Faculty Policy Committee (FPC) considered the policy on Evaluation of Permanent Instructional Faculty (FPC 18-7.12), specifically criteria for early tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and criteria for early promotion to Full Professor. We considered the policy mainly because the current language requiring “sustained outstanding achievement” is not clearly defined; because faculty experience a limited number of periodic evaluations and performance reviews before tenure and after being promoted to Associate Professor; and because the current policy does not allow for singularly outstanding achievements or achievements occurring in later performance reviews which may merit early tenure or promotion. FPC also clarified policy language on extensions of probationary periods by referring to Articles 13.7 and 13.8 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). FPC did not address any other aspects of this expansive policy in this proposed modification.

FPC deliberated about FPC 18-7.12 at its meetings throughout February, March, and April of 2019, and at the 2019-2020 academic year meetings of September 9 and 16. We considered policies on early tenure and promotion from CSU East Bay, CSU Long Beach, and CSU Monterey Bay. We also consulted with the College Deans regarding the proposed modifications. FPC voted to approve the policy modification FPC 18-7.12: Evaluation of Permanent Instructional Faculty on September 16, 2019.

The following points summarize the proposed changes to the policy:

Line 19: Cal State LA is the current brief title used officially by the campus.

Line 66: Cal State LA is the current brief title used officially by the campus.

Line 89: We added a heading to refer specifically to Periodic and Performance Reviews for Probationary Faculty, separated from reference to criteria for early tenure, to improve clarity and organization.

Line 94: Permanent instructional faculty are not appointed in Winter; the word “term” is changed to “semester.”

Lines 100-107: We deleted previous language and added new language that clarifies one-year extensions to the probationary period; and refer readers to the relevant Articles in the CBA (13.7, 13.8) for clarity.
We deleted redundant language and refer to early tenure in its own section.

Cal State LA is the current brief title used officially by the campus.

We added a heading to refer specifically to early tenure and promotion for probationary faculty, for clarity and organization.

We repeat language from earlier in the policy (lines 116-117) to clarify the distinction between the normal tenure process and early tenure.

We refer specifically to probationary faculty for clarity.

We eliminated italics and changed the word “early” to regular font; we deleted the words “to associate professor” because the added heading clarifies that this section applies to probationary faculty.

We added modified criteria for early tenure and early promotion to Associate Professor, which involves “a record of accomplishments that exceeds the standards and level of performance that normally would be expected during the probationary period” achieved “in a shorter period of time.”

We added language that prohibits early promotion of probationary faculty to a higher rank than Associate Professor.

We deleted previous policy language referring to “sustained outstanding achievement.”

We eliminated italics and changed the word “and been denied” to regular font; we added the word “early” in three places to refer specifically to applications for early tenure and promotion.

We moved this language from lines 169-170 to apply it to all performance reviews and periodic evaluations.

We deleted language referring to “sustained outstanding achievement” as required for early promotion to Full Professor.

We added a heading to refer specifically to early promotion for tenured faculty, for clarity and organization.

We added language referring to criteria for early promotion to the rank of Professor, using the same language we used to describe criteria for early tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (lines 128-130).

We add language prohibiting more than one application for early promotion to the rank of Professor, similar to restrictions on applications for early tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (lines 137-139).

We moved this language to lines 149-150 to apply it to all performance reviews and periodic evaluations.
Overview

The purpose of the University's instructional evaluation policy is to maintain and enhance the high quality of the academic programs at CSULA 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 **CSULA 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 winter or spring SEMESTER term (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. During any probationary year in which a faculty member takes a personal leave of absence (of one or more terms' duration), the faculty member may request to extend the probationary period by one year. If such an extension is desired, the faculty member must notify the Provost at the time of application for the leave. If such a request is granted, the tenure eligibility date will be moved forward by one year.

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 probationary faculty member may request to be considered for early 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 CSULA 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 EARLY tenure or early EARLY promotion to associate professor 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 NORMALLY WOULD BE EXPECTED DURING THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD. PROBATIONARY FACULTY MEMBERS SHALL NOT BE PROMOTED BEYOND THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, may be recommended for that action only if found to have a record of sustained outstanding performance in categories A and B, "educational performance" and "professional achievement," and at least satisfactory performance in category C, "contributions to the University."
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* 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. A candidate for early promotion to the rank of professor must have a sustained outstanding record in categories A and B, "educational performance" and "professional achievement" and be at least commendable in category C, "contributions to 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.

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

Performance Review Periods:

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

Periodic Evaluation Periods:

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

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.