

Adopted: February 5, 2019

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
Of  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, CA**

**AS-867-19**

**RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES  
CHAPTER 4: RESPONSIBILITIES IN FACULTY EVALUATION**

**Impact on Existing Policy: This resolution establishes the statement of policy about the responsibilities of all those involved in faculty evaluation. Its impact on existing policy is described in the attached report.<sup>i</sup>**

- 1 WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee is constructing a  
2 document entitled "University Faculty Personnel Policies" (UFPP) to  
3 house all university-level faculty personnel policies; and  
4
- 5 WHEREAS, AS-859-18 resolved that "The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs  
6 Committee construct UFPP by proposing university-level faculty  
7 personnel policies to the Senate in the form of chapters or portions of  
8 chapters of UFPP according to the procedures approved in AS-829-17";  
9 and  
10
- 11 WHEREAS, AS-859-18 resolved that "By the end of Spring 2020 Colleges and other  
12 faculty units reorganize their faculty personnel policy documents to  
13 conform their documents to the chapter structure of UFPP"; therefore be  
14 it  
15
- 16 RESOLVED: The policy document contained at the end of the attached report  
17 "Proposed Chapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document:  
18 CHAPTER 4: RESPONSIBILITIES IN FACULTY EVALUATION" be  
19 established as, Chapter 4: Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation of UFPP,  
20 and be it further  
21
- 22 RESOLVED: Colleges and the Library revise their personnel policy documents by  
23 Spring 2020 to have chapter 4 of their documents cover responsibilities  
24 in faculty evaluation as per chapter 4 of UFPP.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee

Date: January 8, 2019

Revised: January 30, 2019

---

<sup>i</sup> (1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.

(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.

(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.

**Proposed Chapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document:**  
**CHAPTER 4: RESPONSIBILITIES IN FACULTY EVALUATION**

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. This process 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. Using the new process, **FAC will replace the current University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA) document piece by piece to construct a new University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) document.** FAC may then employ the same process to update sections of the new UFPP on an as-needed basis.

The guiding principles in reforming the UFPA into the new UFPP are the following:

- **Clarify existing policies** that are common and already in place across the university.
- **Standardize procedures** for faculty evaluation at the university level.
- **Set baseline expectations and offer guiding principles** with directives to the colleges and departments to specify their criteria accordingly attuned to the disciplinary considerations specific to their programs.
- **Establish a common structure for all personnel policy documents across campus.**

The Senate has approved a resolution (AS-859-18) establishing the general structure of the UFPP in the form of its main chapter divisions, each containing thematically unified selections of policy:

1. **Preface**
2. **Faculty Appointments**
3. **Personnel Files**
4. **Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes**
5. **Evaluation Processes**
6. **Evaluation Cycle Patterns**
7. **Personnel Action Eligibility and Criteria**
8. **Evaluation of Teaching and Professional Services**
9. **Evaluation of Professional Development**
10. **Evaluation of Service**
11. **Governance**
12. **Workload**
13. **Appendices**

FAC is proposing to the Senate individual chapters of UFPP, each covered by its own Senate resolution. A draft of one of these chapters follows in this document, preceded by a summary of its content, impact, and implementation, and a description of feedback received on this proposed chapter.

**Proposed Chapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document:  
CHAPTER 4: RESPONSIBILITIES IN FACULTY EVALUATION**

**Summary of Chapter 4: Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation**

This chapter covers university-level requirements concerning the responsibilities of all those involved in faculty evaluation, including: the candidate under evaluation, department and college peer committees, department chairs and heads, and administrators involved in the evaluation processes.

**Impact on Existing Policy**

This chapter on the responsibilities in faculty evaluation gives a standard and clarified expression to pre-existing policies and practices, but does not establish new policies.

Many of the provisions of this chapter are driven by the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The policies not directly specified by the CBA but left to campus discretion remain as they were in our prior University Faculty Personnel Actions document, which is the current university-level governing policy document.

**Implementation**

*The establishment of UFPP by the Academic Senate would oblige the Colleges and the Library to restructure their faculty personnel policy documents into the same chapter division as UFPP. When a chapter of UFPP is approved by the Academic Senate and ratified by the President, they will now have a focused area of new or revised policy that they must consult and, if necessary, use to revise their documents accordingly.*

Current college documents typically describe the responsibilities of the participants in faculty evaluation. Sometimes these descriptions are combined with policies and procedures for conducting the evaluation. This form of guidance is more of a process guide than a policy statement. The establishment of this chapter of UFPP would require colleges to focus their policies on the responsibilities of those involved in evaluation to chapter 4 and call it "Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation."

For colleges whose account of the responsibilities of those involved in faculty evaluation are clear and up-to-date, and comply with university policy and CBA provisions, placing the statements of those responsibilities into this chapter would be the scope of implementation. Colleges with out-of-date or non-compliant policies about these responsibilities would have some guidance from UFPP about how to bring their documents into compliance. FAC and Academic Personnel have discussed some focused areas of non-compliance with the affected units and they have already taken the necessary steps to become compliant.

Material in this chapter may form the basis for process guides the colleges can draft and include in the appendices of their personnel policy documents.

**Proposed Chapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document:**  
**CHAPTER 4: RESPONSIBILITIES IN FACULTY EVALUATION**

**Feedback from Faculty Units**

*When proposing personnel policies, FAC consults with faculty units about the proposed change so the faculty units may offer feedback on the proposal. FAC then considers this feedback when revising the proposed policy and sending it to the Senate.*

The College of Liberal Arts provided editorial suggestions to clarify policy statements.

**What follows is the proposed text of the chapter...**



## **4. Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes**

### **4.1. Summary**

- 4.1.1. Faculty evaluation processes have various definable functions that are common across the university, such as the roles of candidates undergoing evaluation, Department Peer Review Committees, Department Chair/Heads, College Peer Review Committees, and administrators such as the Deans and the Provost. This chapter defines the responsibilities of these roles in faculty evaluation. Colleges and departments may specify additional responsibilities of the various roles within the college or department in faculty evaluation.
- 4.1.2. Chapter 4 was established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-867-19

### **4.2. Candidates**

- 4.2.1. Faculty subject to evaluation are candidates in the evaluation process. Candidates must provide a complete set of materials that includes evidence appropriate for the nature of the evaluation process and narrative reports pertinent to the purpose of the evaluation. (CBA 15.12)
- 4.2.2. While faculty scheduled for a mandatory review will be notified by the college, faculty intending to be considered for early promotion to associate professor or professor or early tenure must notify the dean in writing (email is acceptable). This notification shall also be copied to the department chair/head.
- 4.2.3. Candidates under review must view their own Personnel Action File (PAF) according to access requirements prior to the commencement of an evaluation and sign the PAF Log.
- 4.2.4. Candidates must assemble and submit a Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) by the University established deadline for their evaluation process.
- 4.2.5. Candidates must provide an updated curriculum vita for placement in their PAF.
- 4.2.6. Candidates must provide an updated professional development plan for their WPAF.
- 4.2.7. The ten days following the receipt of an evaluation report from any level of review comprises a rebuttal period during which the candidates may submit a written rebuttal or request to meet with the evaluator(s) to discuss the evaluation. (CBA 15.5)
- 4.2.8. To acknowledge receipt of an AP 109 evaluation report, candidates must sign the report within the specified timeframe of ten days.

### **4.3. Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC)**

- 4.3.1. For evaluation processes using a Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC), the initial level of review of the candidate is conducted by the DPRC. Evaluation of tenure-track instructional faculty shall commence with a DPRC level of review. Lecturer faculty evaluation may commence with a DPRC level of review, according to College requirements.
- 4.3.2. For Periodic Evaluations the department's probationary and tenured faculty shall elect members of the tenured faculty to serve on DPRCs. Both tenured and probationary faculty may vote on DPRC membership.
- 4.3.3. For Retention, Promotion or Tenure Performance Evaluations, the DPRC shall consist of at least three elected members of the tenured faculty. DPRC members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion. At the request of a department, the President may agree that a faculty unit employee participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program may also engage in deliberations and make recommendations regarding the evaluation of a faculty unit employee. However, faculty committees established for this purpose may not be comprised solely of

## UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES

faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program. Approval shall be obtained from the Dean if a department requests to have faculty in FERP participate as an evaluator member of the DPRC. (CBA 15.2)

- 4.3.4. Faculty may serve on only one level of review (department PRC, department chair/head, or college PRC). (CBA 15.29) Faculty unit employees being considered for promotion themselves are ineligible for service on promotion or tenure peer review committees (CBA 15.42). A potential DPRC member with a clear conflict of interest with a faculty member scheduled for review (e.g., partner, very close friend or collaborator) should not stand as a candidate for that DPRC. DPRC members typically will be from the candidate's own department. However, DPRC members will sometimes need to be recruited outside the department when there is an inadequate number of faculty in the department who are eligible and available to serve on the DPRC.
  - 4.3.5. All DPRC members shall review both the PAF and the WPAF, signing the log sheet in each file. At least a subset of the DPRC shall observe classroom instruction. The DPRC shall review any professional development plan and offer guidance to the candidate for any needed modifications to that plan. This feedback on the professional development plan is especially important in helping faculty develop a compelling record for eventual promotion. All deliberations of the DPRC shall be confidential (CBA 15.10).
  - 4.3.6. The DPRC shall use forms provided by Academic Personnel for their evaluation report. This report shall critically analyze the evidence on each performance dimension (teaching, professional development, service, and other), and offer any suggestions for improvement. The report shall clearly establish the basis for the conclusions of the report and how any recommendations resulted from the assessment of the evidence.
  - 4.3.7. DPRC evaluation recommendations shall be approved by a simple majority of the committee (CBA 15.44). The DPRC shall vote for or against the proposed action (retention, promotion and/or tenure), or, under very rare circumstances, abstain. Abstentions require written explanation. In cases of split votes, the report should reflect the relevant perspectives on the committee and the rationale for the majority decision. In rare instances when agreement cannot be reached on the content of the committee report, the minority committee member(s) may submit a signed minority report.
  - 4.3.8. The DPRC report shall be provided to the candidate at least 10 days before sending the evaluation to the department chair/head. If the candidate requests a meeting concerning a rebuttal to the DPRC report, the DPRC shall meet with the candidate within the 10-day rebuttal period. The DPRC shall review any written rebuttal with the option of revising the recommendation or correcting errors in the original report. No other written response, other than acknowledgment of receipt of the rebuttal, shall be provided to the candidate.
  - 4.3.9. Library, Counseling, and Athletic faculty units shall specify in their personnel policies the composition of their peer review committees.
- 4.4. Department Chair/Head**
- 4.4.1. Department chairs/heads shall conduct their own separate level of review. For evaluation processes using a DPRC, the Department chair/head review shall follow the DPRC review. For evaluation processes not using a DPRC, the Department chair/head level of review initiates the review process.

## UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES

- 4.4.2. The department chair/head shall review both the PAF and the WPAF, signing the logs in each file. The department chair/head shall review any DPRC evaluation. The department chair/head shall review any rebuttal to the DPRC evaluation from the candidate. The department chair/head shall review any professional development plan and offer guidance to the candidate for any needed modifications to that plan. This feedback on the professional development plan is especially important in helping faculty develop a compelling record for eventual promotion.
- 4.4.3. Department chairs/heads shall use forms provided by Academic Personnel for their evaluation report. This report shall critically analyze the evidence on each performance dimension (teaching, professional development, service, and other), and offer any suggestions for improvement. The report shall clearly establish the basis for the conclusions of the report and how any recommendations resulted from the assessment of the evidence. The report from the chair/head shall be provided to the candidate at least 10 days before sending the evaluation to the dean.
- 4.4.4. If the candidate requests a meeting concerning a rebuttal to the department chair/head's report, the department chair/head shall meet with the candidate within the 10-day rebuttal period. The department chair/head shall review any written rebuttal with the option of revising the recommendation or correcting errors in the original report. No other written response, other than acknowledgment of receipt of the rebuttal, shall be provided to the candidate. (CBA 15.5)
- 4.5. College Peer Review Committee (CPRC)**
  - 4.5.1. The CPRC provides an additional level of evaluation for candidates undergoing a Performance Evaluation. The CPRC shall consist of up to one full professor from each department. Approval shall be obtained from the Dean if departments will not have a representative. Each member of the CPRC shall be elected by their department's tenured and probationary faculty for appointment to the CPRC. Colleges may specify further means of selecting CPRC members.
  - 4.5.2. Each CPRC member shall review both the PAF and the WPAF and sign the logs in each file. Each CPRC member shall review the prior levels of evaluation (DPRC and department chair/head) and any rebuttals submitted. All deliberations of the CPRC shall be confidential (CBA 15.10).
  - 4.5.3. Based on the review of the PAF, WPAF, and prior levels of evaluation, the CPRC shall vote for or against the proposed retention, promotion, and/or tenure, or, under rare circumstances, abstain. Abstentions require written explanation. A simple majority of the voting members constitutes the recommendation of the CPRC. The committee shall also rank the promotion candidates in one list. (CBA 15.44-45)
  - 4.5.4. The CPRC shall produce an evaluation report for each candidate under review. This report will critically analyze the evidence on each dimension of performance (teaching, scholarship, and service), both favorable and unfavorable, and produce a narrative clarifying how the evidence was weighed and the conclusions and recommended actions derived. In cases of split votes, the report should reflect the relevant perspectives on the committee and the rationale for the majority decision. In rare instances when agreement cannot be reached on the content of the committee report, the minority committee member(s) may submit a signed minority report.
  - 4.5.5. The CPRC report shall be provided to the candidate at least 10 days before sending the evaluation to the dean (CBA 15.5). Candidates may request a meeting and/or submit a rebuttal to the CPRC report within the 10-day rebuttal period. The CPRC shall review rebuttal material with the option of revising the recommended action or

correcting errors in the original report; no other written response, other than acknowledgment of receipt of the rebuttal, shall be provided to the candidate.

**4.6. Administrative Evaluators**

- 4.6.1. Administrative evaluators include College Deans, Associate Deans, Library Deans, Department Directors, Vice-Provosts, or the Athletic Director. For instructional tenure-track faculty the administrative evaluator is the College Dean. For lecturer faculty the Dean may designate an Associate Dean to serve as the final level of administrative evaluation.
- 4.6.2. Administrative evaluators shall review both the PAF and WPAF, signing the logs in each file, as well as all previous levels of evaluation and any rebuttals submitted. The dean shall provide a separate written evaluation. The administrative evaluator's report shall be provided to the candidate at least 10 days before placing the evaluation in the faculty member's PAF.
- 4.6.3. Candidates may request a meeting and/or submit a rebuttal to the administrative evaluator within the 10-day rebuttal period. The administrative evaluator shall review rebuttal material with the option of revising the recommendation or correcting errors in the original report; no other written response, other than acknowledgement of receipt of the rebuttal statement, shall be provided to the candidate.

**4.7. Provost**

- 4.7.1. The Provost is the final level of administrative evaluation for evaluation processes that conclude with the personnel actions of retention, promotion, and/or tenure.
- 4.7.2. The Provost shall review the candidate's PAF, WPAF and reports from all levels of evaluation for final evaluation for retention, promotion and/or tenure.
- 4.7.3. The Provost's letter to the candidate constitutes the final decision on retention, promotion and/or tenure.






OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MEMORANDUM

**To:** Dustin Stegner, Chair  
Academic Senate

**Date:** March 22, 2019

**From:** Jeffery D Armstrong, President  


**Copies:** K. Enz Finken  
M. Pedersen  
A. Liddicoat  
K. Brown  
College Deans

**Subject:** Response to AS-867-19 Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies  
Chapter 4: Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluations

---

This memo acknowledges my support of the above-entitled Academic Senate resolution. Colleges as well as the Library are encouraged to revise their personnel policy documents to align with Chapter 4 of the University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) as outlined in this resolution and supporting documentation.

Please express my appreciation to the Academic Senate members and the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee for their attention to this important matter.