TO: The Academic Senate
FROM: Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)
SUBJECT: Revision of Procedures for Evaluation of Tenured Faculty
PURPOSE: Approval by the Academic Senate

ACTION REQUESTED: That the Academic Senate approve updating and revision of Procedures for Evaluation of Tenured Faculty, effective upon signature of the President

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: On December 9, 2009, the outgoing Chair of the Academic Senate requested a “complete revision” of the Procedures for Evaluation of Tenured Faculty, which was last updated in 1984. In addition, the Provost’s Office requested inclusion of an annual timeline for all levels of evaluation.

FAC discussed the revisions at its regularly scheduled meetings on January 20, February 17, and March 3, and at a special meeting on March 17. FAC unanimously (9-0) approved the main revisions on March 3 and various small revisions on March 17 (9-0). In its review on March 30, 2010, the Executive Committee expressed concern that a footnote referring to an obsolete evaluation policy had not been deleted from the document; and that there was no reference to faculty members’ PAF’s in the revision. The FAC Chair withdrew the document for further consultation with FAC members. In an email vote on April 26-27, FAC unanimously (9-0) approved the last two changes, listed at the bottom of this memorandum.

Summary of main changes:

The FAC’s updated the document with the University’s new name and the RTP document’s new title; with various references to relevant provisions in CBA Sections 15 (Evaluation) and 20 (Workload); and with separating out of various subsections of the document for greater clarity.

In addition, the significant recommended revisions are as follows:

1. moving responsibility for maintaining faculty members’ 5-year schedules for evaluations from the Department offices to the Provost's Office (2.0);
2. replacing throughout the term “Evaluation Committee” with “Peer Review Committee,” to conform to the language of the CBA, Section 15;
3. replacing throughout the term “appropriate administrator” for the second level of review with the phrase “Dean or Dean’s designee” for greater specificity;
4. unifying the timing of the faculty member’s documentation to a common due date, with the exception of approved extensions for faculty on leave in the fifth year (2.2 & 3.0);
5. clarification of basis for evaluation to conform to CBA 20.1.a on workload, including achievement in instructional, professional, and service areas (4.0);
6. requiring that faculty with administrative assigned time to report on achievement related to the assigned time (5.3);
7. replacing the phrase “instructional performance” with “achievement and service” as the bases for the Peer Review Committee’s evaluation, to confirm to CBA 20.1.a (6.1);
8. confirming that faculty members’ documentation remains at the Department office (6.2);
9. addition of a timeline, situating annual Evaluation of Tenured Faculty after the RTP process at each level of review (see timeline at end of document).

In response to the concerns raised at the March 30 Executive Committee, the following additional changes are recommended:

**Deletion** of the footnote referring to the obsolete policy on evaluation of tenured faculty.

A rewording of section 2.3 to cover faculty hired before the standing policy went into effect: “The schedules of evaluations established before the passage of this policy shall remain in force.”

**Addition** of a phrase referring to faculty members’ PAFs in section 6.1: “The memorandum shall include consideration of the faculty member's achievement and service, including an evaluation of currency in the field, and the faculty member’s PAF on file at the Provost’s Office.”
1.0 This document presents procedures for the evaluation of tenured faculty in compliance with provisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement Between the CSU Board of Trustees and the California Faculty Association for Unit 3 - Faculty (hereafter referred to as the agreement CBA).

1.1 Each tenured faculty member shall be subject to a periodic evaluation at intervals of no more than five years, in accordance with the relevant sections of CBA Article 15 of the Agreement.

1.2 A promotion review conducted at the Department level under University Promotion, Tenure and Retention Policy and Procedures in the fifth year after tenure will serve as this evaluation.

1.3 These procedures will be followed unless a Department elects to establish its own procedures. In that event the Department must submit its proposed procedures to the Faculty Affairs Committee for review; the Faculty Affairs Committee shall ensure that they are fully consistent with provisions of the Agreement CBA. The approved Department procedures shall be kept on file in the offices of the School College Deans and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

2.0 A five year schedule for the evaluation of tenured faculty members shall be established and maintained by the Department Chair Office of the Provost.

2.1 The initial placement of a faculty member on the schedule shall be five years from the fifth year after the faculty member’s last promotion review.

2.2 If a person applies for a sabbatical and is scheduled to be evaluated during the sabbatical year, the evaluation will be done during the year in which the faculty member applies for a sabbatical. If a faculty member will be on leave during any or all quarters in the fifth year, he or she may request an extension through the Department Chair.

2.3 The previously established schedules of evaluations shall remain in force. With the sequence established each faculty member shall be evaluated at least every five years.

3.0 In accordance with CBA Article 15.3229 of the Agreement, the evaluation shall be conducted by a Peer Review Committee of the Department or equivalent unit, comprised of no fewer than three tenured faculty members, and by the Dean or Dean’s designee and the appropriate administrator. The Evaluation Peer Review Committee of not fewer than three tenured faculty members shall be selected in a manner to be decided by the Department for each person being evaluated. Faculty members may not serve on their own committees. The evaluation will normally be performed during the Winter Quarter.
the person being evaluated does not teach in the Winter Quarter, the evaluation will take place in the 
Spring Quarter.

*established pursuant to Article 2.0 of the former University Procedures for Evaluation of 
Tenured Faculty (approved by the President 6/12/81)

4.0 The faculty member being evaluated will shall prepare a dossier documentation consistent with the 
professional responsibilities outlined in CBA Article 20.1a: “The primary professional responsibilities of 
instructional faculty members are: teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, and service to the 
University, profession and to the community.” on instructional performance as provided in Paragraphs 
3.3.1 and 3.3.2 of the Promotion, Tenure, and Retention Document. The dossier will provide evidence of 
instructional achievement including evidence that the faculty member is maintaining currency in the 
courses taught as prescribed in Paragraph 4.1.2 of the Promotion, Tenure and Retention Document.

4.1 The dossier documentation will cover the faculty member’s most recent five years 
of service to the University.

4.2 The faculty member shall submit supporting documentation to the Department Office.

5.0 In accordance with CBA Article 15.1432 of the Agreement, the dossier documentation faculty 
member’s documentation shall include written student questionnaire evaluations for a minimum of two 
classes annually for each faculty member evaluated.

5.1 The Department Chair shall be responsible for determining that the courses evaluated are 
representative of the faculty member’s teaching responsibilities.

5.2 Additional opportunity for student evaluation of the faculty member shall be provided in 
accordance with Article 15.0 of the University Promotion, Tenure and Retention Policy and 
Procedures the CSUEB Policy for Student Evaluation of Teaching.

5.3 Faculty members with reduced or no teaching assignments will be expected to provide 
evidence of achievement related to their assigned time.

6.0 The Evaluation Peer Review Committee shall report its evaluation of the faculty member in a 
memorandum to the appropriate administrator Dean or Dean’s designee, with a copy to the faculty 
member.

6.1 The memorandum shall include an evaluation consideration of the faculty member’s 
instructional performance achievement and service, including an evaluation of currency in the 
field.
6.1 The memorandum shall include consideration of the faculty member’s 
achievement and service, including an evaluation of currency in the field, and the 
faculty member’s PAF on file at the Provost’s Office.

6.2 The Peer Review Committee shall submit its memorandum to the Dean’s Office. The faculty 
member’s documentation will remain at Department Office.
6.3 The appropriate administrator Dean or Dean’s designee shall indicate agreement with the Committee’s report memorandum by signing it, or shall attach a separate memorandum.

6.4 The faculty member shall be provided a copy of the Evaluation signed memorandum or the Dean’s separate memorandum.

7.0 The Chair of the Evaluation Peer Review Committee and the appropriate administrator Dean or Dean’s designee shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the faculty member’s strengths and weaknesses along with suggestions, if any, for improvement.

7.8.0 A copy of the Evaluation Peer Review Committee’s and Dean’s summary memorandum shall be placed in the faculty member’s Personnel Action File.

8.1 The Committee’s report and its deliberations and the evaluation memoranda shall be remain confidential.

8.2 The faculty member’s documentation will be returned to the faculty member no later than the end of the Spring Quarter

TIMELINE

Faculty Member’s Documentation to Department Office No later than March 15

Peer Review Committee’s Memorandum to Dean and Faculty Member No later than April 15

Copy of Dean’s memorandum to the Faculty Member No later than May 24

Dean’s or Dean’s Designee’s Meeting with Faculty Member No later than end of Spring Quarter

Documentation returned to Faculty Member No later than end of Spring Quarter