

## 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 MATERIALS  
33 SUBMITTED BY THE CANDIDATE (REFERRED TO AS the working personnel action file, WPAF). All  
34 evaluations will be entered into the faculty member's permanent personnel action file

35 (PPAF). The permanent personnel action file (PPAF) is maintained by the University. Reports of  
36 ALL peer observations of instruction and quantitative summaries of student opinion surveys are  
37 maintained in the PPAF. The candidate is responsible for providing SUBMITTING the following  
38 materials AS his or her THEIR WPAF to their working personnel action file (WPAF) before the  
39 published date of the file closure. FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEWS, PERMANENT FACULTY MUST  
40 SUBMIT a current curriculum vitae, a personnel information form (PIF) ALONG WITH A  
41 PERSONNEL ACCOMPLISHMENTS REPORT (PAR), A NARRATIVE STATEMENT that summarizes  
42 and describes the candidate's activities and accomplishments during the period under review,  
43 and evidence of these activities and accomplishments. ALTHOUGH PERFORMANCE REVIEW FOR  
44 TENURE IS CUMULATIVE AND COMPREHENSIVE, EVIDENCE SUBMITTED SHOULD FOCUS ON  
45 ACCOMPLISHMENTS SINCE THE LAST PERFORMANCE REVIEW. INCLUSION OF MATERIALS  
46 PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW IS OPTIONAL. FOR PERIODIC  
47 EVALUATIONS, PERMANENT FACULTY MUST SUBMIT A CURRENT CURRICULUM VITAE AND A  
48 PAR; SUBMISSION OF EVIDENCE FOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OUTLINED IN THE PAR IS OPTIONAL  
49 FOR PERIODIC EVALUATIONS.

## 50 I. Types of Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

69 A permanent faculty member undergoing periodic evaluation shall be reviewed by the  
70 appropriate department/division/school peer review committee, the department/division chair  
71 or school director (if not a member of the department/division/school peer review committee),

72 and the dean. Periodic evaluations shall include review of a faculty member's performance in  
73 all of the same areas as during a performance review.

## 74 **II. Evaluative Standards**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 96 **III. Evaluation Timelines**

### 97 **Periodic and Performance Reviews for Probationary Faculty**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

136 promotion, the faculty member cannot apply again for early tenure or early promotion while in  
137 the same rank.

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

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

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

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

### 155 **Early Promotion for Tenured Faculty Members**

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

### 162 **Review Periods**

163 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 <u>eligibility</u> year)
Promotion to Professor	File closure of tenure and promotion performance review	Current file closure (fall semester of promotion eligibility year)

164 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)

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

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

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

- 184 A. Educational Performance
- 185 B. Professional Achievement

186 C. Contributions to the University.

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

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

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

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

- 204 1. teaching performance, and
- 205 2. related educational activities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



- 260 • Community based participatory research, community service, and community based  
261 activities that involve the academic expertise of the faculty member.  
262 • In evaluating these contributions as to their relative merits, the quality and effectiveness,  
263 and not only the quantity of the contributions in category B shall be the primary  
264 consideration.

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

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

## 282 **V. Additional Evaluation Policies**

### 283 **A. External Review**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 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 MATERIALS  
33 SUBMITTED BY THE CANDIDATE (REFERRED TO AS the working personnel action file, WPAF). All  
34 evaluations will be entered into the faculty member's permanent personnel action file

35 (PPAF). The permanent personnel action file (PPAF) is maintained by the University. Reports of  
36 ALL peer observations of instruction and quantitative summaries of student opinion surveys are  
37 maintained in the PPAF. The candidate is responsible for providing SUBMITTING the following  
38 materials AS his or her THEIR WPAF to their working personnel action file (WPAF) before the  
39 published date of the file closure.; FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEWS, PERMANENT FACULTY MUST  
40 SUBMIT a current curriculum vitae; a personnel information form (PIF) ALONG WITH A  
41 PERSONNEL ACCOMPLISHMENTS REPORT (PAR), A NARRATIVE STATEMENT that summarizes  
42 and describes the candidate's activities and accomplishments during the period under review;,  
43 and evidence of these activities and accomplishments. ALTHOUGH PERFORMANCE REVIEW FOR  
44 TENURE IS CUMULATIVE AND COMPREHENSIVE, EVIDENCE SUBMITTED SHOULD FOCUS ON  
45 ACCOMPLISHMENTS SINCE THE LAST PERFORMANCE REVIEW. INCLUSION OF MATERIALS  
46 PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW IS OPTIONAL. FOR PERIODIC  
47 EVALUATIONS, PERMANENT FACULTY MUST SUBMIT A CURRENT CURRICULUM VITAE AND A  
48 PAR; SUBMISSION OF EVIDENCE FOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OUTLINED IN THE PAR IS OPTIONAL  
49 FOR PERIODIC EVALUATIONS.

## 50 I. Types of Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

69 A permanent faculty member undergoing periodic evaluation shall be reviewed by the  
70 appropriate department/division/school peer review committee, the department/division chair  
71 or school director (if not a member of the department/division/school peer review committee),

72 and the dean. Periodic evaluations shall include review of a faculty member's performance in  
73 all of the same areas as during a performance review.

## 74 **II. Evaluative Standards**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 96 **III. Evaluation Timelines**

### 97 **Periodic and Performance Reviews for Probationary Faculty**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

136 promotion, the faculty member cannot apply again for early tenure or early promotion while in  
137 the same rank.

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

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

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

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

### 155 **Early Promotion for Tenured Faculty Members**

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

### 162 **Review Periods**

163 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 <u>eligibility</u> year)
Promotion to Professor	File closure of tenure and promotion performance review	Current file closure (fall semester of promotion eligibility year)

164 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)

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

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

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

- 184 A. Educational Performance
- 185 B. Professional Achievement

186 C. Contributions to the University.

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

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

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

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

- 204 1. teaching performance, and
- 205 2. related educational activities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 260 • Community based participatory research, community service, and community based  
261 activities that involve the academic expertise of the faculty member.  
262 • In evaluating these contributions as to their relative merits, the quality and effectiveness,  
263 and not only the quantity of the contributions in category B shall be the primary  
264 consideration.

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

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

## 282 **V. Additional Evaluation Policies**

### 283 **A. External Review**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Evaluation of Permanent Instructional Faculty**

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

Governing documents: Articles 11, 13, 14, and 15 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the California State University and the California Faculty Association.

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

### **Overview**

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

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

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

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

All reviews shall be based on evidence in the permanent personnel action file (PPAF) and materials submitted by the candidate (referred to as the working personnel action file, WPAF). All evaluations will be entered into the faculty member's permanent personnel action file (PPAF). The PPAF is maintained by the University. Reports of all peer observations of

instruction and quantitative summaries of student opinion surveys are maintained in the PPAF. The candidate is responsible for submitting the following materials as their WPAF before the published date of the file closure. For performance reviews, permanent faculty must submit a current curriculum vitae; a personnel information form (PIF) along with a personnel accomplishments report (PAR), a narrative statement that summarizes and describes the candidate's activities and accomplishments during the period under review; and evidence of these activities and accomplishments. Although performance review for tenure is cumulative and comprehensive, evidence submitted should focus on accomplishments since the last performance review. Inclusion of materials previously submitted for performance review is optional. For periodic evaluations, permanent faculty must submit a current curriculum vitae and a PAR; submission of evidence for accomplishments outlined in the PAR is optional for periodic evaluations.

## I. Types of Evaluation

There are two types of evaluations of permanent faculty members:

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

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

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

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

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



## II. Evaluative Standards

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

Permanent faculty evaluations shall utilize the following official evaluative terms:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## III. Evaluation Timelines

### Periodic and Performance Reviews for Probationary Faculty

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

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

probationary appointment, a faculty member shall undergo a performance review for retention.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Post-Tenure Performance Reviews and Periodic Evaluations

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

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

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

## Early Promotion for Tenured Faculty Members

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

## Review Periods

Performance Review Periods:

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

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

Periodic Evaluation Periods:

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

#### IV. Criteria Governing Evaluations of Permanent Faculty

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

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.