is formative and intended to assist and guide the Associate Professor, Associate Librarian, or SSP-AR II in their preparation for subsequent promotion review.

      (3) Periodic evaluation of tenured faculty employees at any rank shall occur at least once every five years after promotion/appointment to their respective academic rank.
Performance reviews for promotion can serve in lieu of periodic reviews for the purposes of this section. More frequent periodic evaluation of a tenured faculty employee may be requested by the employee, department chair, or dean. After such a request, the periodic evaluation shall be conducted as soon as possible.

b. Procedure for periodic evaluation of tenured faculty employees

(1) Procedures for the periodic evaluation of tenured faculty employees are similar to the procedures for conducting performance reviews (see Section I.A) with the exception that the periodic review concludes at the level of college dean.

(2) A tenured faculty employee shall be provided a copy of the PRC report other/his periodic evaluation. The PRC chair, the department chair, and dean shall meet with the tenured faculty employee to discuss her/his strengths along with suggestions, if any, for improvement.

(3) A written copy of the periodic evaluation report shall be placed in the tenured faculty employee’s PAF, and a copy shall be provided to her/him.

c. Criteria for periodic evaluation of tenured faculty employees

(1) The purpose of periodic evaluation of tenured faculty employees is to maintain and improve their effectiveness.

(2) Criteria are similar to the criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure (Section II.B.2).

2. Periodic evaluation of probationary faculty employees

a. Procedures for periodic evaluation of probationary faculty employees

(1) Periodic evaluation of probationary faculty employees shall be conducted by the elected department PRC composed of tenured faculty, the department chair, and the college dean in any year in which the probationary faculty employee is not subject to a performance review for retention.

(2) A written copy of the periodic evaluation report shall be placed in the probationary faculty employee’s PAF, and a copy shall be provided to the employee.
b. Criteria for periodic evaluation of probationary faculty employees are similar to criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure (Section II.B.2).

3. Periodic evaluation of temporary faculty employees

a. Criteria

Evaluation of temporary faculty employees shall be appropriate to the work assignment of the temporary faculty employee and shall conform to the approved criteria established by the department/college for the performance of instructional and professional responsibilities applicable to temporary faculty.

b. Eligibility

(1) Full-time temporary faculty employees (e.g., lecturers, temporary librarians, and temporary SSP-ARs) appointed for the entire academic year must be evaluated during that year by a PRC of the department, the department chair, and dean. Members of the PRCs must be full-time tenured faculty employees. At the request of the department, the college dean may agree that a faculty employee participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program may serve on a faculty PRC. However, PRCs may not be comprised solely of faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program.

(2) Part-time temporary faculty employees appointed for the entire academic year must be evaluated by the department chair. A PRC evaluation is not required; however, full-time tenured faculty employees should be given the opportunity to provide evaluative statements and such statements should be written and signed.

(3) Temporary faculty employees (full-time or part-time) appointed for one or two quarters are to be evaluated at the discretion of the department chair or dean. Also, the faculty employee may request that an evaluation be performed. The request must be in writing and must be accompanied by an updated resume. The request must be submitted to the department chair by the established deadline.

(4) Temporary faculty employees holding a three-year appointment pursuant to MOU Article 12 shall be evaluated at
least once during the term of their appointment and may be evaluated more frequently upon the request of the faculty employee, department chair, or dean. Normally the evaluation will be scheduled during the second year of appointment.

(5) Lecturers who are no longer eligible for a service salary increase (SSI) in their current range and who have served at least five years in their current range may apply for range elevation.

c. Procedures for periodic evaluation of temporary faculty employees

(1) Academic Personnel will distribute a list of temporary faculty employees eligible for periodic review, including those eligible for range elevation, and the timetable for conducting the reviews.

(2) The temporary faculty employee shall submit a WPAF to the department chair by the established deadline. The file should include supporting materials to document the accomplishments of the work assignment of the temporary faculty employee including but not be limited to:

(a) Resume
(b) Summary of results of student evaluations of teaching
(c) Course syllabi and examples of course materials
(d) Examples of examinations
(e) Grading schemes and grade assignments
(f) Statement of teaching philosophy
(g) Professional accomplishments which contribute to maintaining currency in the faculty employee’s field of expertise such as research, scholarship, and/or creative activity
(h) Service activities, if applicable

(3) All evaluators must sign the logs in the PAF and the WPAF before completing their written evaluative statements and recommendations.
(4) Evaluators shall provide their written evaluation and recommendation to the temporary faculty employee at least ten days before transmitting materials to the next level of review.

(5) The temporary faculty employee under review may submit a written rebuttal statement in response to the evaluation and/or request a meeting be held to discuss the evaluation within ten days following receipt of the evaluation.

(6) A written record of a periodic evaluation shall be placed in the temporary faculty employee’s PAF. The temporary faculty employee shall be provided a copy of the written record of the evaluation.

(7) College deans are delegated authority to approve range elevation.

(8) Range elevation becomes effective at the beginning of the subsequent fall quarter.