



Date: October 5, 2020

To: Talia Bettcher,
Chair, Academic Senate

From: Heidi Riggio, Chair
Faculty Policy Committee

Copies: N. McQueen, J. Lazo-Uy, R. Roquemore, V. Salcido, J. Dennis

Subject: **Proposed Policy Modification for Chapter VI (Section B) of the *Faculty Handbook* FPC 20-2: Evaluation of Permanent Instructional Faculty**

Former Vice President of Academic Affairs Michael Caldwell indicated to FPC before departing Cal State LA that evidence faculty submit in their Supplemental File (the Personnel Accomplishments Report, or PAR) for tenure and promotion does not have to include materials submitted in previous performance reviews. Although the period of review for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is since the date of appointment, and is to be a cumulative and comprehensive review, materials submitted in previous performance reviews have already been evaluated; submitting them a second time permits a second evaluation which might conflict with the earlier evaluation from the earlier performance review. Materials may be evaluated very differently the second time, effectively ignoring the previous evaluation of that same material, resulting perhaps in an unfair evaluation of the faculty person. For example, materials previously evaluated as Satisfactory might be secondarily evaluated as Unsatisfactory by a different RTP committee, which is unfair. Therefore, previous performance reviews must be honored and used as part of the cumulative review. The modification here focuses on evidence submitted in the PAR at tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, as this is the only situation in which this conflict between earlier and current evaluations may occur. The modification makes submission of previously reviewed materials in the PAR optional and up to the choice of the individual faculty person.

FPC deliberated about FPC 20-2 at its meetings on September 21, September 28, and October 5, 2020. FPC voted unanimously to approve the policy modification FPC 20-2: Evaluation of Permanent Instructional Faculty on October 5, 2020.

The following points summarize the proposed changes to the policy:

- Line 7: We added Article 11 of the CBA as a governing document.
- Line 37: We changed “his or her” to “their,” a more inclusive term.
- Lines 38-39: We inserted the term PIF to refer to the personnel information form. We included reference to the Personnel Accomplishments Report (PAR) to reflect the more recent policy on the PAR.
- Lines 41-43: We inserted language indicating that evidence submitted with the PAR should focus on accomplishments since the last performance review.

Lines 43-44:

We inserted language indicating that inclusion of previously reviewed materials with the PAR is optional.

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 11, 13, 14, and 15 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement
8 between 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 Cal State LA by assuring that all permanent faculty
20 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 THEIR working personnel action file (WPAF) before the published date of the file
38 closure: a current curriculum vitae, AND a personnel information form (PIF) ALONG WITH A
39 PERSONNEL ACCOMPLISHMENTS REPORT (PAR) that summarizes and describes the candidate's
40 activities and accomplishments during the period under review, and evidence of these activities
41 and accomplishments. ALTHOUGH PERFORMANCE REVIEW FOR TENURE IS CUMULATIVE AND
42 COMPREHENSIVE, EVIDENCE SUBMITTED SHOULD FOCUS ON ACCOMPLISHMENTS SINCE THE
43 LAST PERFORMANCE REVIEW. INCLUSION OF MATERIALS PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED IN THE
44 SUPPLEMENTAL FILE FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW IS OPTIONAL.

45 I. Types of Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

69 II. Evaluative Standards

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

91 **III. Evaluation Timelines**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

121 **Early Tenure and/or Promotion for Probationary Faculty**

122 Consideration for tenure normally occurs during the sixth year of service as a probationary
123 faculty members minus any credit toward tenure. A probationary faculty member applying for
124 early tenure or early promotion shall demonstrate that they have, in a shorter period of time,
125 (A) achieved the level of development in all areas of review that is expected of candidates for
126 tenure; and (B) established a record of accomplishments that exceeds the standards and level
127 of performance expected during the probationary period. Probationary faculty members shall
128 not be promoted beyond the rank of associate professor. Prior to the final decision for early
129 tenure or early promotion, candidates may withdraw without prejudice from consideration at
130 any level of review. If a faculty member has applied for *and been denied* early tenure or early
131 promotion, the faculty member cannot apply again for early tenure or early promotion while in
132 the same rank.

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

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

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

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

150 **Early Promotion for Tenured Faculty Members**

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

157 **Review Periods**

158 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>elegibility</u> year)

Promotion to Professor	File closure of tenure and promotion performance review	Current file closure (fall semester of promotion eligibility year)
------------------------	---	--

159 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)

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

161 Reviews for retention, tenure, and promotion to associate professor are cumulative in the
162 sense that the progress or growth of the faculty member since joining the faculty is a factor in
163 evaluation. Generally, the evaluation of a probationary faculty member will take into account
164 all and only the activities and achievements since the initial probationary
165 appointment. Reviews are comparative in the sense that the faculty member is evaluated
166 against the quality and effectiveness of performance of colleagues taking into account the
167 broad range of activities in which different members of the faculty engage. Performance
168 reviews for promotion to the rank of professor are similarly cumulative and comparative - i.e.,
169 the progress or growth of faculty members while in their present rank is assessed against the
170 quality and effectiveness of colleagues' performance, taking into account the broad range of
171 activities in which different members of the faculty engage. EXCEPT WHEN APPLYING FOR
172 EARLY PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF PROFESSOR, FOR A FACULTY MEMBER TO RECEIVE
173 PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF PROFESSOR, THEY SHALL DEMONSTRATE A LEVEL OF
174 ACHIEVEMENT THAT IS COMMENSURATE WITH THAT OF OTHER CANDIDATES RECOMMENDED
175 FOR PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF PROFESSOR, REGARDLESS OF THE NUMBER OF YEARS SINCE
176 EARNING TENURE AT CAL STATE LA.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 199 1. teaching performance, and
- 200 2. related educational activities.

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

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

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

216 2. Related educational activities include, but are not limited to: academic advisement,
217 curriculum/program development, programmatic assessment of learning outcomes,

218 membership on thesis committees, the development and evaluation of comprehensive exams,
219 and other academic support activities that enhance student retention and student
220 achievement.

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

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

- 229 • Academic and scholarly contributions to the faculty member's profession and field, that are
230 externally evaluated and published or formally accepted for publication such as research,
231 critical essays and analyses, and theoretical speculations.
- 232 • Innovative use of technology, textbooks, and original teaching or testing materials which
233 are adopted for professional and/or instructional use outside the faculty member's
234 department/division/school.
- 235 • Inventions, designs and innovations that have been favorably evaluated by authorities
236 outside the University.
- 237 • Creation, exhibition, performance or publication in the arts or literature. Producing and
238 directing events in the performing arts, including visual arts, music, dance, and theatre,
239 beyond normal instructional duties.
- 240 • Presentations before meetings of scholarly and professional societies, and presentations as
241 an invited authority in the faculty member's field before scholarly and professional
242 audiences.
- 243 • Participation in activities of scholarly or professional societies beyond mere membership,
244 such as elective office, fellowship status, committee membership, receipt of special awards,
245 organization of symposia, and chairing of conference sessions.
- 246 • Receipt of fellowships, grants, contracts or other subsidies and commissions for scholarly
247 activities in the faculty member's field.
- 248 • Holding special appointments such as visiting professorships, lectureships, or consultant
249 assignments in other academic, scholarly, professional, or governmental institutions.
- 250 • Editing or reviewing of scholarly or professional publications.
- 251 • Professional practice that utilizes the faculty member's academic expertise.
- 252 • Service to one's profession, in such cases where the activity is based on one's disciplinary
253 expertise (for example, appointment to a granting agency's review board or service on a
254 professional board).
- 255 • Community based participatory research, community service, and community based
256 activities that involve the academic expertise of the faculty member.

257 • In evaluating these contributions as to their relative merits, the quality and effectiveness,
258 and not only the quantity of the contributions in category B shall be the primary
259 consideration.

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

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

277 **V. Additional Evaluation Policies**

278 **A. External Review**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

325 Faculty with joint appointments in two or more departments/divisions/schools or equivalent
326 units shall be evaluated either by the peer review committee, in each
327 department/division/school or by a joint committee of faculty from each
328 department/division/school. If a joint committee is utilized, this committee will consist of
329 members of all academic units within which the candidate holds a joint appointment. Each

330 academic unit shall elect the committee members representing the unit and each unit shall be
331 represented in as close to equal proportion as possible to proportion of the candidate's time
332 assigned to that unit. If not a member of the peer review committee, the chair or director of
333 each academic unit shall write an independent evaluation. A faculty member appointed in two
334 different colleges will be evaluated by the college-level peer review committee in each college
335 in which he or she is appointed.

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

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

