

UFPP Evaluation Report Forms (UFPP 3, 4, 7)
Consultation with Academic Senate
Fall 2026

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is developing revisions to AP 109 evaluation report forms used by Department Peer Review Committees, and Department Chairs/Heads. FAC also is developing the use of a wholly new Faculty Self-Evaluation Report form. Policy revisions to cover these proposed forms are part of a larger ongoing project to streamline faculty evaluation.

BACKGROUND: The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, the Solano campus, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a standard process for approval of updates to University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) including consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and clear identification of which policy documents have been superseded by a proposed change. This process uses Academic Senate resolutions to establish new policy, revise existing policy, or substantially reformulate existing policy. It also allows the Senate Executive Committee to place non-controversial updates to personnel policies or addition of administrative memos to the UFPP Appendix on the Senate consent agenda.

Summary

We are gathering feedback on several potential changes to faculty evaluation report forms.

Our current AP109 evaluation report forms are developed for instructional faculty while also used for non-instructional faculty (e.g. librarians). We propose separate forms for instructional faculty and for non-instructional faculty, each with three areas of evaluation.

Three evaluation areas for Instructional Faculty:

1. **Teaching** Performance
2. Professional Growth and Achievement
3. Service to University, Students, and Community

Three evaluation areas for non-instructional Librarians, Counselors, Coaches:

1. **Professional** Performance
2. Professional Growth and Achievement
3. Service to University, Students, and Community

Our current AP109 forms include a fourth section on “Other Factors of Consideration.” We are investigating removing this fourth section this on grounds that anything related to the areas covered in this fourth section relevant to faculty evaluation could be covered in these three areas directly covering the responsibilities of faculty.

UFPP Evaluation Report Forms (UFPP 3, 4, 7)
Consultation with Academic Senate
Fall 2026

Our current forms have two text entry boxes for each evaluation area: “Evidence of Merit” and “Areas and Suggestions for Improvement.” We propose two main text entry boxes to be used for each area of evaluation:

- Text entry for “Comment on Evidence in WPAF and Self Evaluation Report”
- Text entry for “Recommendations for Next Evaluation”

The sample form introduces new selection boxes for “Meets Expectations” or “Does Not Meet Expectations” for each of the three evaluation areas. This is a rather blunt effort to provide a clear summation concerning each of the three evaluation areas.

There is also a text entry for “Requirements for Next Evaluation” to be used *only if “Does Not Meet Expectations” is selected*. For periodic evaluations, instructions are to identify specific, actionable requirements for the next evaluation. For performance evaluations (viz. retention, promotion, tenure, range elevation) this box is to identify unmet expectations by referencing relevant criteria from policy documents.

The separate areas for “recommendations” and for “requirements” is an attempt to provide sharper and clearer messaging from evaluators to candidates in evaluation reports to provide guidance in periodic evaluations, and express a clear basis for recommendations in performance evaluations.

Because indications of whether or not a candidate meets expectations are specific to each of the three evaluation areas, the new forms also remove the four stage summary ranking at the end of the evaluation report.

On performance evaluations, the new forms preserve an overall recommendation for or against the personnel action, though without the text entry box for a summary justification. The basis of recommending for or against a personnel action would be clear from the statements of meeting or not meeting expectations in the evaluation categories.

The proposed new Faculty Self-Evaluation Report Form (FSER) is a narrative report that would be required of all faculty undergoing evaluation. It would be submitted by the candidate in their Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) and be placed in the Personnel Action File (PAF) at the conclusion of the evaluation process. The form is structured according to the evaluation areas for the DPRC and DCH AP109 forms. Text entries for each of the three areas are the following:

- “Summarize Evidence in Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)”
- “Reflect on Previous Evaluation”
- “Plans for Next Five Years”

The summary and reflection sections would replace any other currently used narrative document specifically prepared for the evaluation process. These summary and reflection sections along with the plans for the next five years would take up the function of the Professional Development Plan (PDP), thereby replacing the PDP with this FSER.

**UFPP Evaluation Report Forms (UFPP 3, 4, 7)
Consultation with Academic Senate
Fall 2026**

Evaluators would have access to the FSER in the WPAF and would comment directly on it in the AP109 forms as indicated in the first text entry box for each evaluation category.

Impact on Existing Policy

Revisions to the current AP109 forms and the introduction of the FSER would require revision of portions of UFPP chapters 3 (Personnel Files), 4 (Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes), and 7 (Personnel Action Eligibility and Criteria). Revisions to these chapters of UFPP would require colleges and the library to revise the same chapters of their FPP documents accordingly.

Implementation

In addition to revising their FPP documents, colleges and the library would also need to revise or develop process guides for candidates undergoing evaluation and for evaluators appropriate to the changes required by the use of the new forms.

The guidance documents would need to be for the candidates and for the evaluators. Colleges and departments would need to ensure that explicit criteria for teaching performance, professional growth and achievement, and service are included in their FPP documents, and the library would need to do the same for professional performance, professional growth and achievement, and service. Candidates would need to be mindful of these expectations as they compile the evidence in their Working Personnel Action Files, provide appropriate summaries of the WPAF evidence, reflect on prior evaluation reports, and formulate appropriate plans for the next five years.

The guidance would need to distinguish expectations for tenure-track faculty early in their probationary period, tenure-track faculty approaching promotion and tenure, tenure-track faculty up for tenure, promotion, or early promotion, tenured faculty undergoing post-tenure evaluation, and tenured faculty up for subsequent promotion. The guidance for evaluation of probationary faculty needs to be clear both to candidates and evaluators what it means for faculty to have met expectations for retention, while not yet having met the ultimate criterion for promotion and tenure, for instance.

There needs to be guidance for lecturers undergoing annual periodic evaluation, lecturers undergoing cumulative evaluations, and lecturers undergoing range-elevation evaluations. Lecturers would be required to submit the FSER and be responsive to expectations for lecturer appointments which may have widely varying expectations for professional growth and achievement, and for service.

Since expectations for faculty may differ across departments within a college, departments with their own expectations would need to supplement the college's guidance to express their own expectations.

UFPP Evaluation Report Forms (UFPP 3, 4, 7)
Consultation with Academic Senate
Fall 2026

Earliest possible implementation would be AY 2027-28, though developing the policy at the college/library level likely would need more time. Depending on how the colleges and library adapt to the need for policy, procedural, and guidance document revision/development, the implementation a more likely goal would be implementation for 2028-29.

Consultation

The consultation process began in Spring 2026 and is extending into Fall 2026. All the colleges and the library engaged directly with FAC by inviting the FAC chair, the AVP of Academic Personnel, and the college/library FAC representative to college/library leadership meetings in May and June. FAC presented the sample report forms and gathered initial feedback. The colleges/library would then engage in their standard process of discussing university policy revisions and gathering feedback about the proposed revisions. FAC expects that feedback this Fall, and is willing and able to engage in further discussion of revisions to report forms and their impact on the college/library.

FAC is now engaged in additional avenues of consultation, including this meeting with the Academic Senate. FAC will also follow up with direct engagement with deans as needed through the Provost's Leadership Council, with the Instructional Department Heads and Chairs at IDHC meetings.

Since any changes to faculty evaluation policies accompanies the larger impact of the imposition of Cal Poly's policies and procedures on the Solano faculty, FAC has urged the deans to be mindful of this when they engage with their faculty. The FAC chair will also meet with Solano faculty at a meeting on the Solano campus early in Fall (September 10) to discuss faculty personnel policies in relation to Solano faculty. Administration will be involved directly within FAC and in the engagement with all these stakeholders.

While FAC engages in consultation on this topic of the evaluation report forms, FAC is also interested in developing other related policy on the nature and scope of evidence in Working Personnel Action Files, as well as whether and how to formulate university level requirements and limitations concerning WPAF evidence. These are largely college/library level matters.

Report Attachments:

- **Sample of a current AP109 form**
 - **AP109 DPRC Performance CURRENT**
- **Sample of a revised AP109 form**
 - **AP109 DHDC TT Performance DRAFT**
- **Sample Faculty Self-Evaluation Report Form (FSER)**
 - **Candidate FSER Performance DRAFT**

NAME: Click or tap here to enter text.

DATE: Click to enter a date.

COLLEGE:

Choose an item.

DEPARTMENT:

Click or tap here to enter text.

FACULTY RANK: Choose an item.

 This is an evaluation for (check applicable action): ☐ Retention to a Choose an item. probationary year.

☐ Promotion ☐ Early Promotion ☐ Tenure ☐ Early Tenure

FACTORS OF CONSIDERATION

Justification for Recommendations

(Reference: **University Personnel Action Procedures and Criteria**: <http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/> → Policies and Procedures) **Evaluative statements should be accompanied by supporting evidence. If the evidence does not appear to support the recommendations made, the file will be returned to the reviewing levels for amplification.**

The evaluator should review effectiveness of the faculty member primarily during this evaluation period. The evaluation should reflect both (1) evidence of merit and (2) suggested areas for improvement. Reference any resources used for evaluation; such as class visitation, conferences, and materials provided by the faculty member. If more space is needed, use an additional page.

- *I. Teaching Performance and/or Other Professional Performance:** Consider such factors as the faculty member'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. (Include results of Student Evaluation Program.)

*Nonteaching academic personnel are to be evaluated on their professional performance.

Evidence of Merit:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

Click or tap here to enter text.

- II. Professional Growth and Achievement:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's educational background and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, scholarly and creative achievements, participation in professional societies, publications, presentation of papers at professional and scholarly meetings, and external validation of scholarly activities.

Evidence of Merit:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

Click or tap here to enter text.

- III. Service to University, Students, and Community:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's participation in academic advisement; placement follow-up; co-curricular activities; diversity-related activities; department,

college and university committees; Academic Senate and its committees; individual assignments; systemwide assignments; and service in community affairs directly related to the faculty member's teaching area, as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities.

Evidence of Merit:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

Click or tap here to enter text.

- IV. Other Factors of Consideration:** Consider such factors as collegiality (working collaboratively and productively with colleagues and participation in traditional academic functions); initiative; cooperativeness; and dependability.

Evidence of Merit:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

Click or tap here to enter text.

V. Summary:

1. ☐ *has reached a high level of teaching performance and professional development and is making an outstanding contribution to the university which is readily recognizable.*
2. ☐ *fully meets the requirements of the present assignment and is making a valuable contribution to the university.*
3. ☐ *meets the requirements of the present assignment adequately and by following the preceding suggestions for improvement may make a greater contribution to the university.*
4. ☐ *does not meet satisfactorily the requirements of the present assignment.*

On the basis of the foregoing evaluation, the Department Peer Review Committee recommends the action listed below (required for Retention, Promotion, or Tenure evaluations – do not complete for periodic evaluations):

DPRC Voting Summary	For	Against	Abstain
RETENTION TO: Choose an item.	Enter Vote	Enter Vote	Enter Vote
TENURE ☐ EARLY	Enter Vote	Enter Vote	Enter Vote
PROMOTION ☐ EARLY	Enter Vote	Enter Vote	Enter Vote

For the following reasons:

Click or tap here to enter text.



AP 109 – Department Chair/Head

Performance Evaluation Form Department Chair/Head

<https://academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/policies/rpt>

NAME: Click or tap here to enter text.

DATE: Click to enter a date.

COLLEGE:

Choose an item.

DEPARTMENT:

Click or tap here to enter text.

FACULTY RANK: Choose an item.

This is an evaluation for (check applicable action): ☐ Retention to a Choose an item probationary year.

☐ Promotion ☐ Early Promotion ☐ Tenure ☐ Early Tenure

Evaluation Period: From [term] [year] to [month] [date] [year]

FACTORS OF CONSIDERATION

Justification for Recommendations

(Reference: **University Personnel Action Procedures and Criteria:** <https://academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/> → Policies and Procedures)

The evaluator shall review effectiveness of the faculty member during this evaluation period. The evaluation shall comment on the evidence in the WPAF and the Faculty Self Evaluation Report, including relevant materials in the PAF, and materials related to observation of instruction.

The evaluator shall provide recommendations for the next evaluation and, if necessary and appropriate, requirements for the next evaluation, according to university and college policies.

- I. **Teaching Performance:** Consider such factors as the faculty member'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. (Include results of Student Evaluation Program.)

Comment on Evidence in WPAF and Self Evaluation Report:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Recommendations for Next Evaluation:

Click or tap here to enter text.

☐ Meets Expectations

☐ Does Not Meet Expectations (Check only if performance in this area fails to meet minimum standards or expectations.)

Requirements for Next Evaluation: Use this space to identify unmet expectations by referencing relevant criteria from university, college, and/or department policies. Leave blank if candidate has met expectations.

Click or tap here to enter text.

- II. **Professional Growth and Achievement:** 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. Evaluators shall be mindful of Cal Poly's commitment to the Teacher/Scholar model.

Comment on Evidence in WPAF and Self Evaluation Report:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Recommendations for Next Evaluation:

Click or tap here to enter text.

☐ Meets Expectations

☐ Does Not Meet Expectations (Check only if performance in this area fails to meet minimum standards or expectations.)

Requirements for Next Evaluation: Use this space to identify unmet expectations by referencing relevant criteria from university, college, and/or department policies. Leave blank if candidate has met expectations.

Click or tap here to enter text.

- III. **Service to University, Students, and Community:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's participation in academic advisement; placement follow-up; co-curricular activities; diversity-related activities; department, college and university committees; Academic Senate and its committees; individual assignments; systemwide assignments; and service in community affairs directly related to the faculty member's teaching area, as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities.

Comment on Evidence in WPAF and Self Evaluation Report:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Recommendations for Next Evaluation:

Click or tap here to enter text.

☐ Meets Expectations

☐ Does Not Meet Expectations (Check only if performance in this area fails to meet minimum standards or expectations.)

Requirements for Next Evaluation: Use this space to identify unmet expectations by referencing relevant criteria from university, college, and/or department policies. Leave blank if candidate has met expectations.

Click or tap here to enter text.

IV. **Recommendations:**

On the basis of the foregoing evaluation, I recommend the action(s) listed below:

I RECOMMEND:

RETENTION TO:

Choose an item.

☐ PROMOTION

☐ EARLY PROMOTION

☐ TENURE

☐ EARLY TENURE

☐ NON-RETENTION

☐ NON-PROMOTION

☐ NON-EARLY PROMOTION

☐ NON-TENURE

☐ NON-EARLY TENURE

NAME: Click or tap here to enter text.

DATE: Click to enter a date.

COLLEGE:

Choose an item.

DEPARTMENT:

Click or tap here to enter text.

FACULTY RANK: Choose an item.

This is an evaluation for (check applicable action): ☐ Retention to a Choose an item. probationary year.

☐ Promotion ☐ Early Promotion ☐ Tenure ☐ Early Tenure

FACTORS OF CONSIDERATION

University Personnel Action Procedures and Criteria: <http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/> → Policies and Procedures

- I. **Teaching Performance:** Consider such factors as your 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. (Include your reflections on the results of Student Evaluation Program.)

Summarize Evidence in Working Personnel Action File (WPAF):

Click or tap here to enter text.

Reflect on Previous Evaluation:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Plans for Next Five Years:

Click or tap here to enter text.

- II. **Professional Growth and Achievement:** Consider such factors as your educational background and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, scholarly and creative achievements, participation in professional societies, publications, presentation of papers at professional and scholarly meetings, and external validation of scholarly activities.

Summarize Evidence in Working Personnel Action File (WPAF):

Click or tap here to enter text.

Reflect on Previous Evaluation:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Plans for Next Five Years:

Click or tap here to enter text.

- III. **Service to University, Students, and Community:** Consider such factors as your participation in academic advisement; placement follow-up; co-curricular activities; diversity-related activities; department, college and university committees; Academic Senate and its committees; individual assignments; systemwide assignments; and service in community affairs directly related to your teaching area, as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities.

Summarize Evidence in Working Personnel Action File (WPAF):

Click or tap here to enter text.

Reflect on Previous Evaluation:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Plans for Next Five Years:

Click or tap here to enter text.

By signing below, I acknowledge that I submitted the above information.

Signature

Date