

1 **Evaluation of Permanent Instructional Faculty**

2 (Senate: 8/3/76, 5/24/77, 7/28/82[EA], 5/24/83, 11/3/87, 7/25/89, 11/7/89, 8/21/90, 7/30/91,
3 2/4/92, 10/26/93, 5/10/94, 8/22/95, 5/9/00, 5/10/11, 1/24/12, 5/28/13, 12/2/14; President:
4 8/16/76, 6/14/79, 9/8/82, 6/14/83, 6/22/88, 8/16/89, 11/24/89, 11/1/90, 10/7/91, 3/11/92,
5 12/13/93, 6/29/94, 6/24/96, 6/6/00, 7/14/11, 2/23/12, 7/9/13, 1/26/15; Editorial Amendment:
6 9/00, 8/01)

7 Governing documents: Articles 13, 14, and 15 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between
8 the California State University and the California Faculty Association.

9 In keeping with the terminology utilized in the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the
10 California State University and the California Faculty Association, the term "permanent faculty"
11 shall refer to all probationary (tenure-track) and tenured faculty. This evaluation policy governs
12 permanent instructional faculty. Although librarians, counselors, and coaches fall within the
13 faculty bargaining unit, some aspects of their assignments differ from those of instructional
14 faculty and thus they are subject to specific evaluation criteria. Relevant evaluation policies for
15 each of these groups can be found in their respective evaluation policies elsewhere in this
16 Handbook.

17 **Overview**

18 The purpose of the University's instructional evaluation policy is to maintain and enhance the
19 high quality of the academic programs at CSULA CAL STATE LA by assuring that all permanent
20 faculty members meet and maintain high standards of performance as teachers, scholars, and
21 members of the campus community. The policy aims to achieve this objective by establishing
22 criteria for fair, thorough, and consistent evaluation of individual faculty members.

23 Evaluations of tenure-track and tenured instructional faculty shall focus on the quality and
24 effectiveness of educational performance, professional achievement, and other contributions
25 to the University by the faculty member under review.

26 The evaluation of an instructional faculty member is based upon a comprehensive review of the
27 individual's qualities, achievements, and promise during the year or years included in the
28 review period.

29 Attention shall be given to forming a general "profile" or comprehensive estimate of the faculty
30 member's performance and special professional interests and accomplishments.

31 All reviews shall be based on evidence in the two-part personnel action file, which includes the
32 permanent personnel action file (PPAF) and the working personnel action file (WPAF). All
33 evaluations will be entered into the faculty member's permanent personnel action file
34 (PPAF). The permanent personnel action file (PPAF) is maintained by the University. Reports of

35 peer observations of instruction and quantitative summaries of student opinion surveys are
36 maintained in the PPAF. The candidate is responsible for providing the following materials to
37 his or her working personnel action file (WPAF) before the published date of the file closure: a
38 current curriculum vitae, a personnel information form that summarizes and describes the
39 candidate's activities and accomplishments during the period under review, and evidence of
40 these activities and accomplishments.

41 **I. Types of Evaluation**

42 There are two types of evaluations of permanent faculty members:

43 **performance reviews**, required for retention, tenure and promotion of
44 permanent faculty, and

45 **periodic evaluations**, conducted when an evaluation is required, but in periods
46 in which a faculty member is not under consideration for retention, tenure, or
47 promotion.

48 Performance reviews serve the dual purposes of determining whether or not a faculty
49 member's performance warrants retention, tenure, or promotion, and of providing the faculty
50 member with constructive feedback on his or her performance in the areas under
51 review. Periodic evaluations are aimed primarily at providing the faculty member with
52 feedback on his or her performance. However, they may be considered in subsequent
53 performance reviews.

54 Permanent (probationary and tenured) faculty members shall undergo a performance review
55 when under consideration for retention, tenure, or promotion. A permanent faculty member
56 undergoing a performance review shall be reviewed by the appropriate
57 department/division/school peer review committee, the department/division chair or school
58 director (if not a member of the department/division/school peer review committee), the
59 appropriate college peer review committee, the dean, the Provost and the President.

60 A permanent faculty member undergoing periodic evaluation shall be reviewed by the
61 appropriate department/division/school peer review committee, the department/division chair
62 or school director (if not a member of the department/division/school peer review committee),
63 and the dean. Periodic evaluations shall include review of a faculty member's performance in
64 all of the same areas as during a performance review.

65 **II. Evaluative Standards**

66 Permanent instructional faculty members at CSULA CAL STATE LA shall be evaluated on the
67 basis of their educational performance, professional achievement, and contributions to the
68 University.

69 Permanent faculty evaluations shall utilize the following official evaluative terms:

70 **Outstanding** - describes truly *exceptional* performance, for a faculty member at the particular
71 rank and career stage.

72 **Commendable** - describes performance that is better than satisfactory and that exceed
73 expectations for a faculty member at the particular rank and career stage.

74 **Satisfactory** - describes performance that meets expectations for a faculty member at the
75 particular rank and career stage.

76 **Needs Improvement** - describes performance that does not meet expectations for a faculty
77 member at the particular rank and career stage, in one or more specified areas of concern.

78 **Unsatisfactory** - describes performance that is *seriously deficient* for a faculty member at the
79 particular rank and career stage.

80 A review that finds a faculty member's performance to be satisfactory or better in all areas shall
81 be accompanied by a favorable recommendation for retention, tenure, or promotion, when
82 eligible and not applying early.

83 An evaluation of "needs improvement" does not preclude a reviewer/review committee from
84 recommending retention. To receive a favorable recommendation for tenure and promotion at
85 least satisfactory performance must be demonstrated in all three categories.

86 A judgment of unsatisfactory in any one area shall entail a negative recommendation for
87 retention, tenure, or promotion.

88 **III. Evaluation Timelines**

89 **PERIODIC AND PERFORMANCE REVIEWS FOR PROBATIONARY FACULTY**

90 Initial probationary appointments will normally be for two years. Initial appointments of
91 probationary faculty members who are appointed in a term other than fall shall end in spring
92 term of the second academic year of service.

93 During the first year of an initial probationary appointment, a faculty member shall undergo a
94 periodic evaluation, with the exception of those appointed in winter or spring SEMESTER term
95 (who will not be reviewed in the first [partial] year of appointment). During the second year of
96 an initial probationary appointment, a faculty member shall undergo a performance review for
97 retention.

98 For the purposes of calculating tenure eligibility, the first year shall begin with the first fall term
99 in which a probationary faculty member is employed.

100 IT IS POSSIBLE TO RECEIVE APPROVAL FOR A ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF THE PROBATIONARY
101 PERIOD WHEN PARTICIPATING IN SPECIFIED LEAVE PROGRAMS. INFORMATION RELATED TO
102 EXTENSIONS MAY BE FOUND IN ARTICLES 13.7 AND 13.8 OF THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
103 AGREEMENT. During any probationary year in which a faculty member takes a personal leave of
104 absence (of one or more terms' duration), the faculty member may request to extend the
105 probationary period by one year. If such an extension is desired, the faculty member must
106 notify the Provost at the time of application for the leave. If such a request is granted, the
107 tenure eligibility date will be moved forward by one year.

108 If found to be satisfactory or better during a performance review for retention, probationary
109 faculty members shall be reappointed for subsequent two-year appointment(s) unless they
110 have only one year remaining in their probationary period, in which case they will receive a
111 one-year appointment. If a probationary faculty member is found to be less than satisfactory,
112 he or she *may* receive a one-year appointment. During each year between retention reviews
113 probationary faculty shall undergo periodic evaluations.

114 Probationary faculty members may request a performance review during any year in which
115 they would otherwise receive only a periodic evaluation.

116 Consideration for tenure normally occurs during the sixth year of service as a probationary
117 faculty member minus any credit toward tenure. A probationary faculty member may request
118 to be considered for early tenure.

119 A faculty member shall not normally be promoted to associate professor and may not be
120 promoted to professor during the probationary period. Assistant professors who are awarded
121 tenure shall be promoted concurrently to associate professor.

122 A faculty member must be employed by CSULA CAL STATE LA and in the current rank for at
123 least two years before applying for tenure or promotion to a higher rank.

124 **EARLY TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION FOR PROBATIONARY FACULTY**

125 CONSIDERATION FOR TENURE NORMALLY OCCURS DURING THE SIXTH YEAR OF SERVICE AS A
126 PROBATIONARY FACULTY MEMBER MINUS ANY CREDIT TOWARD TENURE. A PROBATIONARY
127 faculty member applying for early EARLY tenure or early EARLY promotion to associate
128 professor SHALL DEMONSTRATE THAT THEY HAVE, IN A SHORTER PERIOD OF TIME, (A)
129 ACHIEVED THE LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT IN ALL AREAS OF REVIEW THAT IS EXPECTED OF
130 CANDIDATES FOR TENURE; AND (B) ESTABLISHED A RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS THAT
131 EXCEEDS THE STANDARDS AND LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE EXPECTED DURING THE
132 PROBATIONARY PERIOD. PROBATIONARY FACULTY MEMBERS SHALL NOT BE PROMOTED
133 BEYOND THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR. may be recommended for that action only if
134 found to have a record of sustained outstanding performance in categories A and B,
135 "educational performance" and "professional achievement," and at least satisfactory
136 performance in category C, "contributions to the University."

137 Prior to the final decision for early tenure or early promotion, candidates may withdraw
138 without prejudice from consideration at any level of review. If a faculty member has applied
139 for and been denied AND BEEN DENIED EARLY tenure or EARLY promotion, the faculty member
140 cannot apply again for early tenure or EARLY promotion while in the same rank.

141 **Post-Tenure Performance Reviews and Periodic Evaluations**

142 Once tenured, a faculty member will typically undergo a performance review during the fifth
143 year in rank as an associate professor, for consideration for promotion to the rank of
144 professor. A faculty member who does not wish to apply for promotion within five years of
145 receiving tenure/promotion to associate professor, must undergo a periodic evaluation in the
146 fifth year in rank. All tenured professors (at any rank) shall be evaluated at intervals no greater
147 than five years. Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) shall not be
148 required to undergo evaluation unless an evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant
149 or the college dean.

150 TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS MAY BE EVALUATED MORE FREQUENTLY AT THE REQUEST OF
151 THE FACULTY MEMBER OR THE PRESIDENT.

152 The faculty member's evaluation for promotion to the rank of professor emphasizes the scope
153 and depth of teaching performance, the degree of professional recognition within and beyond
154 the University, and the distinctiveness of contributions to the general welfare of the faculty
155 members department/division/school, college, and University. Such a review must
156 necessarily include a careful evaluation of each individual achievement, with the aim of
157 determining its value to the faculty member, the students and the University. A candidate for
158 early promotion to the rank of professor must have a sustained outstanding record in
159 categories A and B, "educational performance" and "professional achievement" and be at least
160 commendable in category C, "contributions to the University."

161 **EARLY PROMOTION FOR TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS**

162 TENURED ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS MAY REQUEST TO BE CONSIDERED FOR EARLY PROMOTION
163 TO THE RANK OF PROFESSOR. TENURED ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS APPLYING FOR EARLY
164 PROMOTION SHALL DEMONSTRATE THAT THEY HAVE ACHIEVED, IN A SHORTER PERIOD OF
165 TIME, A RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS THAT EXCEEDS THE STANDARDS AND LEVEL OF
166 PERFORMANCE THAT WOULD BE EXPECTED DURING THE NORMAL FIVE-YEAR PERIOD OF TIME
167 IN RANK AS AN ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR. A FACULTY MEMBER CANNOT APPLY FOR EARLY
168 PROMOTION IF THEY HAVE APPLIED FOR AND BEEN DENIED EARLY PROMOTION WHILE IN THE
169 SAME RANK.

170 Tenured faculty members may be evaluated more frequently at the request of the faculty
171 member or the President.

172 **Review Periods**

173 Performance Review Periods:

Review:	Review Period Begins:	Review Period Ends:
Retention review for second year faculty	Date of appointment to probationary position	File closure (fall semester of second year)
Retention (probationary performance review years other than second)	File closure of previous performance review	Current file closure (fall semester of performance review years)
Tenure and Promotion	Date of appointment to probationary position	Current file closure (fall semester of tenure ELIGIBILITY <u>eligibility</u> year)
Promotion to Professor	File closure of tenure and promotion performance review	Current file closure (fall semester of promotion eligibility year)

174 Periodic Evaluation Periods:

Evaluation:	Evaluation Period Begins:	Evaluation Period Ends:
First year evaluation	Date of appointment to probationary position	File closure (spring semester of first year)
Annual evaluation (probationary years not requiring retention review)	File closure of previous performance review	Current file closure (spring semester of current year)
Post-tenure review	File closure of last review	Current file closure (spring semester of current year)

175 **IV. Criteria Governing Evaluations of Permanent Faculty**

176 Reviews for retention, tenure, and promotion to associate professor are cumulative in the
 177 sense that the progress or growth of the faculty member since joining the faculty is a factor in
 178 evaluation. Generally, the evaluation of a probationary faculty member will take into account
 179 all and only the activities and achievements since the initial probationary
 180 appointment. Reviews are comparative in the sense that the faculty member is evaluated
 181 against the quality and effectiveness of performance of colleagues taking into account the
 182 broad range of activities in which different members of the faculty engage.

183 Performance reviews for promotion to the rank of professor are similarly cumulative and
 184 comparative - i.e., the progress or growth of faculty members while in their present rank is

185 assessed against the quality and effectiveness of colleagues' performance, taking into account
186 the broad range of activities in which different members of the faculty engage.

187 Permanent faculty members are evaluated on the basis of their performance in the following
188 categories:

- 189 A. Educational Performance
- 190 B. Professional Achievement
- 191 C. Contributions to the University.

192 Of the three categories, category A normally shall have the greatest weight. In the case of a
193 faculty member who is appointed or elected to a non-teaching position, special consideration
194 shall be given to performance in that assignment. In such cases, a faculty member should
195 consider preparing an individualized professional plan; the individualized professional plan is
196 described in section V. B.

197 Although the criteria governing performance reviews are the same for retention, tenure, and
198 promotion cases, reviewers should recognize qualitative differences between these types of
199 reviews. This difference, however, is one of degree, not kind, and it may be summed up under
200 the concept of growth or progress. At the time of the performance review of the faculty
201 member for retention during the probationary period, judgment is based on demonstrated
202 growth, performance and promise in categories A, B, and C.

203 At the time of candidacy for tenure and/or promotion, however, a faculty member is expected
204 to have demonstrated substantive achievements in each of the three areas; promise of future
205 growth will not be sufficient to warrant a positive recommendation for tenure or
206 promotion. Special consideration will be given to the continuity and growth of the activities
207 comprising this total performance.

208 **Category A, Educational Performance**, consists of two elements:

- 209 1. teaching performance, and
- 210 2. related educational activities.

211 1. Teaching performance includes those activities by the faculty member that directly
212 contribute to student learning. Effective teaching can include many pedagogical approaches,
213 such as lectures, individual and group exercises, inquiry-based learning, discussion sessions, and
214 other techniques. It can also include a wide range of activities such as supervising theses or
215 projects; supervising student learning experiences in academic and community based settings;
216 collaborating with students on research, performance, artistic, and other projects; mentoring
217 students; and tutoring students.

218 The evaluation of teaching performance is an assessment of the quality and effectiveness of the
219 efforts of faculty members that contribute to student learning. This evaluation must include
220 multiple measures:

- 221 a. A summary of the quantitative responses to the "Student Opinion Survey on Instruction."
- 222 b. Evaluation of teaching performance based upon a peer observation of instruction.
- 223 c. At least one other source of information, such a course syllabi, instructional
224 materials, assessment methods, assignments (including field assignments), evidence of
225 student work and accomplishments, and signed letters from students.

226 2. Related educational activities include, but are not limited to: academic advisement,
227 curriculum/program development, programmatic assessment of learning outcomes,
228 membership on thesis committees, the development and evaluation of comprehensive exams,
229 and other academic support activities that enhance student retention and student
230 achievement.

231 The evaluation of related educational activities is based upon such items as surveys of student
232 opinions of advisement, student mentoring, tutoring, field activities, etc.; written reports from
233 the department/division chair or school director, students, faculty, and/or other individuals
234 with first hand knowledge of the faculty member's activities; and other such documentation
235 provided by the faculty member regarding participation in program assessment, curriculum
236 development, and other related educational activities.

237 **Category B, Professional Achievement**, is defined as performance of discipline-related activities
238 that include, but are not limited to the following broad areas identified in no particular order:

- 239 • Academic and scholarly contributions to the faculty member's profession and field, that are
240 externally evaluated and published or formally accepted for publication such as research,
241 critical essays and analyses, and theoretical speculations.
- 242 • Innovative use of technology, textbooks, and original teaching or testing materials which
243 are adopted for professional and/or instructional use outside the faculty member's
244 department/division/school.
- 245 • Inventions, designs and innovations that have been favorably evaluated by authorities
246 outside the University.
- 247 • Creation, exhibition, performance or publication in the arts or literature. Producing and
248 directing events in the performing arts, including visual arts, music, dance, and theatre,
249 beyond normal instructional duties.
- 250 • Presentations before meetings of scholarly and professional societies, and presentations as
251 an invited authority in the faculty member's field before scholarly and professional
252 audiences.
- 253 • Participation in activities of scholarly or professional societies beyond mere membership,
254 such as elective office, fellowship status, committee membership, receipt of special awards,
255 organization of symposia, and chairing of conference sessions.

- 256 • Receipt of fellowships, grants, contracts or other subsidies and commissions for scholarly
257 activities in the faculty member's field.
- 258 • Holding special appointments such as visiting professorships, lectureships, or consultant
259 assignments in other academic, scholarly, professional, or governmental institutions.
- 260 • Editing or reviewing of scholarly or professional publications.
- 261 • Professional practice that utilizes the faculty member's academic expertise.
- 262 • Service to one's profession, in such cases where the activity is based on one's disciplinary
263 expertise (for example, appointment to a granting agency's review board or service on a
264 professional board).
- 265 • Community based participatory research, community service, and community based
266 activities that involve the academic expertise of the faculty member.
- 267 • In evaluating these contributions as to their relative merits, the quality and effectiveness,
268 and not only the quantity of the contributions in category B shall be the primary
269 consideration.

270 **Category C, Contributions to the University**, is defined as all other service to the University,
271 profession, or community that contributes to the mission and governance of the University
272 such as, but not limited to, those activities listed below.

- 273 • Contributions to academic governance such as membership and participation in the
274 activities of department/division/school, college, university, and system committees, and
275 service in administrative capacities.
- 276 • Participation in any student, faculty, professional, or community organization or
277 engagement in any service to colleges and/or the community or engagement in other
278 activities that bring positive recognition to the faculty member and to the University.
- 279 • Delivery of speeches, conducting of colloquia, or otherwise conveying information about
280 the faculty member's scholarship, profession, field and university to community groups.
- 281 • Organization of and engagement in significant university, college and
282 department/division/school activities that improve the educational environment and/or
283 student, staff, or faculty life, such as organization of retreats, conferences, or orientations.
- 284 • In evaluating these contributions in category C as to their relative merits, the quality and
285 effectiveness, and not only the quantity of the contributions shall be the primary
286 consideration.

287 **V. Additional Evaluation Policies**

288 **A. External Review**

289 A request for an external review of materials in one's personnel file may be made by any of the
290 parties involved in the review. Any request for an external review must be directed to the
291 President or his designee and must indicate (1) the extraordinary circumstances warranting
292 external review, and (2) the materials to be reviewed. For such a review to take place, the
293 faculty member under review must concur with the request for external review. The dean of

294 the college shall select appropriate external reviewer(s), with the approval of the President or
295 designee and the concurrence of the faculty member under review, and transmit to the
296 reviewers the materials to be reviewed. A copy of the relevant parts of this policy shall
297 accompany the materials to be reviewed.

298 Once the external reviewer(s)' report is received, the file is returned to the initial stage of
299 review and the review commences from that level forward with the reviewers' report added to
300 the permanent personnel action file (PPAF).

301 **B. Individualized Professional Plans (IPP)**

302 Each faculty member shall have the discretion to develop, in collaboration with his or her chair
303 or director and the appropriate department/division school personnel committee, an
304 individualized professional plan (IPP). Such plans shall specify the candidate's goals and
305 objectives and may alter the balance or focus of performance among categories A, B, and C for
306 a specified period of time.

307 A faculty member may choose to prepare an IPP when either his or her work assignment or
308 area of specialization warrants a departure from the usual evaluation criteria, or when the
309 faculty member's work is of a nature that it makes it difficult to apply the established
310 evaluation criteria articulated above. Such a plan must indicate the time period during which it
311 will apply to the evaluation of the faculty member's performance. No IPP may be retroactively
312 applied, and in no case shall an IPP exceed three years in duration. However, an IPP may be
313 renewed. An IPP must be approved by the faculty member, the department/division chair or
314 school director, the dean, the Provost and the President. The IPP must indicate (1) the unusual
315 circumstances or work assignment that warrant(s) the creation of the plan, (2) the work plan
316 (and expected outcomes) for the faculty member over the course of the IPP's duration, and (3)
317 where necessary, the criteria by which the faculty member will be evaluated. An individualized
318 professional plan will still require that a faculty member be evaluated in all areas of expected
319 performance. Whenever an IPP is approved, it must be placed in the permanent personnel
320 file. An IPP will be effective upon its approval and will govern only that part of the evaluation
321 period during which it is in place.

322 **C. Evaluation of Faculty Active in Interdisciplinary Programs**

323 When a faculty member with an appointment in a specific department/division/school devotes
324 all or part of his or her efforts to instruction in or participates in the development and
325 administration of an interdisciplinary program, that faculty member may request an assessment
326 of his or her performance in the activities associated with the interdisciplinary program. In that
327 case, prior to the file closure date, the coordinator of the interdisciplinary program shall
328 provide a written assessment of the contributions of the faculty member to that program for
329 the faculty member's permanent personnel action file. This assessment shall be part of the
330 evidence upon which the evaluation is based.

331 **D. Evaluation of Faculty with Joint Appointment**

332 The criteria for evaluating faculty with joint appointments shall be consistent with those used
333 for comparable evaluations of faculty members appointed to a single
334 department/division/school.

335 Faculty with joint appointments in two or more departments/divisions/schools or equivalent
336 units shall be evaluated either by the peer review committee, in each
337 department/division/school or by a joint committee of faculty from each
338 department/division/school. If a joint committee is utilized, this committee will consist of
339 members of all academic units within which the candidate holds a joint appointment. Each
340 academic unit shall elect the committee members representing the unit and each unit shall be
341 represented in as close to equal proportion as possible to proportion of the candidate's time
342 assigned to that unit. If not a member of the peer review committee, the chair or director of
343 each academic unit shall write an independent evaluation. A faculty member appointed in two
344 different colleges will be evaluated by the college-level peer review committee in each college
345 in which he or she is appointed.

346 College dean(s), in consultation with the faculty member holding a joint appointment and the
347 department/division chair(s) or school director(s), shall determine whether the faculty member
348 will be evaluated in each department/division/school or by a joint committee; this
349 determination should be made at least 30 days prior to the file closure date for the faculty
350 member's first evaluation. In subsequent years, changes to the department/division/school-
351 level review process can be effected either at the recommendation of the faculty member with
352 dean's approval or at the discretion of the dean after consultation with the faculty
353 member. Such changes will become effective for any review cycles beginning 30 days after the
354 change is instituted.

355 In every case, the department/division/school and college-level recommendations shall be
356 forwarded to the respective dean(s) of the college(s) in which an appointment is held; each
357 dean shall conduct an evaluation and forward a recommendation to the Provost. For
358 individuals holding a joint appointment, the President shall make a single decision regarding
359 retention, tenure, or promotion.

Evaluation of Permanent Instructional Faculty

(Senate: 8/3/76, 5/24/77, 7/28/82[EA], 5/24/83, 11/3/87, 7/25/89, 11/7/89, 8/21/90, 7/30/91, 2/4/92, 10/26/93, 5/10/94, 8/22/95, 5/9/00, 5/10/11, 1/24/12, 5/28/13, 12/2/14; President: 8/16/76, 6/14/79, 9/8/82, 6/14/83, 6/22/88, 8/16/89, 11/24/89, 11/1/90, 10/7/91, 3/11/92, 12/13/93, 6/29/94, 6/24/96, 6/6/00, 7/14/11, 2/23/12, 7/9/13, 1/26/15; Editorial Amendment: 9/00, 8/01)

Governing documents: Articles 13, 14, and 15 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the California State University and the California Faculty Association.

In keeping with the terminology utilized in the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the California State University and the California Faculty Association, the term "permanent faculty" shall refer to all probationary (tenure-track) and tenured faculty. This evaluation policy governs permanent instructional faculty. Although librarians, counselors, and coaches fall within the faculty bargaining unit, some aspects of their assignments differ from those of instructional faculty and thus they are subject to specific evaluation criteria. Relevant evaluation policies for each of these groups can be found in their respective evaluation policies elsewhere in this Handbook.

Overview

The purpose of the University's instructional evaluation policy is to maintain and enhance the high quality of the academic programs at Cal State LA by assuring that all permanent faculty members meet and maintain high standards of performance as teachers, scholars, and members of the campus community. The policy aims to achieve this objective by establishing criteria for fair, thorough, and consistent evaluation of individual faculty members.

Evaluations of tenure-track and tenured instructional faculty shall focus on the quality and effectiveness of educational performance, professional achievement, and other contributions to the University by the faculty member under review.

The evaluation of an instructional faculty member is based upon a comprehensive review of the individual's qualities, achievements, and promise during the year or years included in the review period.

Attention shall be given to forming a general "profile" or comprehensive estimate of the faculty member's performance and special professional interests and accomplishments.

All reviews shall be based on evidence in the two-part personnel action file, which includes the permanent personnel action file (PPAF) and the working personnel action file (WPAF). All evaluations will be entered into the faculty member's permanent personnel action file (PPAF). The permanent personnel action file (PPAF) is maintained by the University. Reports of

peer observations of instruction and quantitative summaries of student opinion surveys are maintained in the PPAF. The candidate is responsible for providing the following materials to his or her working personnel action file (WPAF) before the published date of the file closure: a current curriculum vitae, a personnel information form that summarizes and describes the candidate's activities and accomplishments during the period under review, and evidence of these activities and accomplishments.

I. Types of Evaluation

There are two types of evaluations of permanent faculty members:

performance reviews, required for retention, tenure and promotion of permanent faculty, and

periodic evaluations, conducted when an evaluation is required, but in periods in which a faculty member is not under consideration for retention, tenure, or promotion.

Performance reviews serve the dual purposes of determining whether or not a faculty member's performance warrants retention, tenure, or promotion, and of providing the faculty member with constructive feedback on his or her performance in the areas under review. Periodic evaluations are aimed primarily at providing the faculty member with feedback on his or her performance. However, they may be considered in subsequent performance reviews.

Permanent (probationary and tenured) faculty members shall undergo a performance review when under consideration for retention, tenure, or promotion. A permanent faculty member undergoing a performance review shall be reviewed by the appropriate department/division/school peer review committee, the department/division chair or school director (if not a member of the department/division/school peer review committee), the appropriate college peer review committee, the dean, the Provost and the President.

A permanent faculty member undergoing periodic evaluation shall be reviewed by the appropriate department/division/school peer review committee, the department/division chair or school director (if not a member of the department/division/school peer review committee), and the dean. Periodic evaluations shall include review of a faculty member's performance in all of the same areas as during a performance review.

II. Evaluative Standards

Permanent instructional faculty members at Cal State LA shall be evaluated on the basis of their educational performance, professional achievement, and contributions to the University.

Permanent faculty evaluations shall utilize the following official evaluative terms:

Outstanding - describes truly *exceptional* performance, for a faculty member at the particular rank and career stage.

Commendable - describes performance that is better than satisfactory and that exceed expectations for a faculty member at the particular rank and career stage.

Satisfactory - describes performance that meets expectations for a faculty member at the particular rank and career stage.

Needs Improvement - describes performance that does not meet expectations for a faculty member at the particular rank and career stage, in one or more specified areas of concern.

Unsatisfactory - describes performance that is *seriously deficient* for a faculty member at the particular rank and career stage.

A review that finds a faculty member's performance to be satisfactory or better in all areas shall be accompanied by a favorable recommendation for retention, tenure, or promotion, when eligible and not applying early.

An evaluation of "needs improvement" does not preclude a reviewer/review committee from recommending retention. To receive a favorable recommendation for tenure and promotion at least satisfactory performance must be demonstrated in all three categories.

A judgment of unsatisfactory in any one area shall entail a negative recommendation for retention, tenure, or promotion.

III. Evaluation Timelines

Periodic and Performance Reviews for Probationary Faculty

Initial probationary appointments will normally be for two years. Initial appointments of probationary faculty members who are appointed in a term other than fall shall end in spring term of the second academic year of service.

During the first year of an initial probationary appointment, a faculty member shall undergo a periodic evaluation, with the exception of those appointed in spring semester (who will not be reviewed in the first [partial] year of appointment). During the second year of an initial probationary appointment, a faculty member shall undergo a performance review for retention.

For the purposes of calculating tenure eligibility, the first year shall begin with the first fall term in which a probationary faculty member is employed.

It is possible to receive approval for a one-year extension of the probationary period when participating in specified leave programs. Information related to extensions may be found in Articles 13.7 and 13.8 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

If found to be satisfactory or better during a performance review for retention, probationary faculty members shall be reappointed for subsequent two-year appointment(s) unless they have only one year remaining in their probationary period, in which case they will receive a one-year appointment. If a probationary faculty member is found to be less than satisfactory, he or she *may* receive a one-year appointment. During each year between retention reviews probationary faculty shall undergo periodic evaluations.

Probationary faculty members may request a performance review during any year in which they would otherwise receive only a periodic evaluation.

Consideration for tenure normally occurs during the sixth year of service as a probationary faculty member minus any credit toward tenure.

A faculty member shall not normally be promoted to associate professor and may not be promoted to professor during the probationary period. Assistant professors who are awarded tenure shall be promoted concurrently to associate professor.

A faculty member must be employed by Cal State LA and in the current rank for at least two years before applying for tenure or promotion to a higher rank.

Early Tenure and/or Promotion for Probationary Faculty

Consideration for tenure normally occurs during the sixth year of service as a probationary faculty member minus any credit toward tenure. A probationary faculty member applying for early tenure or early promotion shall demonstrate that they have, in a shorter period of time, (a) achieved the level of development in all areas of review that is expected of candidates for tenure; and (b) established a record of accomplishments that exceeds the standards and level of performance expected during the probationary period. Probationary faculty members shall not be promoted beyond the rank of associate professor.

Prior to the final decision for early tenure or early promotion, candidates may withdraw without prejudice from consideration at any level of review. If a faculty member has applied for and been denied early tenure or early promotion, the faculty member cannot apply again for early tenure or early promotion while in the same rank.

Post-Tenure Performance Reviews and Periodic Evaluations

Once tenured, a faculty member will typically undergo a performance review during the fifth year in rank as an associate professor, for consideration for promotion to the rank of professor. A faculty member who does not wish to apply for promotion within five years of

receiving tenure/promotion to associate professor, must undergo a periodic evaluation in the fifth year in rank. All tenured professors (at any rank) shall be evaluated at intervals no greater than five years. Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) shall not be required to undergo evaluation unless an evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant or the college dean.

Tenured faculty members may be evaluated more frequently at the request of the faculty member or the president.

The faculty member's evaluation for promotion to the rank of professor emphasizes the scope and depth of teaching performance, the degree of professional recognition within and beyond the University, and the distinctiveness of contributions to the general welfare of the faculty members department/division/school, college, and University. Such a review must necessarily include a careful evaluation of each individual achievement, with the aim of determining its value to the faculty member, the students and the University.

Early Promotion for Tenured Faculty Members

Tenured associate professors may request to be considered for early promotion to the rank of professor. Tenured associate professors applying for early promotion shall demonstrate that they have achieved, in a shorter period of time, a record of accomplishments that exceeds the standards and level of performance that would be expected during the normal five-year period of time in rank as an associate professor. A faculty member cannot apply for early promotion if they have applied for and been denied early promotion while in the same rank.

Review Periods

Performance Review Periods:

Review:	Review Period Begins:	Review Period Ends:
Retention review for second year faculty	Date of appointment to probationary position	File closure (fall semester of second year)
Retention (probationary performance review years other than second)	File closure of previous performance review	Current file closure (fall semester of performance review years)
Tenure and Promotion	Date of appointment to probationary position	Current file closure (fall semester of tenure eligibility year)
Promotion to Professor	File closure of tenure and promotion performance review	Current file closure (fall semester of promotion eligibility year)

Periodic Evaluation Periods:

Evaluation:	Evaluation Period Begins:	Evaluation Period Ends:
First year evaluation	Date of appointment to probationary position	File closure (spring semester of first year)
Annual evaluation (probationary years not requiring retention review)	File closure of previous performance review	Current file closure (spring semester of current year)
Post-tenure review	File closure of last review	Current file closure (spring semester of current year)

IV. Criteria Governing Evaluations of Permanent Faculty

Reviews for retention, tenure, and promotion to associate professor are cumulative in the sense that the progress or growth of the faculty member since joining the faculty is a factor in evaluation. Generally, the evaluation of a probationary faculty member will take into account all and only the activities and achievements since the initial probationary appointment. Reviews are comparative in the sense that the faculty member is evaluated against the quality and effectiveness of performance of colleagues taking into account the broad range of activities in which different members of the faculty engage.

Performance reviews for promotion to the rank of professor are similarly cumulative and comparative - i.e., the progress or growth of faculty members while in their present rank is assessed against the quality and effectiveness of colleagues' performance, taking into account the broad range of activities in which different members of the faculty engage.

Permanent faculty members are evaluated on the basis of their performance in the following categories:

- A. Educational Performance
- B. Professional Achievement
- C. Contributions to the University.

Of the three categories, category A normally shall have the greatest weight. In the case of a faculty member who is appointed or elected to a non-teaching position, special consideration shall be given to performance in that assignment. In such cases, a faculty member should consider preparing an individualized professional plan; the individualized professional plan is described in section V. B.

Although the criteria governing performance reviews are the same for retention, tenure, and promotion cases, reviewers should recognize qualitative differences between these types of reviews. This difference, however, is one of degree, not kind, and it may be summed up under the concept of growth or progress. At the time of the performance review of the faculty

member for retention during the probationary period, judgment is based on demonstrated growth, performance and promise in categories A, B, and C.

At the time of candidacy for tenure and/or promotion, however, a faculty member is expected to have demonstrated substantive achievements in each of the three areas; promise of future growth will not be sufficient to warrant a positive recommendation for tenure or promotion. Special consideration will be given to the continuity and growth of the activities comprising this total performance.

Category A, Educational Performance, consists of two elements:

1. teaching performance, and
2. related educational activities.

1. Teaching performance includes those activities by the faculty member that directly contribute to student learning. Effective teaching can include many pedagogical approaches, such as lectures, individual and group exercises, inquiry-based learning, discussion sessions, and other techniques. It can also include a wide range of activities such as supervising theses or projects; supervising student learning experiences in academic and community based settings; collaborating with students on research, performance, artistic, and other projects; mentoring students; and tutoring students.

The evaluation of teaching performance is an assessment of the quality and effectiveness of the efforts of faculty members that contribute to student learning. This evaluation must include multiple measures:

- a. A summary of the quantitative responses to the "Student Opinion Survey on Instruction."
- b. Evaluation of teaching performance based upon a peer observation of instruction.
- c. At least one other source of information, such as course syllabi, instructional materials, assessment methods, assignments (including field assignments), evidence of student work and accomplishments, and signed letters from students.

2. Related educational activities include, but are not limited to: academic advisement, curriculum/program development, programmatic assessment of learning outcomes, membership on thesis committees, the development and evaluation of comprehensive exams, and other academic support activities that enhance student retention and student achievement.

The evaluation of related educational activities is based upon such items as surveys of student opinions of advisement, student mentoring, tutoring, field activities, etc.; written reports from the department/division chair or school director, students, faculty, and/or other individuals with first hand knowledge of the faculty member's activities; and other such documentation provided by the faculty member regarding participation in program assessment, curriculum development, and other related educational activities.

Category B, Professional Achievement, is defined as performance of discipline-related activities that include, but are not limited to the following broad areas identified in no particular order:

- Academic and scholarly contributions to the faculty member's profession and field, that are externally evaluated and published or formally accepted for publication such as research, critical essays and analyses, and theoretical speculations.
- Innovative use of technology, textbooks, and original teaching or testing materials which are adopted for professional and/or instructional use outside the faculty member's department/division/school.
- Inventions, designs and innovations that have been favorably evaluated by authorities outside the University.
- Creation, exhibition, performance or publication in the arts or literature. Producing and directing events in the performing arts, including visual arts, music, dance, and theatre, beyond normal instructional duties.
- Presentations before meetings of scholarly and professional societies, and presentations as an invited authority in the faculty member's field before scholarly and professional audiences.
- Participation in activities of scholarly or professional societies beyond mere membership, such as elective office, fellowship status, committee membership, receipt of special awards, organization of symposia, and chairing of conference sessions.
- Receipt of fellowships, grants, contracts or other subsidies and commissions for scholarly activities in the faculty member's field.
- Holding special appointments such as visiting professorships, lectureships, or consultant assignments in other academic, scholarly, professional, or governmental institutions.
- Editing or reviewing of scholarly or professional publications.
- Professional practice that utilizes the faculty member's academic expertise.
- Service to one's profession, in such cases where the activity is based on one's disciplinary expertise (for example, appointment to a granting agency's review board or service on a professional board).
- Community based participatory research, community service, and community based activities that involve the academic expertise of the faculty member.
- In evaluating these contributions as to their relative merits, the quality and effectiveness, and not only the quantity of the contributions in category B shall be the primary consideration.

Category C, Contributions to the University, is defined as all other service to the University, profession, or community that contributes to the mission and governance of the University such as, but not limited to, those activities listed below.

- Contributions to academic governance such as membership and participation in the activities of department/division/school, college, university, and system committees, and service in administrative capacities.

- Participation in any student, faculty, professional, or community organization or engagement in any service to colleges and/or the community or engagement in other activities that bring positive recognition to the faculty member and to the University.
- Delivery of speeches, conducting of colloquia, or otherwise conveying information about the faculty member's scholarship, profession, field and university to community groups.
- Organization of and engagement in significant university, college and department/division/school activities that improve the educational environment and/or student, staff, or faculty life, such as organization of retreats, conferences, or orientations.
- In evaluating these contributions in category C as to their relative merits, the quality and effectiveness, and not only the quantity of the contributions shall be the primary consideration.

V. Additional Evaluation Policies

A. External Review

A request for an external review of materials in one's personnel file may be made by any of the parties involved in the review. Any request for an external review must be directed to the President or his designee and must indicate (1) the extraordinary circumstances warranting external review, and (2) the materials to be reviewed. For such a review to take place, the faculty member under review must concur with the request for external review. The dean of the college shall select appropriate external reviewer(s), with the approval of the President or designee and the concurrence of the faculty member under review, and transmit to the reviewers the materials to be reviewed. A copy of the relevant parts of this policy shall accompany the materials to be reviewed.

Once the external reviewer(s)' report is received, the file is returned to the initial stage of review and the review commences from that level forward with the reviewers' report added to the permanent personnel action file (PPAF).

B. Individualized Professional Plans (IPP)

Each faculty member shall have the discretion to develop, in collaboration with his or her chair or director and the appropriate department/division school personnel committee, an individualized professional plan (IPP). Such plans shall specify the candidate's goals and objectives and may alter the balance or focus of performance among categories A, B, and C for a specified period of time.

A faculty member may choose to prepare an IPP when either his or her work assignment or area of specialization warrants a departure from the usual evaluation criteria, or when the faculty member's work is of a nature that it makes it difficult to apply the established evaluation criteria articulated above. Such a plan must indicate the time period during which it will apply to the evaluation of the faculty member's performance. No IPP may be retroactively applied, and in no case shall an IPP exceed three years in duration. However, an IPP may be

renewed. An IPP must be approved by the faculty member, the department/division chair or school director, the dean, the Provost and the President. The IPP must indicate (1) the unusual circumstances or work assignment that warrant(s) the creation of the plan, (2) the work plan (and expected outcomes) for the faculty member over the course of the IPP's duration, and (3) where necessary, the criteria by which the faculty member will be evaluated. An individualized professional plan will still require that a faculty member be evaluated in all areas of expected performance. Whenever an IPP is approved, it must be placed in the permanent personnel file. An IPP will be effective upon its approval and will govern only that part of the evaluation period during which it is in place.

C. Evaluation of Faculty Active in Interdisciplinary Programs

When a faculty member with an appointment in a specific department/division/school devotes all or part of his or her efforts to instruction in or participates in the development and administration of an interdisciplinary program, that faculty member may request an assessment of his or her performance in the activities associated with the interdisciplinary program. In that case, prior to the file closure date, the coordinator of the interdisciplinary program shall provide a written assessment of the contributions of the faculty member to that program for the faculty member's permanent personnel action file. This assessment shall be part of the evidence upon which the evaluation is based.

D. Evaluation of Faculty with Joint Appointment

The criteria for evaluating faculty with joint appointments shall be consistent with those used for comparable evaluations of faculty members appointed to a single department/division/school.

Faculty with joint appointments in two or more departments/divisions/schools or equivalent units shall be evaluated either by the peer review committee, in each department/division/school or by a joint committee of faculty from each department/division/school. If a joint committee is utilized, this committee will consist of members of all academic units within which the candidate holds a joint appointment. Each academic unit shall elect the committee members representing the unit and each unit shall be represented in as close to equal proportion as possible to proportion of the candidate's time assigned to that unit. If not a member of the peer review committee, the chair or director of each academic unit shall write an independent evaluation. A faculty member appointed in two different colleges will be evaluated by the college-level peer review committee in each college in which he or she is appointed.

College dean(s), in consultation with the faculty member holding a joint appointment and the department/division chair(s) or school director(s), shall determine whether the faculty member will be evaluated in each department/division/school or by a joint committee; this determination should be made at least 30 days prior to the file closure date for the faculty member's first evaluation. In subsequent years, changes to the department/division/school-

level review process can be effected either at the recommendation of the faculty member with dean's approval or at the discretion of the dean after consultation with the faculty member. Such changes will become effective for any review cycles beginning 30 days after the change is instituted.

In every case, the department/division/school and college-level recommendations shall be forwarded to the respective dean(s) of the college(s) in which an appointment is held; each dean shall conduct an evaluation and forward a recommendation to the Provost. For individuals holding a joint appointment, the President shall make a single decision regarding retention, tenure, or promotion.