



---

**Date:** March 19, 2020/August 31, 2020

**To:** Veena Prabhu,  
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 19-9.4: Evaluation of Permanent Instructional Faculty**

In February 2020, a faculty member brought to FPC a concern that when faculty who are eligible for promotion to the rank Professor forgo that promotion opportunity and instead apply for promotion at a later date, those faculty are sometimes expected to have completed greater accomplishments to be awarded promotion than other candidates being evaluated for promotion at the same time. In this way, waiting a year or two (or more) to apply for promotion to Professor is often detrimental to the faculty candidate, resulting in their being expected to achieve even more than other faculty who are promoted to Professor. These faculty sometimes languish as Associate Professors for many years (or perhaps permanently) merely because they took a year or two (or more) longer to achieve sufficient accomplishments for promotion to Professor. FPC revised the policy on Evaluation of Permanent Instructional Faculty so that faculty are not penalized for delaying promotion to Professor and are instead evaluated fairly and in comparison to other faculty being considered for promotion at the same time, as indicated in the existing policy.

FPC deliberated about FPC 19-9.4 at its meetings February 17 and 24, and the meeting of March 2, 2020. FPC voted to approve the policy modification FPC 19-9.4: Evaluation of Permanent Instructional Faculty on March 2, 2020 and August 31, 2020

The following points summarize the proposed changes to the policy:

- Line 150: Deleting the language “five-year” so as to not define the time period.
- Lines 167-168: We include the phrase “except when applying for early promotion to the rank of Professor” to distinguish between faculty applying for early promotion and those applying for promotion later than the typical timeline.
- Lines 168-172: We include language indicating that for faculty to receive promotion, they must demonstrate a level of achievement commensurate that with other candidates recommended for promotion at the same time, regardless of the number of years since earning tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

## 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 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 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 Cal State LA shall be evaluated on the basis of their  
67 educational performance, professional achievement, and contributions to the University.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 87 **III. Evaluation Timelines**

#### 88 **PERIODIC AND PERFORMANCE REVIEWS FOR PROBATIONARY FACULTY**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 117 **Early Tenure and/or Promotion for Probationary Faculty**

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

#### 129 **Post-Tenure Performance Reviews and Periodic Evaluations**

130 Once tenured, a faculty member will typically undergo a performance review during the fifth  
131 year in rank as an associate professor, for consideration for promotion to the rank of  
132 professor. A faculty member who does not wish to apply for promotion within five years of  
133 receiving tenure/promotion to associate professor, must undergo a periodic evaluation in the

134 fifth year in rank. All tenured professors (at any rank) shall be evaluated at intervals no greater  
 135 than five years. Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) shall not be  
 136 required to undergo evaluation unless an evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant  
 137 or the college dean.

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

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

146 **Early Promotion for Tenured Faculty Members**

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

153 **Review Periods**

154 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)

155 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)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 195 1. teaching performance, and
- 196 2. related educational activities.

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

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

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

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

217 The evaluation of related educational activities is based upon such items as surveys of student  
218 opinions of advisement, student mentoring, tutoring, field activities, etc.; written reports from



219 the department/division chair or school director, students, faculty, and/or other individuals  
220 with first hand knowledge of the faculty member's activities; and other such documentation  
221 provided by the faculty member regarding participation in program assessment, curriculum  
222 development, and other related educational activities.

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

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

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

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

## 273 **V. Additional Evaluation Policies**

### 274 **A. External Review**

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

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

### 287 **B. Individualized Professional Plans (IPP)**

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

293 A faculty member may choose to prepare an IPP when either his or her work assignment or  
294 area of specialization warrants a departure from the usual evaluation criteria, or when the  
295 faculty member's work is of a nature that it makes it difficult to apply the established

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

### 308 **C. Evaluation of Faculty Active in Interdisciplinary Programs**

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

### 317 **D. Evaluation of Faculty with Joint Appointment**

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

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

332 College dean(s), in consultation with the faculty member holding a joint appointment and the  
333 department/division chair(s) or school director(s), shall determine whether the faculty member

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

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