TO: Academic Senators

Following procedures approved by the Academic Senate Executive Committee on November 8, 2016 with regards to revisions to University Faculty Personnel Policies documents, the attached revisions of the current University Faculty Personnel Action document for placements in the Appendix of the new University Faculty Personnel Policies documents will appear as a consent agenda item on the December 3, 2019 Senate agenda.

Every senator is expected to review the documents. Please keep in mind that there are 5 separate items, each of which are individual and can be pulled separately from the agenda.

Issues, concerns, and questions regarding this curriculum proposal should be directed to Ken Brown, chair of the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee. If the concern is strong enough, any senator may request an item be removed from the consent agenda by Tuesday, November 26, 2019.

Items removed from the Academic Senate consent agenda will be placed on the Academic Senate agenda as business items

If you have any questions, please contact Ken Brown, Chair Faculty Affairs Committee.
University Faculty Personnel Policies
Consent Agenda Revision of UFPP 2.2.3, 2.4.4, 2.4.8

The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies which specifies the nature of consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and provides a clear accounting of which policy documents have been superseded by the proposed change. It also allows the Senate Executive Committee to place non-controversial updates to personnel policies on the Senate consent agenda.

In creating UFPP FAC has adopted a guiding principle that, as far as possible, the migration of existing personnel policies from the former governing personnel policies document, University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA), into UFPP shall not change those policies as they are in UFPA, but instead just reformulate them into the new style and structure of UFPP. In the initial movement of policies from UFPA to UFPP, a few existing policies in UFPA were inadvertently left out. Also, some of the policy statements warrant editorial revision. Such minor changes in policy statement warrant the use of the Senate personnel policies consent agenda so as to save time in making minor changes to policy statements.

Summary of Proposed Policy Revisions
The requirements for materials to be included in tenure-track and lecturer applications in UFPP chapter 2 do not conform with current recruitment policies. These policy revisions bring UFPP into conformity with existing policy.

Impact on Existing Policy
This revision changes no policies. It conforms the policy statement in UFPP with existing university level recruitment policies already in place.

Implementation
There is no implementation as the policy text revision already conforms with existing policy.

Consultation with Faculty Units
No consultation necessary as this proposed change in policy text makes no changes to recruitment practices and policies across campus.

Proposed Policy Revisions

**REPLACE EXISTING UFPP POLICIES:**

2.2.3 Applications for tenure-track faculty positions must be submitted to the university’s applicant tracking system. Application packages must include at least the following items:
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- Current Curriculum Vitae (CV)
- At least three letters of reference
- Unofficial transcripts at the time of application (Official transcripts required for appointment)
- Cover Letter (preferred)
- Other materials required by the college or department

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

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

WITH NEW UFPP POLICIES:

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.

2.4.4 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.

2.4.8 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.
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The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies which specifies the nature of consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and provides a clear accounting of which policy documents have been superseded by the proposed change. It also allows the Senate Executive Committee to place non-controversial updates to personnel policies on the Senate consent agenda.

In creating UFPP FAC has adopted a guiding principle that, as far as possible, the migration of existing personnel policies from the former governing personnel policies document, University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA), into UFPP shall not change those policies as they are in UFPA, but instead just reformulate them into the new style and structure of UFPP. In the initial movement of policies from UFPA to UFPP, a few existing policies in UFPA were inadvertently left out. Also, some of the policy statements warrant editorial revision. Such minor changes in policy statement warrant the use of the Senate personnel policies consent agenda so as to save time in making minor changes to policy statements.

Summary of Proposed Policy Revisions

The requirements for materials to be included in the Personnel Action File (PAF) for probationary and tenured faculty has long included the Professional Development Plan. This item is restored to the list of items in the PAF.

Impact on Existing Policy

This revision changes no policies. It conforms the policy statement in UFPP with existing university level policies already in place.

Implementation

There is no implementation as the policy text revision already conforms with existing policy.

Consultation with Faculty Units

No consultation necessary as this proposed change in policy text makes no changes to practices and policies across campus.

Proposed Policy Revisions

ADD THE UNDERLINED TEXT TO EXISTING UFPP POLICY:

3.2.3 Contents of the PAF include:
• Hiring materials/letters of appointment

Faculty Affairs Committee, Fall 2019
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- 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.
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The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies which specifies the nature of consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and provides a clear accounting of which policy documents have been superseded by the proposed change. It also allows the Senate Executive Committee to place non-controversial updates to personnel policies on the Senate consent agenda.

In creating UFPP FAC has adopted a guiding principle that, as far as possible, the migration of existing personnel policies from the former governing personnel policies document, University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA), into UFPP shall not change those policies as they are in UFPA, but instead just reformulate them into the new style and structure of UFPP. In the initial movement of policies from UFPA to UFPP, a few existing policies in UFPA were inadvertently left out. Also, some of the policy statements warrant editorial revision. Such minor changes in policy statement warrant the use of the Senate personnel policies consent agenda so as to save time in making minor changes to policy statements.

### Summary of Proposed Policy Revisions

The responsibilities of evaluators of faculty for promotion have had a requirement to rank the candidates for promotion they have evaluated. This provision is added back to the lists of responsibilities of Department Peer Review Committees (DPRC), Department Chairs/Heads, College Peer Review Committees, and Administrative Evaluators (such as Deans).

The need for candidates under evaluation to sign AP 109 forms is no longer necessary with the electronic evaluation processes initiated in AY 2018-2019. This policy at 4.2.8 is therefore deleted.

The policy about DPRC composition overstates restrictions on conflict of interest relative to the original statements about it in the UFPA. UFPP 4.3.4 is therefore revised to remove this overstatement.

### Impact on Existing Policy

This revision changes no policies. It conforms the policy statement in UFPP with existing university level policies already in place from UFPA.

### Implementation

There is no implementation as the policy text revision already conforms with existing policy in UFPA.

### Consultation with Faculty Units

No consultation is necessary as this proposed change in policy text makes no changes to practices and policies across campus.
DELETE THE STRIKETHROUGH TEXT FROM EXISTING UFPP POLICY:

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

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

ADD THE UNDERLINED TEXT TO EXISTING UFPP POLICY:

4.3.7 DPRC evaluation recommendations shall be approved by a simple majority of the committee (CBA 15.44). The DPRC shall vote for or against the proposed action (retention, promotion and/or tenure), or, under very rare circumstances, abstain. Abstentions require written explanation. In cases of split votes, the report should reflect the relevant perspectives on the committee and the rationale for the majority decision. In rare instances when agreement cannot be reached on the content of the committee report, the minority committee member(s) may submit a signed minority report. The DPRC shall submit a ranking of those promotion applicants whom they positively recommended.

4.4.5 The department chairs/heads shall submit a ranking of those promotion applicants whom they positively recommended.

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.

4.6.4 Administrative evaluators shall submit a ranking of those promotion applicants whom they positively recommended.
The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies which specifies the nature of consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and provides a clear accounting of which policy documents have been superseded by the proposed change. It also allows the Senate Executive Committee to place non-controversial updates to personnel policies on the Senate consent agenda.

In creating UFPP FAC has adopted a guiding principle that, as far as possible, the migration of existing personnel policies from the former governing personnel policies document, University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA), into UFPP shall *not change* those policies as they are in UFPA, but instead *just reformulate them* into the new style and structure of UFPP. In the initial movement of policies from UFPA to UFPP, a few existing policies in UFPA were inadvertently left out. Also, some of the policy statements warrant editorial revision. Such minor changes in policy statement warrant the use of the Senate personnel policies consent agenda so as to save time in making minor changes to policy statements.

### Summary of Proposed Policy Revisions

Two policy sections in chapter 5 need editorial revisions.

### Impact on Existing Policy

These revisions change no policies.

### Implementation

There is no implementation as the revisions are purely editorial.

### Consultation with Faculty Units

No consultation is necessary for purely editorial changes.

### Proposed Policy Revisions

DELETE STRIKETHROUGH AND ADD UNDERLINED TEXT TO EXISTING UFPP POLICY:

5.2.4.1 Four-Stage Performance Evaluation is a performance evaluation that results in the retention or tenure for tenure-track faculty.
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.
The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies which specifies the nature of consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and provides a clear accounting of which policy documents have been superseded by the proposed change. It also allows the Senate Executive Committee to place non-controversial updates to personnel policies on the Senate consent agenda.

In creating UFPP FAC has adopted a guiding principle that, as far as possible, the migration of existing personnel policies from the former governing personnel policies document, University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA), into UFPP shall not change those policies as they are in UFPA, but instead just reformulate them into the new style and structure of UFPP. In the initial movement of policies from UFPA to UFPP, a few existing policies in UFPA were inadvertently left out. Also, some of the policy statements warrant editorial revision. Such minor changes in policy statement warrant the use of the Senate personnel policies consent agenda so as to save time in making minor changes to policy statements.

### Summary of Proposed Policy Revisions

Two-year retention patterns are used by CSM and CLA. This pattern requires some adjustment for cases of faculty hired with service credit. Colleges already have such alternative patterns in practice. Guidance about where to place such alternative patterns has been requested by college analysts. This policy revision provides this guidance.

### Impact on Existing Policy

These revisions change no policies, but clarify how existing permitted choices of retention patterns work for cases of hiring with service credit and indicate where colleges shall place their accounts of such alternate retention patterns.

### Implementation

There is no implementation as the revisions express what colleges already do.

### Consultation with Faculty Units

No consultation is necessary.

### Proposed Policy Revisions

ADD THE UNDERLINED TEXT TO EXISTING UFPP POLICY:
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.