University Faculty Personnel Policies

AY 2020–2021

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

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 Final policy text is in effect for the academic year listed above until superseded by revisions to prevailing policy.

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

1. **Preface** .................................................................................................................. 4  
   1.1. Summary ............................................................................................................... 4  
   1.2. Vision Statement ................................................................................................. 4  
   1.3. Mission Statement ............................................................................................... 4  
   1.4. Teacher-Scholar Model ...................................................................................... 4  
   1.5. Purpose and Scope of this Document .................................................................. 4  
   1.6. Procedure for Updating University Faculty Personnel Policies ....................... 5  

2. **Faculty Appointments** ............................................................................................. 7  
   2.1. Summary ............................................................................................................. 7  
   2.2. Tenure-Track Recruitment ................................................................................... 7  
   2.3. Tenure-Track Qualifications .............................................................................. 8  
   2.4. Lecturer Recruitment .......................................................................................... 8  
   2.5. Other Faculty Recruitments for Library, Counseling, and Athletics .................. 9  

3. **Personnel Files** ....................................................................................................... 10  
   3.1. Summary ............................................................................................................ 10  
   3.2. Personnel Action File (PAF) .............................................................................. 10  
   3.3. Purpose of Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) .............................................. 10  
   3.4. Contents of WPAF ............................................................................................. 11  

4. **Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes** .................................................... 12  
   4.1. Summary ............................................................................................................ 12  
   4.2. Candidates ......................................................................................................... 12  
   4.3. Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) ..................................................... 12  
   4.4. Department Chair/Head ..................................................................................... 13  
   4.5. College Peer Review Committee (CPRC) .......................................................... 14  
   4.6. Administrative Evaluators .................................................................................. 15  
   4.7. Provost .............................................................................................................. 15  

5. **Evaluation Processes** .............................................................................................. 16  
   5.1. Summary ............................................................................................................ 16  
   5.2. Instructional Faculty Evaluation Processes ......................................................... 16  
   5.3. Library Faculty Evaluation Processes ................................................................. 18  
   5.4. Library Faculty Performance Evaluation ............................................................ 18  
   5.5. Counseling Services Faculty Evaluation Processes ............................................. 18  
   5.6. Athletic Faculty Evaluation Process ................................................................... 18  
   5.7. Exceptions ......................................................................................................... 19
5.8. University Evaluation Process Calendar ................................................................. 19

6. Evaluation Cycle Patterns ......................................................................................... 20
   6.1. Summary ............................................................................................................... 20
   6.2. Probationary Faculty Evaluation Patterns ......................................................... 20
   6.3. Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Pattern ............................................................. 21
   6.4. Instructional Lecturer and Temporary Librarian Evaluation Patterns ............. 22

7. Personnel Action Eligibility and Criteria ................................................................. 24
   7.1. Summary ............................................................................................................... 24
   7.2. Retention, Promotion and Tenure of Tenure-Track Faculty ......................... 24
   7.3. Retention Eligibility ............................................................................................ 26
   7.4. Promotion Eligibility ......................................................................................... 26
   7.5. Tenure Eligibility ............................................................................................... 27
   7.6. Tenure Criteria .................................................................................................. 27
   7.7. Lecturer Range Elevation Eligibility and Criteria ........................................... 28
   7.8. Counseling Faculty Eligibility and Criteria ...................................................... 28

8. Evaluation of Teaching and Professional Services .................................................. 29
   8.1. Summary ............................................................................................................... 29
   8.2. [Reserved] Evaluation of teaching .................................................................... 29
   8.3. [Reserved] Evaluation of professional service for non-instructional faculty .... 29
   8.4. Student Evaluation of Instruction ........................................................................ 29

   9.1. Summary ............................................................................................................... 32

10. Evaluation of Service [RESERVED FOR FUTURE USE] ........................................ 33
    10.1. Summary ............................................................................................................ 33

11. Governance ............................................................................................................. 34
    11.1. Summary ............................................................................................................ 34
    11.2. [Reserved] Guiding Principles ......................................................................... 34
    11.3. [Reserved] College Governance ....................................................................... 34
    11.4. [Reserved] Department Governance ................................................................ 34
    11.5. Associate Dean Appointments ......................................................................... 34

12. Workload .................................................................................................................. 35
    12.1. Summary ............................................................................................................ 35
    12.2. Office Hours ..................................................................................................... 35
    12.3. [Reserved] Assigned time for exceptional service to students ................. 37
12.4. [Reserved] Summer Teaching .................................................................37

13. **Appendices** .........................................................................................38

13.1. Administrative Memos ........................................................................38

13.2. [Reserved] Glossary ...........................................................................39
1. Preface

1.1. Summary

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

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

1.2. Vision Statement

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

1.3. Mission Statement

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

1.4. Teacher-Scholar Model

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

1.5. Purpose and Scope of this Document

1.5.1. University level personnel policies for faculty are contained in this document, titled “University Faculty Personnel Policies” (abbreviated as UFPP). It includes the University statement of policy, criteria and university-wide procedures for faculty personnel actions. This document is based on Title V, Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA), and the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). If Title V, HEERA and/or the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement is in
conflict with the provisions in these criteria and procedures, the terms of Title V, HEERA and/or the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement, and not the provisions of these procedures and criteria, shall govern.

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

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

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

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

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

1.6. Procedure for Updating University Faculty Personnel Policies

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

1.6.2. Cal Poly’s university-level faculty personnel policies are composed and approved by means of shared governance between faculty and administration. Personnel
policies are established or revised either by means of Academic Senate resolutions or consent agenda items, both of which must be ratified by the university President.

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

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

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

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

1.6.7. Proposed revisions to university-wide faculty personnel policies should include as many of the following as are relevant to the proposal:

- The text of the proposed policy.
- The text of superseded policy (if available).
- Summary of the proposed changes noting especially any revisions to reflect existing policy stated elsewhere, or any proposed changes in policy.
- Citation of relevant documents, which may include: Academic Senate resolutions, provisions in the collective bargaining agreement, administrative memos, existing policy documents in need of revision, superseded policy statements.
- Expected effects of the policy change on faculty units.
- The nature of consultation with affected faculty units.
- The timeline and nature of implementation.
2. Faculty Appointments

2.1. Summary

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


2.2. Tenure-Track Recruitment

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

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

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

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

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

2.2.6. The Search Committee members shall give careful consideration to temporary employees who have been evaluated by the department or equivalent unit. The search committee members, or screening sub-committee members, and
department chair/head shall review and sign the Personnel Action File for these candidates.

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

2.3. Tenure-Track Qualifications

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

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

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

2.4. Lecturer Recruitment

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

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

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

2.4.4. Applications for full-time lecturer faculty positions must be submitted to the university’s applicant tracking system. Applicants must submit a current CV, a list of CSU courses taught, and names and contact information of at least three references. Unofficial transcripts may be requested at time of application; official transcripts are required for appointment. Additional materials may be requested by the college or department.
2.4.5. Criteria for appointment for full-time lecturers are determined by the college or department. Initial appointment is for 1 academic year with a possible 1-year extension. Full-time lecturer appointments are unconditional and their work assignment cannot be reduced once these appointments are made. The department must meet the entitlements of other lecturers listed in the order of assignment in article 12.29 of the CBA.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1. Summary

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


3.2. Personnel Action File (PAF)

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

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

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

3.3. Purpose of Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)

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

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

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

3.3.4. The Provost establishes a specific deadline by which the WPAF is declared complete for each type of personnel action. Insertion of materials after that date must have the approval of the college peer review committee (CPRC) and is limited to items that became accessible after the deadline. The table of contents or index should be
updated to reflect any material added to the file during the course of the evaluation cycle.

3.4. Contents of WPAF

3.4.1. Contents of Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) for all instructional faculty include:

- Index of WPAF
- CV
- Evidence appropriate to the nature of the appointment

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

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

3.4.4. Colleges shall define in their personnel policies the appropriate evidence for Teaching, Professional Development, and Service suited to the nature of different faculty appointments.

3.4.5. The Library, Counseling, and Athletics shall define in their personnel policies the appropriate evidence categories for their faculty.

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

4.1. Summary

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

4.1.2. Chapter 4 established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-894-20.

4.2. Candidates

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.3. Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC)

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

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

4.3.3. For Retention, Promotion or Tenure Performance Evaluations, the DPRC shall consist of at least three elected members of the tenured faculty. DPRC members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion. At the request of a department, the President may agree that a faculty unit employee participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program may also engage in
deliberations and make recommendations regarding the evaluation of a faculty unit employee. However, faculty committees established for this purpose may not be comprised solely of faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program. Approval shall be obtained from the Dean if a department requests to have faculty in FERP participate as an evaluator member of the DPRC. (CBA 15.2)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.5. College Peer Review Committee (CPRC)

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

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

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

4.5.4. The CPRC shall produce an evaluation report for each candidate under review. This report will critically analyze the evidence on each dimension of performance (teaching, scholarship, and service), both favorable and unfavorable, and produce
a narrative clarifying how the evidence was weighed and the conclusions and recommended actions derived. In cases of split votes, the report should reflect the relevant perspectives on the committee and the rationale for the majority decision. In rare instances when agreement cannot be reached on the content of the committee report, the minority committee member(s) may submit a signed minority report. The CPRC shall submit a ranking of those promotion applicants whom they positively recommended.

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

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

4.6. Administrative Evaluators

4.6.1. Administrative evaluators include College Deans, Associate Deans, Library Deans, Department Directors, Vice-Provosts, or the Athletic Director. For instructional tenure-track faculty the administrative evaluator is the College Dean. For lecturer faculty the Dean may designate an Associate Dean to serve as the final level of administrative evaluation.

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

4.6.3. Candidates may request a meeting and/or submit a rebuttal to the administrative evaluator within the 10-day rebuttal period. The administrative evaluator shall review the rebuttal material 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 statement, shall be provided to the candidate.

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

4.7. Provost

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

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

4.7.3. The Provost’s letter to the candidate constitutes the final decision on retention, promotion and/or tenure.
5. Evaluation Processes

5.1. Summary

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


5.2. Instructional Faculty Evaluation Processes

5.2.1. Two-Stage Part-Time Lecturer Evaluation

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

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

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

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

5.2.2. Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

5.2.2.6. Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is REQUIRED for post-tenure review.
5.2.2.7. Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for lecturer range elevation.
5.2.2.8. Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for periodic evaluation of part-time lecturers who are neither 12.12 nor 12.13 eligible and who are appointed in all three terms of an academic year.
5.2.2.9. Three-Stage Part-Time Lecturer Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for periodic evaluation of part-time lecturers who are neither 12.12 nor 12.13 eligible and who are appointed in fewer than three terms of an academic year.

5.2.3. **Four-Stage Lecturer Range Elevation Evaluation**
5.2.3.1. Four-Stage Lecturer Range Elevation Evaluation is an evaluation process that results in lecturer range elevation and includes an additional peer review committee between the department and the Dean.
5.2.3.2. Four-Stage Lecturer Range Elevation Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
   - DPRC
   - Department Chair/Head
   - CPRC
   - Dean
5.2.3.3. Four-Stage Lecturer Range Elevation Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for lecturer range elevation.

5.2.4. **Four-Stage Performance Evaluation**
5.2.4.1. Four-Stage Performance Evaluation is a performance evaluation that results in the retention or tenure of tenure-track faculty.
5.2.4.2. Four-Stage Performance Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
   - DPRC
   - Department Chair/Head
   - Dean
   - Provost.
5.2.4.3. Four-Stage Performance Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for tenure of tenure-track faculty.
5.2.4.4. Four-Stage Performance Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for retention of tenure-track faculty.

5.2.5. **Five-Stage Promotion Evaluation**
5.2.5.1. Five-Stage Promotion Evaluation is a performance evaluation that results in the promotion to a higher rank for tenure-track faculty, and includes a college level peer review committee as an additional level of review between the department and the Dean.
5.2.5.2. Five-Stage Promotion Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
   - DPRC
   - Department Chair/Head
   - CPRC
   - Dean
   - Provost.
5.2.5.3. Five-Stage Promotion Evaluation is REQUIRED for promotion of tenure-track faculty.
5.2.5.4. Five-Stage Promotion Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for tenure of tenure-track faculty.
5.2.5.5. Five-Stage Promotion Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for retention of tenure-track faculty.

5.3. Library Faculty Evaluation Processes

5.3.1. Library Faculty Periodic Evaluation
5.3.1.1. Library Faculty Periodic Evaluation is a periodic evaluation that provides feedback and guidance to the library faculty member in support of future personnel actions.
5.3.1.2. Library Faculty Periodic Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
   - DPRC
   - Associate Dean
   - Dean
   - Vice-Provost

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

5.5. Counseling Services Faculty Evaluation Processes

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

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

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

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

5.7. Exceptions

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

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

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

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

5.8. University Evaluation Process Calendar

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

6.1. Summary

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


6.2. Probationary Faculty Evaluation Patterns

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

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

6.2.3. The Three-Year Retention Pattern proceeds as follows for each year of appointment for faculty retained for three years:

- Year 1: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 2: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 3: Retention to fourth, fifth and sixth year
- Year 4: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 5: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 6: Tenure/Promotion

6.2.4. The Three-Year Retention Pattern proceeds as follows for each year of appointment for faculty retained for one year:

- Year 1: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 2: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 3: Retention to fourth year
- Year 4: Retention to fifth year
• Year 5: Retention to sixth year
• Year 6: Tenure/Promotion

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

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

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

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

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

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

6.3. Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Pattern

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

6.3.2. More frequent periodic evaluation of a tenured faculty employee may be conducted by request of the faculty member, the department chair/head, or dean. After such a request, the periodic evaluation shall be conducted as soon as possible.
6.3.3. A Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation may be conducted during the third year in which a tenured faculty employee has served in the academic rank of Associate Professor or Associate Librarian. The purpose of the evaluation is formative and intended to assist and guide the Associate Professor or Associate Librarian in their preparation for subsequent promotion review. Colleges and other faculty units requiring this evaluation shall include that requirement in their personnel policies documents.

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

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

6.4. Instructional Lecturer and Temporary Librarian Evaluation Patterns

6.4.1. Full-time instructional lecturers and temporary librarians appointed for the entire academic year that do not hold a three-year appointment with a 12.12 or 12.13 entitlement must be evaluated each year by a department PRC, the department chair/head, and dean.

- Years 1–5: Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (Annual)
- Year 6: Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (6 year cumulative)

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

- Years 1–5: Two or Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (Annual)
- Year 6: Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (6 year cumulative)

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

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

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

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

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

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

7.1. Summary

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

7.1.2. Chapter 7 established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-893-20.

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

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

7.2.2. Recommendations for retention, promotion, and tenure of instructional faculty are based on the exhibition of merit and ability in each of the following areas:

- Teaching performance
- Professional development
- Service
- Other factors of consideration

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

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

7.2.3. Recommendations for retention, promotion, and tenure of library and non-instructional faculty are based on the exhibition of merit and ability in each of the following areas:

- Professional performance
- Professional development
- Service
- Other factors of consideration

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

7.2.3.2. The granting of tenure requires stronger evidence of worthiness than retention, and promotion to Librarian requires a more rigorous application of criteria than promotion to Associate Librarian.
7.2.4. Recommendations for retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty may also include criteria set by colleges. Departments may also have additional criteria established in their approved personnel policy documents.

7.2.5. Teaching Performance of Instructional Faculty

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

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

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

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

7.2.6. Professional Performance of Librarians and Non-instructional Faculty

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

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

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

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

7.2.7. Professional Growth and Scholarly Achievement

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

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

7.2.7.3. In their personnel policy documents colleges and the library shall specify how these factors enter into the evaluation of professional growth and scholarly achievement. Colleges and departments, and the library may include additional factors in their personnel policies.
7.2.8. Service
7.2.8.1. In formulating recommendations on the retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty, evaluators shall place emphasis on the service the applicant performs in relation to the university and the community.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7.4.4. An application for promotion to Associate Professor or Associate Librarian is considered normal if the applicant is eligible and both of the following conditions hold:
   - The applicant is tenured or the applicant is also eligible for and applying for normal tenure.
   - The applicant has completed at least the equivalent of four years in their academic rank at Cal Poly.

7.4.5. An application for promotion to Associate Professor or Associate Librarian is considered “early” if one of the following conditions holds:
   - The applicant is a probationary faculty employee who is not in their sixth probationary year and is not eligible for normal tenure.
   - The applicant is a tenured faculty employee and has not satisfied the equivalent service requirements of at least four years in their academic rank at Cal Poly.

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

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

7.5. Tenure Eligibility

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

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

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

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

7.6. Tenure Criteria

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

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

7.6.4. Retention is not a guarantee of tenure.

7.6.5. Tenure is not a guarantee of promotion.

7.6.6. Early promotion is not a guarantee of tenure.

7.6.7. An applicant for tenure must at least fully meet the requirements of their assignment and be making a valuable contribution to the university according to department, college or library criteria for tenure in each of the following performance areas:
   • For instructional faculty: teaching, professional growth and scholarship, service, and other factors of consideration.
   • For librarian faculty: professional performance, professional growth and scholarship, service, and other factors of consideration.

7.6.8. An applicant for early tenure must meet department, college, or library criteria for normal tenure and provide evidence of exceptional performance in each of the following performance areas:
   • For instructional faculty: teaching, professional growth and scholarship, service, and other factors of consideration.
   • For librarian faculty: professional performance, professional growth and scholarship, service, and other factors of consideration.

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

7.7. Lecturer Range Elevation Eligibility and Criteria

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

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

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

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

7.8. Counseling Faculty Eligibility and Criteria

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

8.1. Summary

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

8.1.2. [CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION].

8.2. [Reserved] Evaluation of teaching

8.3. [Reserved] Evaluation of professional service for non-instructional faculty

8.4. Student Evaluation of Instruction

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

8.4.2. Student Evaluation Instruments

8.4.2.1. All student evaluation instruments must include the following two prompts with responses on an agreement scale:

- “Overall, this instructor was educationally effective,”
- “Overall, this course was educationally effective.”

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

8.4.3. General Criteria for Conducting Student Evaluations

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

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

- Courses with low enrollment (fewer than five students) such as individual senior projects and independent study.
- Capstone senior project classes will be evaluated if there are more than 5 students enrolled.
- Student evaluations will not be administered for individually supervised senior projects.
- Cooperative Education courses that do not include direct instruction shall not be evaluated using the student evaluation process. Academic
departments or the Career Services Office may use a survey to evaluate the students’ co-op experience, but this is not part of the student evaluation process.

- Team-taught classes: In situations when classes are team-taught, the instructor of record shall conduct student evaluations. If there is more than one instructor of record, then copies of the evaluation results shall be placed in each of the instructor’s personnel files with a memo indicating that the course was team-taught. Faculty team teaching a course will have the opportunity to write narrative descriptions to accompany the student evaluation results for the team-taught course to add context to the results. Faculty who team-teach a course and believe that the results are not representative of their contributions to the course may request that the dean not include the results associated with this team-taught course in their PAF. After reviewing this request, the dean has the discretion to determine if the student evaluation results of the team-taught course shall be placed in the instructor’s file.

8.4.4. Procedure for Conducting Student Evaluation of Instruction

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

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

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

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

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

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

8.4.5. Student Evaluation Results

8.4.5.1. Placement of student evaluation results in Personnel Action Files is governed by CBA 11.1, 15.15, 15.17.
8.4.5.2. Results of student evaluations shall be stored in electronic format and incorporated by extension into the Personnel Action File. The dean is the custodian of the PAF and will provide secure access to this information.

8.4.5.3. Results of student evaluations consist of reports generated for each course evaluated, including a complete accounting of the quantitative responses and all the student comments from a given class section of a course. Policies about filing, storage, and disposition of student evaluation results concern only these reports of student evaluation results.

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

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

8.4.5.6. Results of student evaluations from classes taught earlier than the prior six complete academic years shall be removed from the PAF, following standard CSU procedures for legal document disposition. The removal of results of student evaluations from the PAF shall normally occur in summer.
9. Evaluation of Professional Development
[RESERVED FOR FUTURE USE]

9.1. Summary

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

9.1.2. [CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION].
10. Evaluation of Service
[RESERVED FOR FUTURE USE]

10.1. Summary

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

10.1.2. [CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION].
11. Governance

11.1. Summary

11.1.1. This chapter sets university level expectations for the definition of academic program governance at the college and department levels. This chapter will include definitions of department leadership as “chairs” or “heads” and university level requirements for defining any changes between those models of department leadership. This chapter also includes university-level policies concerning departmental recommendations to deans for the appointment of department chairs. 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. [Reserved] Guiding Principles

11.3. [Reserved] College Governance

11.4. [Reserved] Department Governance

11.5. Associate Dean Appointments

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

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

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

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

12.1. Summary

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

12.2. Office Hours

12.2.1. Subchapter 12.2 established by AS-886-20. This policy supersedes the previous university policy on office hours originally in CAM 370.2.

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

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

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

12.2.5. An office hour is one credit hour (i.e. 50 minutes) of regularly scheduled time for faculty to be available to meet in a regularly scheduled location.

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

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

12.2.8. Scheduled instructional office hours

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional WTU</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Tenure-Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 0 up to and including 4</td>
<td>1 office hour</td>
<td>2 office hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4 up to and including 8</td>
<td>2 office hours</td>
<td>3 office hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 8 up to and including 12</td>
<td>3 office hours</td>
<td>4 office hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 12</td>
<td>4 office hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

12.2.8.3. Tenure-line faculty whose instructional assignments have been reduced to zero WTU but who are involved in research or other projects involving supervision
of students shall hold a minimum of one regularly scheduled in-person office hour.

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

12.2.9. Scheduled advising office hours

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

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

12.2.10. Mode of office hours

12.2.10.1. Scheduled office hours should be congruent with the mode of engagement with students for the instructional or advising function that requires the scheduling of the office hours.

12.2.10.2. For normal classroom instruction, scheduled office hours should be held in-person in the faculty member’s office. Faculty with more than one scheduled office hour may hold up to one office hour conducted in a synchronous online mode suited to the nature of the engagement with the affected students.

12.2.10.3. For online courses, scheduled office hours should be conducted in a synchronous online mode suited to the nature of the engagement with the enrolled students.

12.2.10.4. Hybrid courses may warrant an appropriate combination of in-person and synchronous online office hours.

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

12.2.11. Notification

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

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

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

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

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

12.2.12.3. Exceptions should be temporary and specific.

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

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

12.3. [Reserved] Assigned time for exceptional service to students

12.3.1. [CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION]

12.4. [Reserved] Summer Teaching

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

13.1. Administrative Memos

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

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

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

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

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

13.1.6. List of administrative memos

- AM-19850222: AB85-2 Role and Definition of Professional Growth and Development
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20050111: Faculty Post-Retirement Employment
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20061117: Agreement for Summer Quarter Faculty Assignments
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20130110: New Outside Employment Reporting Requirement for Unit 3 Employees
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20130222: New Student Evaluation Requirement Effective Winter Quarter 2013
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20130919: Self-Support Program Personnel Policies
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20161115: Amendments to the Range Elevation Procedures 2016
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20170530: Guidelines for Special Session Teaching
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20171030: Settlement on Lecturer Voting
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20171110: Employment of Non-Immigrants – Important updates
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20180919: Lecturer Range Elevation Eligibility Guidelines
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
- AM-20190208: Summer Term 2019 Faculty Eligibility
  - Academic Senate Consent 4/21/2020
13.2. [Reserved] Glossary

13.2.1. [CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION]
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Improving the climate for professional growth has been an issue of special concern to me ever since I came to Cal Poly in 1979. A modern university needs a faculty that is up-to-date in its field. I am, therefore, committed to doing whatever is necessary to ensure that end.

To do so, we have already taken several steps. The first of these has been to define the role of research. Previously, research had been viewed by many as a questionable activity, unrelated, perhaps even inimical, to the aims of the institution. In the fall of 1981, I issued Administrative Bulletin 81-2 with the intention of dispelling that notion. That bulletin identified research as an important and valid form of professional development, appropriate to the purpose of the institution. It also asserted that professional development is essential to maintaining a viable educational program, and is second in importance only to instruction.

The Academic Senate saw the need for a fuller statement on professional growth and development to provide a context for the role of research. In the Fall of 1981, it appointed an ad hoc committee to draft a policy on professional development. That committee met during academic year 1981-82, drafted a statement, and forwarded its recommendations to the Senate in May of 1982. The Senate approved the report in February of 1983 and forwarded it to me with a recommendation for adoption. An Administrative Bulletin was drafted based on that report and shared with other members of the academic community in the Fall of 1983. Further suggestions for improvement were received, evaluated, and, as appropriate, used to refine this version of the bulletin, which is attached.

Parallel with these developments, the Academic Planning Committee was seeking to define more clearly Cal Poly’s overall mission. A final statement, originated by this Committee, was issued in September of 1983 after much consultation. Once again, the importance of intellectual and professional growth to the campus was asserted, as follows:

Cal Poly is committed to establishing and maintaining an environment that fosters the complete growth of the individual-student and faculty member alike. Commitment to inquiry and the search for truth is a foundation for intellectual and personal growth. Cal Poly strives to instill among its students intellectual maturity, an appreciation of learning, and a dynamic professionalism. To foster professional development among faculty, it strives to stimulate faculty members to challenge themselves—to develop professionally through organizations, creative activity, consultation, professional leaves in business and industry, or applied or basic research.

Supporting a strong program of professional growth is a costly enterprise, and financial support for faculty development is scarce. The University is aware of the history of deficiency in this vital area and recognizes its responsibility to continue to take action to help alleviate these resource constraints. Clearly it is in the State’s best interest to protect its investment in students by insuring the continued development of its teachers.

But the State has not always recognized these responsibilities and their potential benefits. In recent years it has turned down requests for augmented funding with distressing regularity. Consequently, problems that were once nuisances have accumulated and been compounded until quick remedies are no longer possible.

Fortunately, that era seems to be turning around in California as in other states. Although attempts to reduce the teaching load have failed, Cal Poly’s FTE faculty allocations have been augmented recently, giving us a student/faculty ratio considerably lower than it was four years ago, making some assigned time appointments possible. Faculty allocations should continue to grow, at least into the near future,
with no accompanying growth in student numbers.

Our teaching laboratories are not ideally suited for some advanced forms of professional development, but the outlook for funds to replace equipment and purchase new equipment is considerably improved. In addition, plans are being considered for conversion of facilities being replaced by new construction to space which could be made available for faculty development and research efforts. Private faculty offices are also being added as each new building is completed. Approved capital improvement projects could add 150 private offices to the campus by the fall of 1987.

Our technical and clerical support staff is still not adequately funded to assure the most productive use of faculty time, and travel to attend professional meetings has never been sufficient to meet realistic needs.

However, a recent program change proposal increased state support for technical staff in some disciplines and the Governor's budget this year formally recognizes faculty professional development in a program change proposal although the funding level is still quite small. The annual giving program along with other private support programs established by the Development Office continue to improve each year to help ameliorate our shortage of resources for faculty professional development.

These changes are happening now, and further initiatives are underway, undertaken at many different levels by various constituencies. I have personally informed key legislators, the Department of Finance, the Governor's Office and, of course, the Chancellor of our need for help, and of the State's responsibility to remedy these problems. In addition, I am redoubling our efforts to gain private support. With the appointment of the new Vice President, University Relations, we have made another major commitment to finding support from the private sector.

In the meantime, this Administrative Bulletin is intended to define professional development, to assert its importance, describe various avenues of professional development, and outline its role in faculty personnel actions.

Clearly, if we were provided adequate funding for professional development, we could do much. Even though we are not, we cannot choose to do nothing at all. As an institution of higher education, we have an obligation to ourselves, our colleagues, our profession, and our students to do the best we can with what we have. Within that context, this bulletin defines the unique role professional development plays on our campus. I encourage each of you to do your best to preserve and enhance the vitality of teaching at Cal Poly.

Warren J. Baker

Date

Note: This Administrative Bulletin should be filed in the Appendix of the Campus Administrative Manual and an entry made in the CAM Index and the title added to the Administrative Bulletin’s title page.
ROLE AND DEFINITION OF PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

The vitality of Cal Poly as a university depends on an intellectually active and professionally vigorous faculty. Those who continue to grow professionally also continue to grow as teachers. Indeed, scholarship, professionalism, and teaching are so interdependent that scholarship can become enervated without the stimulation of a professional commitment, and teaching can become irrelevant without the revitalization of scholarship or the touchstone of the marketplace.

As a special institution of higher learning, Cal Poly can profit from a wide range of professional development modes. This Administrative Bulletin is intended to guide faculty into those directions of professional growth most useful to Cal Poly and to define the role professional growth and development plays in the instructional program of the University.

Definition of Professional Development

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 his or her profession.

Role of Professional Development

Excellence in teaching is the primary purpose of the University. Professional growth and development is essential to meeting this goal.

Avenues of Professional Development

The instructional programs at Cal Poly range from the basic to the applied. In turn, any of a number of professional development activities can fit Cal Poly’s spectrum of disciplines and professions.

The campus has a faculty of diverse interests as well, whose professional pursuits cannot be neatly categorized. Typical activities can be listed, however. They fall into two major modes: generation of knowledge concerning teaching or the discipline; and acquisition of further knowledge in, or professional contributions to, one’s own or related fields.

1. The generation of knowledge concerning teaching or the discipline

   A. Contributions to the teaching profession. Examples of this type of professional development include studies of pedagogic technique, papers on pedagogy presented at professional meetings or submitted to professional journals; presentations on pedagogy given in invited talks, seminars, and workshops; development and marketing of audio-visual aids; and development and publication of textbooks or manuals.

   B. Contributions to the general body of knowledge in an academic discipline. Generation of knowledge in a discipline may involve basic and applied research or creative productions. The various forms of research have already been defined in AB 81-2, “Role of Research.” In the visual, performing, or literary arts, creative contributions in the discipline involve the production of art works and techniques that become part of the general body of literature of an artistic discipline. Contributions to knowledge may also include creative works protected by copyright or patents.
Dissemination of new knowledge occurs through papers presented at meetings or published by professional journals, and through contributions to colloquia or seminars. Dissemination of works of art and new modes of artistic expression occurs through publication, gallery shows, public performances, and presentations at meetings seminars.

2. The acquisition of further knowledge in one’s field or a related field.

Examples include service to or study in a different but related academic discipline; classes, seminars or conferences attended to enrich or update professional knowledge or skills; international development and education appointments; professional experience in industry or government; challenging consultancies; internships or residencies at appropriate institutions or organizations; participation in national and international professional programs; projects undertaken to improve teaching skills; the completion of advanced degrees, professional licenses, or additional advanced studies; participation in appropriate institutes, seminars, and workshops; active participation in professional organizations; and service on advisory boards or committees in relevant fields.

The above examples, although not exhaustive, suggest the variety of professional development activities in which faculty could engage.

Appraisal of Professional Development

Each discipline or department at Cal Poly must decide on the combination of professional development activities best suited to its individual character. It is the responsibility of each academic department to ensure that the professional activities of individual faculty members are an asset to the university and are supportive of its educational mission. This responsibility should be carried out in a manner consistent with established departmental criteria.

The direction of research, scholarship--indeed, of any professional development activity--is often uncertain and can take unexpected turns. Recognizing that specificity is often not possible, it is helpful nonetheless to have a plan for guidance. It is important, therefore, that each faculty member carefully consider and document general plans for professional development, and modify these plans as necessary.

Departments can help orient new faculty by clarifying what modes of professional development are most consistent with departmental goals, and by endorsing general plans. The faculty member’s immediate colleagues are usually the people best suited to evaluate the quality of the work done. The department head, in consultation with the tenured and senior faculty, is responsible for informing individual department members about how well their professional activities are meeting these criteria, both in plan and performance.

Because of the crucial relationship between teaching and professional development, it is campus policy that evidence of professional development is and continues to be an important requirement for all faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure. Cal Poly’s health as a university depends on the vitality of its faculty. Teaching can continue to be invigorating only if it is energized by regular involvement in the recreative activities of professional development. This bulletin is intended to clarify and assert the importance of encouraging and nurturing this most vital element in Cal Poly’s continued success.

Resources for Professional Development

In order to create an atmosphere in which faculty can strive for excellence both in the classroom and professionally, a university must provide an academic environment that encourages pride in one’s work, and an opportunity to do that work well. The university must strive to provide faculty sufficient time and resources to pursue both professional growth and teaching excellence, so that these two types of endeavors may be mutually supportive rather than competitive.
The present teaching load is such that faculty often compromise the quality of their teaching because of inadequate time to develop new approaches and new material. Finding time for professional development is extremely difficult and can further compromise and limit improvements in quality. Efforts should be made to bring the teaching load into line with the expectations for continual improvement and professional development.

Facilities need to be improved and expanded for basic teaching activities. Furthermore, the current facilities utilization formulas do not recognize the need for facilities to support the teaching effort through faculty development. Adequate recognition must be given to provide facilities for both teaching and professional development.

The working environment should be sufficiently attractive to acquire and retain faculty dedicated to teaching excellence fostered by continual professional development activities. This means that adequate support should be sought for salaries, sabbaticals, professional travel, publication, private offices, library and computing facilities, and technical, clerical, and student assistant help.

Professional growth and development is extremely important for the competence of our faculty and for the vitality of our academic programs. Both the faculty and the university must cooperate in this effort of mutual benefit. The faculty bear the responsibility of engaging in appropriate professional activities, and the university bears the responsibility of providing appropriate time and resources for these activities.
AM-20050111: Faculty Post-Retirement Employment

State of California
Memorandum

To: College Deans: Phil Bailey; David Christy; Linda Holisky; Tom Jones; Bonnie Konopak; Peter Lee; David Wehner

From: Michael Suess
Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel

Date: January 11, 2005

Copies: Department Chairs/Heads
Robert Dewweiler
Hiram Davis
Susan Opava
Linda Dalton
David Corn
Manzar Foroohar
David Harmings

File: 5/Amr/post-retirement

Subject: Faculty Post-Retirement Employment

This is a reminder of post-retirement employment limitations for faculty employees. Government Code provisions permit former California State University (CSU) academic employees who retire and receive retirement benefits from the California Public Employees Retirement System (CalPERS) to accept limited CSU employment without jeopardizing retirement benefits or requiring reinstatement from retirement.

Government Code 21227 allows a retiree to accept a faculty assignment where such post-retirement employment does not exceed, in any fiscal year, 960 hours or 50 percent of the hours the member was employed during the last fiscal year prior to retirement. Recently, CalPERS advised the CSU that the retiree is required to select the option that provides the lesser employment. Every academic workday of a specific academic term (prorated by time base) counts toward the 960 hour or 50 percent limitation, regardless of the actual days teaching or whether the faculty member is working full or part-time during the term.

The Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) article in the CSU-CFA collective bargaining agreement is more restrictive and limits FERP employment to 90 days (720 hour equivalent) or 50 percent of the employee’s regular time base in the year preceding retirement. The campus academic calendar identifies workdays. Every academic workday in a term (academic quarter) counts toward the FERP 90 day or 50 percent methodology maximum, regardless of actual days spent teaching.

FERP participants are not eligible for other CSU appointments except for appointments in CSU extension (Continuing Education) during the period of employment in FERP. For example, a FERP participant may not be appointed as a lecturer and may not be appointed to additional employment through the Foundation. The only exception allows a FERP participant assigned to work full-time for one academic quarter to accept CSU extension (Continuing Education) on days that do not coincide with the period of FERP employment as long as the total of FERP plus CSU extension does not exceed 90 days in a fiscal year.

If post-retirement employment limits are exceeded, the CalPERS retiree and Cal Poly are subject to penalties to include repaying the employee and employer contributions that would have been paid during any period of "unlawful" employment, plus interest and administrative expenses incurred by CalPERS in responding to this situation.
AM-20061117: Agreement for Summer Quarter Faculty Assignments

California Polytechnic State University
AGREEMENT FOR SUMMER QUARTER FACULTY ASSIGNMENTS
Effective Summer 2007
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1. Offers of summer employment shall be based on the curricular needs of the department.

2. The composition of summer quarter appointment offers for extra pay within the University (and preferably within each college and department) may consist of:
   a. At least 60% of summer appointment offers (headcount) shall consist of tenured and probationary faculty, as follows:
      i. Three-quarters of summer appointment offers (headcount) shall consist of tenured and probationary faculty based on priority lists and ranking procedures (item 8, below).
      ii. One-quarter of summer appointment offers (headcount) may consist of a combination of new first year tenure track faculty and additional probationary faculty. (Offers of summer employment may be extended to any new first year tenure track faculty member either during the summer preceding the tenure track assignment, or the summer quarter immediately following their first academic year.)
   b. Up to 40% of summer appointment offers (headcount) may consist of lecturer appointments. It is possible that more than 40% (headcount) of the appointments for Summer Quarter may result in lecturer appointments if tenured and probationary faculty decline offers extended to them.

3. Appointment of probationary or tenured faculty during Summer Quarter will be based on a 12 WTU teaching assignment and 3 WTU for instructionally related responsibilities (see item 7 below), or pro-rata amount for part-time assignments. (For example, the assignment of a probationary or tenured faculty member teaching 4 units over five weeks or eight weeks would be paid 4/12 for the quarter to include instructionally related responsibilities.)

4. Probationary and tenured faculty teaching part-time may either:
   a. be compensated on a pro-rata basis of 12 WTU, or
   b. "bank" the summer units on a pro-rata basis of 12 WTU to reduce a future teaching assignment during a quarter in the immediately subsequent academic year. The quarter for which the teaching assignment will be reduced will be jointly determined by the faculty member and department head/chair before the summer letter of appointment is extended.

5. Probationary or tenured faculty "banking" Summer Quarter by teaching full-time will not be assigned to teach for extra pay during the vacation quarter (except for emergencies or extraordinary circumstances).

6. Summer Quarter appointments of lecturers will be based on a 15 unit teaching load. Lecturers will be paid for all work assigned. Lecturers assigned instructionally related responsibilities shall be paid accordingly.

7. Instructionally related responsibilities include research, scholarship, creative activity, and/or service to the University, profession and/or the community.

8. After determining the curricular needs for Summer Quarter, consideration of probationary and tenured faculty eligible and qualified to teach the courses shall then include a rank/ordered list of
California Polytechnic State University
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faculty with priority being given to those eligible faculty members who have taught during
summer quarter less recently.

a. The Academic Personnel office will develop a list, by department, reporting past history
of summer quarter assignments for those faculty who have taught for extra pay; banked a
summer quarter full time; or repaid an "advance quarter off" by teaching a summer
quarter.
b. Faculty will advise their department head/chair (by a deadline established by the
department) whether the assignment will be for extra pay or for banking in the event they
are appointed to teach Summer Quarter.
c. Tie-breaking procedures, when faculty are equally eligible and qualified, will be
determined by the respective department/equivalent unit.

9. Summer quarter assignments not affecting eligibility are:

a. Banking a part-time summer teaching assignment to reduce the teaching assignment in
the immediate subsequent academic year, but will impact department priority;
b. Non-teaching assignments reimbursed by grants, fellowships, non-State funding, etc.;
c. Instructional administrative assignments such as coordinators, department heads/chairs,
production/farm managers, etc.; and/or
d. Assigned time for professional development or course/curriculum development.

10. Unless otherwise agreed to by the parties, this agreement shall remain in effect through at least the
ending date of the successor contract currently being negotiated between the CSU and CFA.

11. The intent of the Parties is to maintain the level of compensation provided in this agreement,
unless the collective bargaining agreement provides a higher level of compensation or benefits.

12. For terms and conditions of employment not specifically addressed by this agreement, it is the
intent of the parties to maintain the status quo with regard to summer employment. However, in
the event of a conflict regarding this agreement or past practice, the state-wide MOU (excluding
Article 21- Summer Session) will control for summer employment.

SIGNATURES:

RICHARD SAFER
CFA Chapter President SLO

WARREN J. BAKER
President
California Polytechnic State University

11/16/06
11/17/06

June 1, 2020
State of California  
Memorandum

To: Philip Bailey, Dave Christy, Douglas Epperson, Debra Larson, Christine Theodoropoulous, David Wehner, Mike Miller, Preston Allen, and Don Oberheiman

From: Albert A. Liddicoat  
Associate Vice Provost for Academic Personnel

Subject: New Outside Employment Reporting Requirement for Unit 3 Employees

Date: January 10, 2013

Copies: Kathleen Ena Finken  
Department Heads/Chairs  
Anna Gold, Marty Bragg  
College Analysts  
Academic Personnel Staff

On September 18, 2012 the CSU Board of Trustees ratified the successor CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement for immediate implementation. The Collective Bargaining Agreement includes a new requirement for full-time faculty unit employees to report outside employment that is expected to exceed 110 hours in an academic quarter for academic year faculty, or outside employment (non-Cal Poly employment) that exceeds 120 hours per three-month period for faculty holding 12-month appointments. A fillable version of the required Outside Employment Disclosure Form is available on the Academic Personnel website at the following URL:

http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/forms

The reporting of outside employment will be implemented campus wide at the start of the Winter quarter 2013. Academic Personnel will notify all full-time faculty at the beginning of each academic term and reporting period of their requirement to report outside employment. Full-time faculty members that meet the reporting requirement must submit the completed Outside Employment Disclosure Form within thirty days of the commencement of the term or three-month period. They will be instructed to submit the form directly to their dean or appointing authority for inclusion in their Personnel Action File. Please provide a copy of any forms you receive to Academic Personnel before filing. Feel free to contact Al Liddicoat, aliddico@calpoly.edu if you have any questions regarding the implementation of the new outside employment reporting requirement.

Collective Bargaining Agreement Article 35 Outside Employment

35.3 In addition to the requirements of 35.2 above, all full-time faculty unit members shall be required to provide a written statement to the appropriate administrator of all outside employment, where such outside employment is expected to amount to more than:

i. 160 hours per semester for faculty holding academic year or ten (10) month appointments at a semester campus.

ii. 110 hours per quarter for faculty holding academic year or ten (10) month appointments at a quarter campus.

iii. 120 hours per 3 month period for faculty holding twelve (12) month appointments.

Written statements shall be submitted using the form at Appendix H and shall be provided to the appropriate administrator within 30 days of the commencement of the semester, quarter, or three (3) month period during which the outside employment is to be undertaken. For faculty holding twelve (12) month appointments the quarter dates for the purposes of reporting shall be July 1; October 1, January 1; and April 1.
AM-20130222: New Student Evaluation Requirement Effective Winter Quarter 2013

State of California
Memorandum

To: Philip Bailey, Dave Christy, Douglas Epperson, Debra Larson, Christine Theodoropoulos, David Wehner

From: Kathleen Enz Finken Provost

Date: February 22, 2013

Copies: Jeffrey Armstrong
Department Heads/Chairs
All Faculty Employees
College Analysts
Al Liddicoat
Glen Thorncroft
Steve Rein
Dustin Stegner
Kenneth Brown
Academic Personnel Staff

Subject: New Student Evaluation Requirement Effective Winter Quarter 2013

Provision 15.15 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement states that student evaluations shall be required for all classes taught by each faculty unit employee, unless the President has approved a requirement to evaluate fewer classes after considerations of the recommendations of appropriate faculty committee(s). The new requirement for faculty to evaluate all classes taught will take effect Winter Quarter 2013, as communicated in the memo dated 10/19/12 from Al Liddicoat, AVP Academic Personnel (available at http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/policies/procedures).

After consulting with the Academic Senate Instructional Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee, President Armstrong and I have reviewed and endorse the following exceptions for conducting student evaluations in low enrollment courses (individual senior project, independent study), capstone, and cooperative education courses:

1. Courses with low enrollment (less than five students) shall not be evaluated. Typical of these courses would be:
   - Individual senior projects
   - Independent study

2. 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.

3. Capstone senior project courses, which usually have larger enrollment, shall be evaluated if there are more than 5 students enrolled.

4. 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. Any faculty member team teaching the course will have the opportunity to write a narrative description to accompany the student evaluation results for the team-taught course if they desire to add context to the results. A faculty member who team-teaches a course and believes 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 his/her PAF. After reviewing this request, the dean has the discretion to determine if the student evaluation results of the team-taught course should be placed in the instructor’s file.

As a reminder, all student evaluations are to be conducted utilizing the questions and format that have been vetted and approved by your college. All other requirements and processes outlined in the Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty (available at http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/policies/rpt) remain applicable.
AM-20130919: Self-Support Program Personnel Policies

State of California
Memorandum

To: College Deans
   Department Heads/Chairs

From: Kathleen Enz Finken
       Provost and Executive Vice President
       for Academic Affairs

Date: September 19, 2013

Copies: Brian Tietje
         Al Liddicoat
         John Lyons
         Cari Moore
         Rich Savage
         IG&EE Staff

Subject: International, Graduate and Extended Education
         Self-Support Program Personnel Policies

As a follow-up to discussions about self-support program policies in the Deans’ Retreats over the summer, I am pleased to approve the attached International, Graduate and Extended Education Self-Support Program Personnel Policies document.

This document is intended to define and promote policies that will lend structure, clarity, consistency and transparency to the processes governing faculty appointment, assignment and pay for Cal Poly’s self-support programs offered through the auspices of the International, Graduate and Extended Education office. The applicable self-support classifications covered by these policies include:

- 2322 = Instructional Faculty – Special Programs (for credit)
- 2323 = Instructional Faculty – Extension (for credit)

Applicable programs include Off-Campus and International Programs, Self-support Graduate and Certificate Programs, and all other Special Session Programs for academic credit. Self-support Summer Term policies are covered separately and will be updated later in the academic year.

These policies are posted on the Academic Personnel website at http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/policies/procedures. I would appreciate your assistance in advising your faculty of the new policies.
International, Graduate and Extended Education

Self-Support Program Personnel Policies

September 16, 2013

This document is intended to define and promote policies that will lend structure, clarity, consistency and transparency to the processes governing faculty appointment, assignment and pay for Cal Poly's self-support programs offered through the auspices of International, Graduate and Extended Education office. These programs include Off-Campus and International Programs, Self-support Graduate and Certificate Programs, and all other Special Session Programs for academic credit. Self-support Summer Term policies are documented separately (available at [http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/summer](http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/summer)).

The applicable self-support jobcodes and classifications covered by these policies include (source: CSU Salary Schedule; Unit 3 Faculty CBA):

- 2322 = Instructional Faculty – Special Programs (for credit)
- 2323 = Instructional Faculty – Extension (for credit)

1. Recruitment and Appointment/Assignment Authority
   a. 2322: Current faculty unit employees will be assigned by academic departments for all programs for academic credit (special session, off-campus programs, self-support graduate programs, and international programs). A Self-Support Program Appointment and Acceptance Agreement will be issued by the Vice Provost for International, Graduate, and Extended Education (IG&EE), and will be reviewed by the Associate Vice Provost for Academic Personnel before being sent to the faculty employee.
   b. 2323: Current faculty unit employees will be assigned and appointed by the Vice Provost for International, Graduate, and Extended Education.
   c. If there is a need to hire non-faculty to teach self-support courses for academic credit (2322), applicable academic recruitment policies must be followed by the academic department or college in which the program resides to solicit applications and interest, normally using the part-time pool recruitment process.

2. Appointments to 2322 and 2323 jobcodes
   a. Article 40.13: The official notification to a faculty unit employee of an appointment in the classifications noted in provisions 40.1 and 40.2 shall include the beginning and ending dates of appointment, number of WTUs, salary, the requirement to meet the first class, and other conditions of appointment. The faculty unit employee’s appointment may require participation in the student evaluation process.
   b. Additional compensation for current faculty teaching Self-Support program courses during the regular academic year will be compensated at a rate of 1/45th of the faculty member’s annual base salary per WTM.
c. Appointments of non-faculty for Self-Support programs during academic year will be compensated at the published rate in the CSU salary schedule (see attachment) for the appropriate jobcode, based on the entry level rank (3=Assistant Professor equivalent). Higher rank placement may be used if such placement is in accordance with applicable department and college personnel policies and is recommended by the appropriate department head/chair and college dean (see 1.c above).

d. Article 40.12: An appointment to the classifications noted in provisions 40.1 and 40.2 is a temporary appointment for a specific period of time. Appointments are for instructional course WTUs only and are exempt appointments. No entitlements or fringe benefits of any type are earned in 2322 and 2323 jobcodes (these positions are paid in one lump sum at the conclusion of the assignment and therefore do not qualify for benefits).

e. Article 40.15: Faculty who develop the courses that are offered through Extension in classification code 2322, Instructional Faculty, Special Programs - For Credit shall have the right of first preference to teach those courses.

f. Article 40.21: When employing faculty to teach Extension courses that have been previously offered on that campus through the regular state-supported (General Fund) curriculum during the last academic year, first hiring preference shall be given to qualified three-year appointed faculty who have not received work sufficient to fulfill the time base entitlement of their three-year appointment in the most recent academic year, or in the case of a midyear extension course, in the current academic year. Qualified as used herein shall mean that the faculty member has taught the offered course, or a substantially similar course, on the offering campus.

g. Jobcodes 2322 and 2323 may not be used for assignments of current Cal Poly faculty during Summer Term in lieu of jobcode 2357, except by advance approval of the Vice Provost for International, Graduate, and Extended Education and Associate Vice Provost for Academic Personnel. Requests for exceptions must clearly indicate how an exception will benefit the University and its students, and cannot be granted for courses that would qualify as self-support summer courses. Exceptions will not be approved for reasons that solely benefit the instructor. Cal-Poly Led Programs and other off-campus and self-support graduate and certificate programs offered during summer may continue to use jobcodes 2322 and 2323 for these appointments.

3. FERPs may not receive any additional employment for additional compensation for the duration of their FERP employment. This includes any additional employment for additional pay regardless of funding source, such as Special Consultant appointments, Extended Education or Cal Poly Corporation.

   a. FERPs will generally not be permitted to teach for self-support programs on a reimbursed basis for the duration of their FERP appointment, unless an exception is granted by the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs under the established exception criteria.

   b. Any exceptions will be recommended by the Vice Provost for International, Graduate, and Extended Education on the basis of demonstrated programmatic need for the expertise of the FERP and unavailability of other faculty member(s) with the needed expertise. A FERP requesting an exception to teach for self-support programs within their college or
Memorandum of Understanding: Amendments to the Range Elevation Procedures 2016

In order to address issues associated with lack of opportunities for range elevation in the absence of negotiated Service Salary Increases (SSIs), the following program shall be available to eligible lecturers and temporary librarian faculty unit employees.

Lecturers and temporary librarian faculty unit employees who meet range elevation criteria as currently defined by Article 12.17, or become eligible while this agreement is in effect, shall continue to be eligible to apply for range elevation under provisions 12.16 through 12.20 and campus policies.

Lecturers and temporary librarian faculty unit employees who have served at least five years in the current range and have reached the Service Salary Increase (SSI) maximum shall be considered eligible for range elevation regardless of whether they have received prior Faculty Merit Increases (FMIs).

For those lecturers and temporary librarian faculty unit employees who have not exhausted SSI eligibility by the beginning of the 2017/18 academic year, the following provisions shall apply.

Determination of eligibility

- Full-time adjusted service (FTAS) shall be established as of the beginning of the 2017/18 academic year. For each academic or fiscal year, FTAS is defined as the average FTE over the academic or fiscal year, divided by 0.8, up to a maximum of 1.0 for the year.

- Range elevation shall be accompanied by a salary increase of at least 5% or whatever percentage increase is required to reach at least the minimum of the next range, whichever is greater.

- Lecturers and temporary librarian faculty unit employees with at least 6 years FTAS in the current range as of the start of the Fall 2017 term shall be eligible to apply for range elevation according to the following schedule:
  - In 2017/18, individuals with 12 or more years FTAS shall be eligible to apply.
  - In 2018/19, individuals with 9 or more years FTAS shall be eligible to apply.
  - In 2019/20, individuals with 6 or more years FTAS shall be eligible to apply.

Review process

- Campus criteria, timelines, and review processes for range elevation established at each campus pursuant to Article 12.16 shall continue to be used for range elevation under these modified criteria.

Effective date for increases

Range elevation, as well as applicable salary increases, shall take effect at the beginning of the first appointment in the academic year following review.

These provisions will remain in effect until June 30, 2020 unless superseded by an agreement between the parties.
Memorandum of Understanding: Amendments to the Range Elevation Procedures 2016

Additional Terms

The parties agree that this issue shall continue to be the subject of bargaining in successor contract negotiations, and that this Memorandum of Understanding does not impact, limit, or otherwise constrain the ability of either party to make proposals on any issue subject to this Memorandum of Understanding.

For any year in which this agreement is in effect and for any faculty member eligible under the terms of this agreement, the CSU agrees to the following: At least thirty (30) days prior to the commencement of the annual campus Range Elevation process, the campus shall notify lecturers of their eligibility. In that notification the campus shall inform the lecturers that receipt of a previous TMI will not affect their eligibility for Range Elevation, and that Range Elevation is accompanied by a salary increase of at least 5% or whatever percentage increase is required to reach at least the minimum of the next range, whichever is greater.

For CFA

Kathy Sheffield
Director of Representation
11/9/2016

For CSU

L.A. Swierbrick
Associate Vice Chancellor
11/15/2016
This memo provides the guidelines to determine reasonable maximum work assignments for teaching assignments administered through Extended Education.

General guidelines for faculty with full-time AY assignments:

1. During the fall, winter or spring academic terms, faculty working full-time in a state assignment can teach up to four (4) WTU per term for Extended Ed for added compensation.
2. During summer term, AY faculty can teach up to full-time (12) WTU for tenure/tenure-track and 15 WTU for Lecturers) for additional compensation.
3. During the five-week summer term, faculty will be limited to eight (8) WTU since the contact hours and teaching responsibilities are compressed by 50% and therefore this is in line with full-time effort. Faculty may teach in different five-week summer terms as long as they do not exceed (8) WTU in one term or (15) WTU for the entire summer term.
4. Intersession 2-2.5 week instruction is less than 1/4 of the nominal quarter so faculty will be limited to four (4) WTU.

Exceptions may be considered but they require an advance review with the AVP for Academic Personnel, who in turn will consult with me for approval prior to processing such an appointment. Faculty requesting such an exception must submit a memo to Academic Personnel that includes the justification for the teaching assignment and approval from the college dean no later than six weeks prior to the first day of classes for the assignment.

Any questions related to Extended Education teaching assignments for additional compensation should be directed to Brian Tietje, Vice Provost International, Graduate and Extended Education or Al Liddicoat, AVP Academic Personnel.
Dear Faculty Unit Employees:

CFA filed a grievance regarding the rights of lecturers to vote in recommendations for department chairs. This is to let you know that a no-fault grievance settlement was obtained regarding this grievance. The relevant language from the final signed settlement agreement is now effective and is copied below:

All 12.12 (3 year) lecturers, including counselors and librarians, with an appointment in the academic quarter of the vote will be eligible to participate in the vote to recommend a department chair, per Provision 20.30 of the November 12, 2014 – June 30, 2017 Collective Bargaining Agreement (and extended to June 30, 2018) (“CBA”), with a full vote in their department voting process. Nothing in the ballot process will differentiate the three-year lecturers’ vote from tenured and tenure-track faculty votes for department chair recommendations.

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

The above voting terms represent a minimum; departments may modify their department chair selection policies through the joint governance process.

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

Lecturers eligible to cast a vote or an advisory vote shall be afforded the same opportunity as tenured and tenure-track faculty to attend regularly scheduled department meetings when department chair balloting is scheduled.

In the event the department conducts a search for a department chair that is not from the department, a different process will be used in place of the process delineated in Paragraphs 3 through 6 of this Agreement. In this case, the chair of the search committee shall solicit feedback from all lecturers employed during the quarter of the vote; these lecturers will be granted a full advisory vote, which will be presented to the faculty search committee. External department chair searches will follow the Cal Poly recruitment process for tenured and tenure-track faculty. Per the CBA, only tenured and tenure-track faculty with the permission of the dean, may serve on the search committee for external faculty recruitments. An external search may or may not include internal candidate applications, but all candidates who apply must go through the same selection process.

The CBA has since been extended to June 30, 2020.
AM-20171101: Employment of Non-Immigrants – Important updates

State of California
Memorandum

To: Scott Dawson, Doug Epperson, Keith Humphrey, Jim Meagher, Don Oberhelman, Christine Theodoropoulos, Andy Thulin, Dean Wendt

Date: November 1, 2017

File No.: O/AA/Visa-Work Authorization

From: Albert A. Liddicoat
Vice Provost, Academic Affairs and Personnel

Copies: Kathleen Erz Finken
Mary Pedersen
Department Heads/Chairs
College Analysts
Adriana Popescu
Geneva Reynaga-Abiko
Nick Pettit
Kacey Chun
Chris Kitts
Amy Velasco
Jodi Block
Marc Benadiba
Jennifer Hiatt
Staff: AP, CPIC

Subject: Employment of Non-Immigrants – Important updates

Both the Academic Personnel Office and the International Center work closely with departments and the college dean’s offices to invite international faculty, staff and students to campus for temporary paid and volunteer activities. These offices follow complex U.S. Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) and U.S. Department of State federal visa regulations to determine which visa type and category is most appropriate for each individual’s proposed activity and assist with the required visa application documents.

State of California regulations and Worker’s Compensation regulations also mandate that all employees be legally able to work in the U.S. and provide proof of employment authorization before beginning employment.

Below are some important guidelines and the processes to follow when inviting or hiring an international applicant. Please review carefully, as several important changes are being communicated with this update.
Employment of Non-Immigrants – Important Updates
November 1, 2017

Academic Personnel Office - Tenure-Track Instructional Faculty and Temporary Lecturer Classifications

- Consult with the Academic Personnel office prior to offering a faculty position to an international applicant. Academic Personnel will determine if the individual has employment authorization or needs to be sponsored for an H-1B specialty occupation category visa. Sufficient lead time must be allowed for the H-1B application processing prior to the appointment start date, since USCIS processing time can be highly variable before employment authorization is received.

- The college or department is responsible for the H-1B filing fees except for any H-4 filing fees related to the employee’s dependents. Review the H-1B visa process and fees online.

- International applicants for tenure track or other permanent positions may also inquire about employer assistance with applications for U.S. Permanent Residency. The CSU does not allow any attorney fees and/or any filing fees associated with a petition for employer-based permanent residency (“green card”) to be paid by the campus employing the petitioner, either by direct payment or as a reimbursement, from any funding source, including non-state or non-general funds. It is important to clearly communicate that the applicant is responsible for retaining an immigration attorney and is responsible for all required fees if interested in pursuing permanent residency at the time a preliminary verbal offer is extended in order to avoid any expectations to the contrary. This policy will also be communicated in the official offer letter on an as-needed basis.

- The department employing the international applicant should also be aware that not all types of positions will satisfy the eligibility criteria for employment-based permanent resident status. It is often not an option for employees in non-instructional classifications such as librarians, counselors, coaches, and the majority of staff and management positions to attain permanent resident status based on their Cal Poly employment.

- The college sends the offer letter and the applicant’s file to Academic Personnel for approval.

- If an H-1B visa petition is needed, the Academic Personnel office will be able to initiate processing of immigration forms and documentation required once the applicant accepts the written offer.

- If the required degree listed in the advertisement has not been conferred prior to the anticipated date of employment, the employee cannot begin working for Cal Poly, even in another capacity (such as a lecturer). When the highest degree earned was received from any international institution, the prospective faculty member is responsible for ordering and paying for their degree to be evaluated (and translated into English if provided in another language) by Academic Credential Evaluation Institute, Inc. (ACEI). This applies to any highest degree transcript from an international institution, even if obtained in English (such as from Canada). No other form of degree evaluation will be accepted. For verifying degrees from international universities that do not provide transcripts,
Employment of Non-Immigrants – Important Updates
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the employee should order ACEI’s Comprehensive Report including grades whenever possible. Translation services are also offered if needed.

- Once the H-1B visa petition is approved by USCIS, send the new employee to Payroll Services to verify that all employment authorization documents are in place before starting work. The employee is required to bring an original Social Security Card to Payroll in order to receive pay. If needed, please refer the new employee to the Social Security Administration office.

- Notify the Academic Personnel Office whenever a non-immigrant employee terminates employment and/or leaves Cal Poly.

Faculty Working on Grants/Sponsored Projects, Contracts, or Sports Camps

- The Cal Poly Corporation cannot employ or compensate H-1B workers for grants, contracts, camps or any other additional employment funded through external funding. However, the employing department can provide the additional compensation funded by external sources directly to the H-1B worker through an additional appointment classification (such as Special Consultant) and request reimbursement from the grant, contract, or other program administered by the Corporation.

- All sources of employment and compensation taken together cannot exceed 125% FTE, regardless of the classification used to compensate or source of compensation. Departments who employ non-immigrant faculty on visas will use the Special Consultant classification (job code 4660) for the purpose of compensating these faculty for work on grants and contracts, and any other additional employment. It should be noted that since the Special Consultant is an exempt classification, faculty employed as Special Consultants must be compensated for the work in full day increments. During the academic term, faculty employed as Special Consultants are permitted to work up to a maximum of fourteen days per academic term to stay within the 25% additional compensation provisions. During academic holidays and breaks, Special Consultant assignments may be performed on a full-time basis.

- The procedures and forms for processing Special Consultant appointments for faculty on visas are available on the Academic Personnel website.

International Center - Inviting Visiting Instructors, Researchers and Student Interns

- Visit the International Scholars website for links to all forms and sample letters.

- At least five months prior to the start date, the academic department completes the International Visitor Form and sends it to the International Center to determine the appropriate visa type.

- If a J-1 visa is deemed appropriate, the academic department assigns a faculty mentor or student intern supervisor and asks that person to complete and return the Mentor Agreement or J-1 Student Intern Supervisor Form.
Employment of Non-Immigrants – Important Updates
November 1, 2017

- The International Center will work with the Dean’s office to provide information for the invitation letter.
- The invitation letters for all paid appointments will be sent to Academic Personnel for approval.
- The International Center sends the DS-2019 visa document to the Dean’s office to send via international courier to the visitor along with the invitation letter. If the visitor is a volunteer, the Dean’s office will also include a Volunteer Information (V-1) Form.
- Upon arrival, the visitor will check in with the International Center and then apply for a Social Security card if he or she is to be paid.

Contact Information
Academic Personnel
Nicole Hadley
756-2841

International Center
Judy Mitchell
756-5837
Lecturer Range Elevation Eligibility Guidelines
(Updated for 2018-19 Academic Year)

The agreement reached between the California State University (CSU) and the California Faculty Association (CFA – Unit 3), ratified by the CSU Board of Trustees on May 24, 2016, included a provision that the parties meet to review and make recommendations regarding lecturer range elevation eligibility. The parties subsequently reached an agreement modifying range elevation eligibility that was memorialized in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) dated November 15, 2016.

The agreement affects lecturers who have served at least five years in their current range who have reached the SSI maximum salary or otherwise have no more SSI eligibility in their range, and lecturers who have not reached the SSI maximum salary, but who have reached qualifying levels of service in their current range as of the beginning of the 2017-18 academic year.

Individuals with six or more years of Full-Time Adjusted Service (FTAS) in their current range as of the beginning of the 2017-18 academic year shall be eligible for range elevation according to the following schedule:
- In 2017-18, individuals with 12 or more years of FTAS shall be eligible to apply.
- In 2018-19, individuals with 9 or more years of FTAS shall be eligible to apply.
- In 2019-20, individuals with 6 or more years of FTAS shall be eligible to apply.

For each academic or fiscal year, FTAS is defined as the average time base (FTE) worked over the year, divided by 0.8, and up to a maximum of 1.0 for that year. Average FTE can either be determined from the FTE assigned each term, or by adding up the number of WTUs assigned over the academic year and dividing by or 36.

Once Academic Personnel determines which lecturers are eligible to apply for range elevation, a memo will be sent to each college dean.

Range elevation is not automatic and is based on the written request and documentation provided by the temporary faculty member that demonstrates he/she has satisfied fully the approved criteria for range elevation established by the college. At each level of review, the candidate is to be provided a copy of the written recommendation and allowed ten days to submit a written statement/rebuttal and/or request a meeting to discuss the recommendation with the evaluator(s) before it is sent to the next level of review. A faculty peer review committee composed of elected tenured faculty members of the department is responsible to provide a written recommendation using the Lecturer Evaluation Form API90-L. The ERC should include reasons for the recommendation based on the college’s approved range elevation criteria, and after reviewing the Working Personnel Action File and the permanent Personnel Action File of the candidate. The department chair/head is responsible for submitting a separate evaluation and recommendation using the Lecturer Evaluation Form API90-L, and the dean has been delegated responsibility by the President to make range elevation decisions. Approved range elevation decisions shall be accompanied by at least a 5% increase in salary effective at the beginning of Fall Quarter 2019.

Pursuant to the collective bargaining agreement, range elevation evaluations of lecturers shall be appropriate to the work assignment of the lecturer and shall conform to the approved criteria established by the college. Criteria approved by the Academic Senate that is within the scope of the individual lecturer’s assignment should be used in range elevation recommendations and decisions.
While teaching comprises the work assignment of most lecturers, consideration shall also be given to other assigned duties beyond teaching when applicable. Article 20.1c of the faculty contract defines instructional responsibilities as:

The performance of instructional responsibilities extends beyond duties in the classroom and includes such activities as: preparation for class, evaluation of student performance, syllabus preparation and revision, and review of current literature and research in the subject area, including instructional methodology. Research, scholarship and creative activity in the faculty member’s field of expertise are essential to effective teaching. Mentoring students and colleagues is another responsibility that faculty members are frequently expected to perform. Just as faculty members may teach online, they may perform other duties online, pursuant to campus policies.

Lecturers eligible to apply for range elevation during the 2018-19 academic year must be notified of the deadlines for submitting their Working Personnel Action File and provided with college criteria by which they will be evaluated before the end of Fall Quarter. Lecturer range elevation information is available at https://academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/rep.

The following is the timetable for 2018-19 Lecturer Range Elevation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Dec 15 (Sat)</td>
<td>Candidates advised of eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 9 (Wed)</td>
<td>Candidates notify Dean whether they intend to apply for range elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 15 (Tu)</td>
<td>Close PAF and Candidate submits Working Personnel Action File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 8 (Fri)</td>
<td>Peer Review Committee Evaluation to Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 19 (Tu)</td>
<td>Peer Review Committee Evaluation to Department Head/Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 15 (Fri)</td>
<td>Department Head/Chair Evaluation to Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 25 (Mo)</td>
<td>Department Head/Chair Evaluation to Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3 (Fri)</td>
<td>Dean Decision to Candidate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Colleges should forward to Academic Personnel a summary of range elevation decisions, along with copies of all range elevation applications (whether recommended or not), recommendations at each level, and notification letters by June 28, 2019. For questions regarding range elevation eligibility please contact Chris Blackburn (cblackbu@calpoly.edu). For questions regarding range elevation evaluation procedure please contact Lindsay Howell (lmhowell@calpoly.edu).

The Lecturer Evaluation Form API09-L referenced in this memo is available at https://academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/forms.

Lecturer range elevation appeal information can be found at https://academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/rep.
AM-20190208: Summer Term 2019 Faculty Eligibility

State of California
Memorandum

To: Andy Thulin, Christine Theodoropoulos, Scott Dawson, Amy Fleischer, Kathryn Rummell, Dean Wendt

From: Albert A. Liddicoat
Vice Provost, Academic Affairs and Personnel

Copies: Kathleen Enz Finken
Brian Tietje
Sandra Harris
Cheri Baumgarten
Dustin Stegner
Lewis Call
Jennifer Hiatt
Academic Personnel Staff
College HR Analyst/Partners
Dept. Heads/Chairs

Subject: Summer Term 2019 Faculty Eligibility

Date: February 8, 2019

As with the past nine Summer Terms, the University is planning to offer Summer Term 2019 through Extended Education as a self-supported program. The prior practices will continue with respect to determining summer term eligibility and workload.

1. During the summer term, AY faculty can teach up to full-time (12 WTU for tenure/tenure-track and 15 WTU for lecturers) for additional compensation.

2. During the five week summer term, faculty will be limited to eight (8) WTU since the contact hours and teaching responsibilities are compressed by 50% and, therefore, this is in line with full-time effort. Faculty may teach in different five week summer terms as long as they do not exceed eight (8) WTU in one term or fifteen (15) WTU for the entire summer.

Course offerings shall continue to be based on the needs of the students with the proviso that all costs at the college level are to be covered by revenues procured through student enrollment fees. Please note that due to the self-support nature of the summer program, the University cannot ensure summer term teaching assignments.

Eligibility lists report only faculty who have either ZERO or PARTIAL eligibility (in WTUs) to teach during Summer Term 2019, along with a brief explanation for the ineligibility or partial eligibility. Academic-year faculty with no other summer assignments who do not appear on the list are eligible for a full-time teaching assignment (jobcode 2357) during Summer 2019. A continuing faculty member who taught full-time FWS 2017-18 and FWS 2018-19, and taught Summer 2018 (regardless of time-base) will be listed as not eligible on the list due to having exceeded the 7 consecutive quarter rule. Teaching assignments in Special Session programs held during the period between Spring and Fall terms (jobcode 2322) are not subject to the Summer Term eligibility process, and will have no impact on ability to teach during Summer Term. The Quarter Plus Program, off-campus programs, and international programs are all examples of Special Session programs that are run during this period. Non-teaching assignments (jobcode 2368) during a previous Summer Term will likewise not impact Summer Term teaching eligibility. Faculty in 12-month assignments are excluded from the eligibility process since summer is part of their normal teaching pattern.

Eligibility to teach during Summer Term 2019 is determined based on the following parameters:

1. Faculty may not teach more than the equivalent of seven consecutive quarters, regardless of time-base — rule applies to tenure-track faculty and full-time lecturers; and

2. Faculty may teach no more than the equivalent of ten (10) FTE quarters in a triad (12-quarter period) — rule applies only to tenure-track faculty.
Exceptions to the above limitations may be granted if it is determined that the assignment of the faculty member is essential to the offering of required instruction and no other qualified eligible faculty members are available to teach. As in previous Summer Terms, requests and justifications for exceptions to the triad regulations will be documented directly on the AP101-S form. The signatures of the department chair/head and dean on the AP101-S will indicate their recommendation that such a waiver be granted. Final approval for any appointments involving requests for exceptions will rest with the AVP Academic Personnel.

3. Eligible tenured and probationary faculty will have priority for Summer Term assignments over lecturers for at least 60% (headcount) of Summer Term offers, assuming they are qualified to teach the courses offered. The respective department chair/head will determine tie-breaking procedures when faculty are equally eligible and qualified.

4. One-quarter of Summer Term appointments may consist of probationary faculty, including faculty hired to begin in Fall Quarter 2019.

5. Summer Term appointments of tenured and tenure-track faculty members carry the obligation to fulfill normal instructionally related responsibilities including research, scholarship, creative activity, and service to the University, profession and to the community.

Please note that due to the self-support Summer Term program and the unpredictable nature of Summer Term assignments, faculty may not request an Advance Quarter Off with pay.

Please review the accuracy of the enclosed lists with your departments and bring any questions or corrections to the attention of Chris Blackburn (756-5281) or Elena Morelos (756-6575) as early as possible. Summer Term appointment procedural instructions and FAQs will be distributed and posted in early Spring Quarter 2019.

If you have any questions regarding an individual case in terms of eligibility please contact Chris Blackburn by email or at 756-5281. Any questions regarding Special Session instruction (including QuarterPlus) should be directed to Cher Baumgarten in the International, Graduate, and Extended Education office.

This information is available at http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/summer.
To: Academic Deans  
From: Cynthia Jackson-Elmoore, Ph.D.  
Provost and Executive Vice President 

Date: August 28, 2020  
Copies: Al Liddicoat  
Kathryn Rummell 

Subject: Revised University Faculty Personnel Policies 

The subject document, written by the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee and approved by the Academic Senate in June 2020, is approved for immediate implementation. Please provide the university faculty access to the document as soon as possible.