

*CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo*

**COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS
PERSONNEL POLICIES, PROCEDURES
AND EVALUATION CRITERIA**

*Update:
July 2011*

Minor Editorial Updates:

*August 10, 2009
August 8, 2008*

Approved July 21, 2006

***This is the sole personnel document for the College of Science and Mathematics.
It replaces all previous college and department documents.***

Current, past, and future students depend on the faculty and administration to participate responsibly in personnel matters and to make recommendations and decisions that are fair, supportable, and in the best interests of the University. The quality of personnel actions has a tremendous influence on the reputation of the university, the value of a Cal Poly diploma, and the welfare of members of the University community including students, faculty, staff, alumni, and loyal friends and supporters. Candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion and evaluators at all levels have a solemn responsibility to pursue their roles thoughtfully, with high integrity, and with sincere dedication to the future of Cal Poly.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>I.</i>	<i>APPOINTMENT OF TENURE TRACK FACULTY MEMBERS.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>II.</i>	<i>INTER-DEPARTMENTAL OR INTER-COLLEGE TRANSFER OF TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS OR GRANTING OF RETREAT RIGHTS.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>III.</i>	<i>APPOINTMENT OF LECTURERS</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>IV.</i>	<i>EVALUATION SCHEDULE FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>V.</i>	<i>PERIODIC REVIEW OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY MEMBERS.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>VI.</i>	<i>PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>VII.</i>	<i>COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS VOTING PROCEDURE FOR PRIORITIZING CANDIDATES FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>VIII.</i>	<i>PERIODIC REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>IX.</i>	<i>EVALUATION OF LECTURERS</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>X.</i>	<i>EVALUATION OF TEACHING ASSOCIATES.....</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>XI.</i>	<i>STUDENT EVALUATIONS</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>XII.</i>	<i>PROFESSIONAL LEAVES.....</i>	<i>33</i>
	<i>APPENDIX A: WORKING PERSONNEL ACTION FILE</i>	<i>35</i>
	<i>PART 1:.....</i>	<i>35</i>
	<i>A. INDEX OF MATERIALS</i>	<i>35</i>
	<i>B. RESUME:.....</i>	<i>35</i>
	<i>C. SUMMARY TABLE OF GRADES ASSIGNED:.....</i>	<i>38</i>
	<i>D. SUMMARY TABLE OF STUDENT EVALUATION RESULTS:</i>	<i>38</i>
	<i>E. STATEMENT OF TEACHING PHILOSOPHY AND APPROACH:</i>	<i>38</i>
	<i>F. PROFESSIONAL PLAN:</i>	<i>39</i>
	<i>G. CASE FOR TENURE/PROMOTION:.....</i>	<i>40</i>
	<i>H. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS:.....</i>	<i>41</i>
	<i>PART 2: MATERIALS FOR EXAMINATION IN TEACHING, PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT, AND SERVICE.</i>	<i>41</i>
	<i>A. TEACHING:</i>	<i>41</i>
	<i>B. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:</i>	<i>41</i>
	<i>C. SERVICE:.....</i>	<i>41</i>
	<i>D. OTHER:.....</i>	<i>41</i>
	<i>APPENDIX B: DEPARTMENT PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE (DPRC) COMPOSITION, ELECTION AND DUTIES TABLE</i>	<i>42</i>

PERSONNEL POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

I. Appointment of Tenure Track Faculty Members

The College of Science and Mathematics will recruit faculty members who have the potential to be outstanding and dedicated teachers and scholars and who demonstrate talent, currency, and creativity in their fields. A commitment to students and student learning and success is critical. Also important are the willingness to share expertise in service functions at the university and in the community, the ability to interact thoughtfully and successfully with a diverse university community, and the potential to attain tenure and promotion in a timely manner (see section VI.D. for criteria).

Cal Poly and the College of Science and Mathematics are committed to the development of a diverse faculty, staff, and student body. In recruiting for tenure track faculty members, efforts will be made to attract a diverse applicant pool.

A Ph.D. in the discipline or a closely related discipline is the required educational background for appointment except in unusual cases. A terminal degree of like level (such as an MD) may be considered.

The departments will devise development programs for each new faculty member that include mentoring, assistance in initiating a program of creative activity and/or scholarly work, and assignment of a teaching schedule designed to promote the development of an outstanding instructor.

Authorizations for tenure-track recruitments and appointments are made by the dean after consultation with the appropriate faculty units. Recruitment announcements will be written to require applicants to submit: letter of application, completion of the Cal Poly Applicant Information form, professional resume, statement on teaching philosophy and interest, statement on professional development, and letters of recommendation.

Procedure for Evaluation of Tenure Track Candidates

- Election of a Peer Review Committee: A peer review committee is elected by and from the tenured and probationary faculty members. The entire tenured and tenure track faculty is normally expected to participate in recruitment of tenure track faculty members and is thus expected to be on the peer review committee. Participation by probationary faculty, however, requires approval by the Dean.
- Selection of a Screening Committee: A screening committee can be selected from the elected committee for the purpose of selecting semifinalists to be considered for subsequent interviews. How the committee functions will depend on the number of applications. For example, if there are a large number, the members may divide them among the committee for review using an agreed upon set of criteria.
- Selection of Semifinalists for Telephone or Video Interviews: Any members of the elected Peer Review Committee can become involved in the selection of those for telephone or video interviews if they agree to read the applications of the semi-finalists and participate in discussions. Telephone or video interviews are strongly encouraged.

- Selection of Finalists: Telephone or video interviews may be conducted to determine finalists for on-campus interviews. Any member of the elected Peer Review Committee can participate in determining the finalists for on-campus interviews if they agree to read the applications and participate in the telephone or video interviews.
- On-Campus Interviews: Finalists will be invited for on-campus interviews. A comprehensive program that may include an agenda of seminars, classroom presentations, interviews by committees, visitation with faculty members, and meetings with students will constitute the interview. The interview should be robust and designed to glean impressions of potential teaching effectiveness, ability to develop a sustainable professional development program capable of external validation, and the probability of sincere university citizenship. The interview also must provide the candidate with a view, vision, and information about the department, college, and university. Appropriate feedback by constituent groups is encouraged.
- Recommendation of Candidate for Appointment: It is expected that the entire elected Peer Review Committee will participate in this step and that each member will have reviewed the applications of the on-campus interview finalists and been involved in the interview process. Rankings (see section VII for ranking procedure) and voting by the entire committee should occur first. This is followed by a vote of the tenured faculty members on the committee to either accept, reject or modify the determination of the entire committee. Both votes and rankings should be presented to the dean.
- Action by the Dean: The dean makes the final offers of appointment. Ideally, communication among the recommending groups and the dean will result in a mutually agreeable decision.

The departments will devise development programs for each new faculty member that include mentoring, assistance in initiating a program of creative activity and/or scholarly work, and assignment of a teaching schedule designed to promote the development of an outstanding instructor.

II. Inter-Departmental or Inter-College Transfer of Tenured Faculty Members or Granting of Retreat Rights

Proposed transfers of faculty members between departments or colleges or granting of retreat rights will be considered on a case by case basis by the receiving department. The tenured faculty and department chair will make a recommendation to the dean. The dean will forward this recommendation with his/her own recommendation to the president for the final decision.

III. Appointment of Lecturers

The College of Science and Mathematics is committed to employing excellent faculty members whether they are part-time, full-time, or full-year Lecturers. Educational background, experience, previous performance, type and level of contribution, and teaching assignments will be considered in determining appointment levels.

IV. Evaluation Schedule for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

A. *Application for Promotion:*

Faculty members who wish to be evaluated for promotion to full professor or early promotion to associate professor prior to tenure consideration, or for early tenure must notify the dean in writing with a copy to the department chair by October 15 of the RPT cycle. A tenured assistant professor wishing promotion consideration must also apply in this manner by October 15. Early tenure and early promotion are considered only under extraordinary conditions of performance and achievement.

B. *Required Personnel Actions: Reappointment and Tenure of Probationary Faculty Members.*

Reappointment and tenure evaluations are required as described in this section. Schedules and deadlines are announced each year by the University.

All probationary faculty members will undergo either a performance evaluation or periodic review each year. A periodic review will be conducted during the first full year of employment.

A performance evaluation is defined as an evaluation process that results in a personnel action such as reappointment, tenure, or promotion. A periodic review is an evaluation process that does not result in a formal personnel decision, but that can be used to support future personnel decisions.

Probationary Faculty Members on a Six-Year Tenure Cycle:

Probationary faculty members in this category will receive an initial appointment of two years. They are expected to undergo performance evaluations in their 2nd, 4th, and 6th probationary years and periodic reviews in their 1st, 3rd, and 5th probationary years. Normally, the 2nd and 4th year performance evaluations are for reappointment consideration to the 3rd-4th and 5th-6th probationary years respectively but, alternatively, can be for only one additional probationary year. If reappointment is for one additional probationary year, a performance evaluation rather than periodic review will be required during that probationary year. The 6th year performance evaluation is for tenure consideration. Leaves may impact the scheduling of performance and periodic evaluations.

Probationary Year Typical Schedule for Evaluations

Initial appointment is for two probationary years.

1	Periodic review for guidance
2	Performance evaluation for reappointment to 3 rd and 4 th probationary years
3	Periodic review for guidance
4	Performance evaluation for reappointment to 5 th and 6 th probationary years
5	Periodic review for guidance
6	Performance evaluation for tenure consideration

Probationary Faculty Members on a Five-Year Tenure Cycle:

Probationary faculty members in this category will receive an initial appointment of two years with one year credit towards tenure; their first year will be designated as their 2nd probationary year. They are expected to undergo performance evaluation in their 3rd, 5th, and 6th probationary years and periodic review in their 2nd and 4th probationary years. Normally the 3rd year performance evaluation is for reappointment consideration to the 4th-5th probationary years but, alternatively can be to only the 4th probationary year. In the latter case, a performance evaluation rather than periodic review will be required during the 4th probationary year. The 6th year performance evaluation is for tenure consideration.

Probationary Year Typical Schedule for Evaluations

Initial appointment is for two probationary years with one year credit towards tenure.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 2 | Periodic review for guidance |
| 3 | Performance evaluation for reappointment to 4th and 5th probationary years |
| 4 | Periodic review for guidance |
| 5 | Performance evaluation for reappointment to a 6th probationary year |
| 6 | Performance evaluation for tenure consideration |

Probationary Faculty Members on a Four-Year Tenure Cycle:

Probationary faculty members in this category will receive an initial appointment of two years with two years credit towards tenure; their first year will be designated as their 3rd probationary year. During their first year (3rd probationary year) they will undergo periodic review. In the 4th and 5th probationary years they will be subject to performance evaluation for reappointment to an additional probationary year. The 6th year performance evaluation is for tenure consideration.

Probationary Year Typical Schedule for Evaluations

Initial appointment is for two probationary years with two years credit towards tenure.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 3 | Periodic review for guidance |
| 4 | Performance evaluation for reappointment to a 5th probationary year |
| 5 | Performance evaluation for reappointment to a 6th probationary year |
| 6 | Performance evaluation for tenure consideration |

Probationary Faculty Members Starting Winter or Spring Quarter:

Probationary faculty members in this category will receive an initial appointment for winter/spring or spring quarter plus two complete academic years (WS or S / FWS / FWS) which will be designated as the first two years of a six year probationary cycle.

Pursuant to the faculty unit contract and the College of Science and Mathematics Personnel Document, no evaluation will be conducted during the late start academic year. A periodic review will be conducted in their first full probationary year and a performance review during their second full academic year as part of our normal procedures for reappointment of tenure-track faculty members.

They are expected to undergo performance evaluations in their 2nd 4th and 6th probationary years and periodic reviews in their 1st, 3rd and 5th probationary years. Normally, the 2nd and 4th year performance evaluations are for reappointment consideration to the 3rd-4th and 5th-6th probationary years respectively but, alternatively, can be for only one additional probationary year. If reappointment is for one additional probationary year, a performance evaluation rather than periodic review will be required during that probationary year. The 6th year performance evaluation is for tenure consideration.

Probationary Year Type of Evaluation

Initial appointment for winter/spring or spring quarter plus two complete academic years (WS or S / FWS / FWS); this seven or eight quarter period is designated as the first two years of a six year probationary cycle.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 | Winter or Spring Start: No Evaluation |
| 1 | Periodic review for guidance |
| 2 | Performance evaluation for reappointment to 3rd and 4th probationary years |
| 3 | Periodic review for guidance |
| 4 | Performance evaluation for reappointment to 5th and 6th probationary years |
| 5 | Periodic review for guidance |
| 6 | Performance evaluation for tenure consideration |

V. **Periodic Review of Probationary Faculty Members**

Periodic review is an opportunity to provide mentoring and guidance verbally and in writing to probationary faculty members. It is not a performance evaluation and does not result in a personnel decision. Evaluators at all levels are encouraged to direct their written comments primarily to the faculty member rather than to subsequent levels of review.

A. Materials for Review

1. **First Periodic Review:** Probationary faculty members must check their Personnel Action File for completeness and accuracy. They must prepare a Working Personnel Action File with the following materials:
 - **Teaching Materials:** Course syllabus, exams and quizzes, and significant or representative prepared materials from each lecture and laboratory course during the first quarter(s) at Cal Poly
 - **Student Evaluations and Grades Assigned:** Faculty members must begin the tables tabulating student evaluations and grading patterns that will be required for each performance evaluation. Numerical student evaluations on a 4.0 scale (4.0 highest) are required for every lecture and lab section for the question describing overall instructor evaluation. Graded courses or labs are to be reported in percents of A, B, C, D, F / WU, and W / I
 - **Resume, Teaching and Professional Statements Submitted with Application Materials for Appointment:** It is not necessary to submit revised documents as evaluators will provide guidance for presentation of these for the first performance review
2. **Second and Third Periodic Reviews:** The faculty member will submit the Part 1 binder of the Working Personnel Action file (described in the Appendix) from the previous year's performance evaluation with the following modifications:

Part 1 Binder of the Working Personnel Action File

- **Updated Resume**
- **Student Evaluations and Grades Assigned:** Faculty members must continue to update the tables of student evaluations and grading patterns that are required for each performance review
- **Professional Plan:** Report progress on the professional plan for teaching, professional development, and service
- **Response:** Response to any major concerns or suggestions from the previous performance review

B. Levels of Review (for Periodic Review of Probationary Faculty Members)

Following are the responsibilities at each level of review. Results of subsequent levels of review may be forwarded to previous levels of review.

At each level of review the recommendation/response will be provided to the candidate who will be given a 10 day response period [10 calendar days, excluding the first day and including the last, unless the last day is a holiday or weekend]. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall accompany the WPAF and also be sent to all previous levels of review (Art. 15.5, MOU).

1. Department Peer Review Committee

The Department Peer Review Committee for periodic review of probationary faculty members consists of at least three members of the tenured* faculty elected** by the probationary and tenured faculty.

*A tenured Associate Professor may serve on an Assistant Professor's periodic review PRC, even if the tenured Associate Professor is undergoing their 3rd year Associate Professor periodic review. They may not, however, serve on another Associate Professor's 3rd year periodic review, or on a full professor's post tenure review.

**The tenured and probationary faculty may vote on each eligible PRC member for each candidate, or on the PRC as a whole. The vote may be determined by simple majority.

Committee members will review the Personnel Action File (this will contain the resume, teaching philosophy, and professional plan from the previous performance evaluation) and Working Personnel Action File (Part 1) and perform any other appropriate reviews. Based on these reviews, the committee will produce a single document that provides evaluative and guidance comments that will be useful to the faculty member in pursuing the probationary years and preparing for the next performance evaluation. Guidance on the professional plan is an important part of the peer review. The elected committee is not required to report to the tenured faculty at large.

2. Department Chair

The department chair (except in the Physics Department where the department chair is not a separate level of review) will have the same responsibilities as the Department Peer Review Committee and provide additional evaluation and guidance statements from the chair's perspective or further explain or support the evaluation of the department peer review committees.

3. Dean

The dean will have the same responsibilities as the Department Peer Review Committee and provide additional evaluation and guidance statements from the dean's perspective or endorse the reviews generated at the department level.

VI. **Performance Evaluation: Evaluation Criteria and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion**

A. Application for Personnel Action

See Section IV.A. Early tenure or early promotion is considered only under extraordinary conditions of performance and achievement.

B. Personnel Action File and Working Personnel Action File

Candidates for reappointment, tenure, or promotion will prepare materials for evaluation as described in this section.

1. Personnel Action File

The Personnel Action File is the official employment record of a faculty member and is maintained in the dean's office. It generally contains:

- Initial Appointment: original appointment materials including resume, teaching and professional development statements, and the letter of offer and acceptance
- Materials from Periodic Reviews and Performance Evaluations: Generally this includes part 1 of the Working Personnel Action File (see Appendix A), written evaluations and recommendations from each level of review, and the document describing the final action (performance evaluations)
- Student Evaluations: numerical results as required by this document
- Other Significant Documents: special and important documents of both a positive and negative nature

The candidate may examine his/her Personnel Action File for accuracy and completeness, and sign and date the log prior to the commencement of personnel action and the university deadline. Any required modifications should be requested of the dean well in advance of the time that the file is to be made available to evaluators. After the stated deadline, the file will be considered to be complete.

2. Working Personnel Action File (for Performance Evaluation)

The Working Personnel Action File is a special file used during a specific personnel action cycle. The candidate must develop a Working Personnel Action File which contains materials important to the evaluation of the candidate for personnel action including: Part 1 (small binder provided by the College) - current resume, teaching philosophy, professional plan (for teaching, professional development, and service), student evaluations, grading summaries, and Part 2 (larger binder) supporting materials in teaching, professional development and service. A comprehensive outline for developing the Working Personnel Action File is presented in Appendix A. Other materials may be requested by the dean in the memo initiating a personnel cycle. Specific requests from the department level must be approved by the dean and included in the dean's initiation memo.

Performance Evaluation Continued

The professional plan is an especially important part of the Working Personnel Action File. Criteria for personnel action in the College of Science and Mathematics are purposefully general. They are applied to each faculty member via the faculty member's individual professional plan that is developed to demonstrate career-long commitment in teaching, professional development with external validation, and active service and participation in the University community. The plan is evaluated as to whether or not it is an appropriate guide towards tenure and promotion and thus serves as the faculty member's own personalized set of criteria.

The Working Personnel Action File will be submitted by the faculty candidate by the prescribed deadline and considered to be complete at that time. An index of materials contained in the file will be submitted with the Working Personnel Action File for eventual inclusion in the Personnel Action File. By this reference, the Working Personnel Action File will be considered to be incorporated into the Personnel Action File. Materials, other than evaluation and related documents generated during the process, cannot be added to either file following the deadline except in unusual circumstances and with authorization by the College Peer Review Committee. Such authorization may be based on information not accessible prior to the deadline.

Evaluation materials and recommendations generated at each level of review will be transmitted to subsequent levels via the Working Personnel Action File.

C. Levels of Review (for Performance Evaluation)

Following are the responsibilities at each level of review. Results of subsequent levels of review may be forwarded to previous levels of review.

At each level of review the recommendation/response will be provided to the candidate who will be given a 10 day response period [10 calendar days, excluding the first day and including the last, unless the last day is a holiday or weekend]. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall accompany the WPAF and also be sent to all previous levels of review (Art. 15.5, MOU).

In addition to their carefully documented recommendation, department PRCs, department chairs, college PRCs and deans shall submit a ranking of those promotion applicants who were positively recommended at their respective level.

1. Department Peer Review Committee

The Department Peer Review Committee for evaluating candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will be comprised of tenured faculty members elected* by probationary and tenured faculty members (MOU 15.38). For each promotion candidate the peer review committee members must have a higher rank than those being considered for promotion. Faculty members being considered for promotion may not serve on promotion or tenure PRCs (MOU 15.40).

Generally all eligible faculty members are expected to participate on all department peer review committees unless not elected, cannot serve because of a conflict of interest (such as evaluation of a close relative), or, for other reasons, choose not to serve (for example, associate professors who may not feel comfortable making a retention or tenure recommendation on a full professor).

Performance Evaluation Continued

For reappointment and tenure reviews, DPRC members [and the department chair] must be full-time tenured faculty employees; may be of any rank. For promotion reviews DPRC members [and the department chair] must have higher academic rank than those being considered for promotion.

* The tenured and probationary faculty may vote on each eligible DPRC member for each candidate, or on the DPRC as a whole. The vote may be determined by simple majority. **The Committee has the following responsibilities.**

- a. **Review of Submitted Materials:** Each committee member will carefully review the candidate's submitted materials and qualifications by examining the:
 - **Personnel Action File** with emphasis on materials generated by levels of review subsequent to the Department Peer Review Committee in a previous year's personnel action and before.
 - **Working Personnel Action File** including resume, teaching philosophy, student evaluations, grading patterns, professional plan, responses to previous evaluations, and materials submitted for examination.
- b. **Direct Observation of Teaching:** *The Committee will arrange for visitation of classroom and laboratory teaching of each candidate for the purpose of evaluation of teaching effectiveness.*
- c. **Evaluation Responsibilities:** *The Committee will produce a single written performance evaluation for the candidate in the areas of teaching, professional development, and service which includes strengths, accomplishments, guidance, and suggestions for improvement. This report will also include evaluation of the professional plan. In producing evaluations, the criteria in section VI.D. must be considered and commented upon as appropriate. The evaluative statement should include the following:*
 - **Teaching:** In addition to other comments the Committee chooses to include, the written evaluation should address the appropriateness of course content, organization, and level; course materials including the course syllabus; quality of presentation; quality, level, and appropriateness of exams and evaluation methods; comments on grade distributions; and comments on student evaluations.
 - **Professional Development:** Professional achievements should be evaluated and validated so that those in subsequent levels of review can understand the significance of the achievements.

- **Service:** Report and evaluate participation in department responsibilities. Evaluate contributions in terms of active involvement, achievement, leadership, and level of service (department, college, and university level). Comment on involvement in the campus community and participation in events important to the department, college, and university.
- **Review of the Professional Plan:** The Committee will review and evaluate the professional plan in teaching, professional development, and service, provide guidance as necessary. For probationary faculty members working towards tenure, the Committee will make a definitive statement as to whether the professional plan is appropriate for eventual achievement of tenure. For the performance evaluation of a candidate for associate professor, the Committee will provide evaluation and guidance on the submitted professional plan for eventual promotion to professor. For the performance evaluation of a candidate for full professor, the Committee will evaluate and provide guidance on the submitted professional plan in teaching, professional development, and service from the standpoint of its demonstrated commitment to career-long teaching effectiveness, a productive professional program capable of external validation, and a record of active service and participation in the University community. See Appendix A, Part 1F for details on the professional plan.

For each candidate for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, the Department Peer Review Committee will select a subcommittee to produce the written evaluation (it is permissible to use the same subcommittee for all candidates). It is the responsibility of the entire Department Peer Review Committee to ensure that the candidate's qualifications have been seriously considered. The subcommittee must provide a reliable and substantive process for gathering information and evaluative input from the Department Peer Review Committee prior to writing the evaluation. This can be accomplished by soliciting written comments (these will not become part of the Working Personnel Action File or Personnel Action File) and/or scheduling discussion meetings.

The subcommittee must produce a written evaluation for each candidate that can be supported by a majority of the Department Peer Review Committee. It is required that the Department Peer Review Committee meet as a group to discuss, propose changes, and approve the written evaluation. Minority reports are permissible from individuals or groups within the Department Peer Review Committee who do not agree with the Committee report. DPRC members must sign the DPRC report or a minority report.

Recommendation on Proposed Action: The Department Peer Review Committee must recommend for or against the proposed action by voting. The numerical results of the vote must be reported as for, against, or abstain. The votes of individual Committee members are not reported. The Department Peer Review Committee will provide each candidate with a copy of the Committee evaluation and recommendation for the required response period. The Committee will consider any responses received and may revise its evaluation and recommendation. The final recommendations with the files will be forwarded to the next level of review, the department chair. The DPRC must rank candidates it positively recommends for promotion.

2. Department Chair

The department chair will oversee the entire department review process to ensure that required actions are accomplished according to schedule and in a fair and equitable manner.

The department chair is a separate level of review (except in the Physics Department where the chair is a member of the Department Peer Review Committee) with responsibilities that are essentially the same as the Department Peer Review Committee. In addition to the materials submitted by the candidate, the department chair will consider the evaluation and recommendation of the Department Peer Review Committee and any responses by the candidate.

The campus "Faculty Personnel Actions – Cal Poly, SLO" document, approved 9/1/2009, stipulates 'Department Chairs must use Form AP109 (Faculty Evaluation Form) to evaluate faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure. Comments regarding student evaluations must be included in section 1 of AP109.'

The department chair will provide each candidate with a copy of the evaluation/recommendation for the required response period. The chair is encouraged to share the recommendation with the department peer review committee during this response period if the evaluation/recommendation is substantially different. The chair will consider any responses received and may revise the evaluation and recommendation. The final chair level recommendations with the files will be forwarded to the next level of review. The department chair must rank candidates he/she positively recommends for promotion.

3. College Peer Review Committee

The College Peer Review Committee will evaluate and make recommendations on faculty members who are candidates for tenure and promotion. In fulfilling its functions the Committee has the responsibility to determine whether evaluations at preceding levels by each department have been carried out responsibly and in accordance with College criteria (section VI.D.).

- a. **Election of the College Peer Review Committee:** The probationary and tenured faculty in each department will elect one tenured full professor to serve on the College Peer Review Committee. The elected faculty members will not participate in any other levels of review in tenure or promotion actions.
- b. **Evaluation Responsibilities:** The College Peer Review Committee will review the Personnel Action File and Working Personnel Action File of each tenure and promotion candidate including evaluation and recommendation materials forwarded from previous levels of review and any responses and rebuttals received. Based on this review and considering the criteria stated in section VI.D. of this document and the previously submitted professional plans of the candidate, the committee will generate an evaluation statement for each candidate covering teaching, professional growth and development, service, and participation in the University community.

[College Peer Review Committee Continued]

- c. **Evaluation of Professional Plans for the Future:** For the performance evaluation of a candidate for associate professor, the Committee will provide evaluation and guidance on the submitted professional plan for eventual promotion to professor. For the performance evaluation of a candidate for full professor, the Committee will evaluate and provide guidance on the submitted professional plan in teaching, professional development, and service from the standpoint of its demonstrated commitment to career-long teaching effectiveness, a productive professional program capable of external validation, and a record of active service and participation in the University community. See Appendix A, Part 1F for details on the professional plan.
- d. **Recommendation:** The committee will recommend for or against the action under consideration and report the vote as for, against, or abstain. The votes of individual Committee members are not reported. The committee will provide a written report with substantiating reasons. Written evaluations by individual committee members (minority report) are authorized in cases where agreement cannot be reached on the content of the committee report. CPRC members must sign the CPRC report or a minority report. The College Peer Review Committee will provide each candidate with a copy of the evaluation/recommendation for the required response period. The College Peer Review Committee is encouraged to share the recommendation with previous levels of review during this response period if the evaluation/recommendation is substantially different. The committee will consider any responses received and may revise its evaluation and recommendation. The final recommendations with the files will be forwarded to the next level of review, the dean, with a ranking of those promotion applicants who were positively recommended by the CPRC.

4. **College Dean**

The dean will prepare evaluations and recommendations on each candidate for reappointment, tenure, and promotion after reviewing the Personnel Action File, Working Personnel Action File, and evaluations and recommendations from previous levels of review including any responses and rebuttals received. The dean's report will include evaluative statements regarding the candidate's performance in teaching, professional growth and development, service, participation in the University community, and the candidate's professional plan. The dean will make a recommendation for or against the action under consideration.

For probationary faculty members working towards tenure, the dean will make a definitive statement as to whether the professional plan is appropriate for eventual achievement of tenure. For the performance evaluation of a candidate for associate professor, the dean will provide evaluation and guidance on the submitted professional plan for eventual promotion to professor. For the performance evaluation of a candidate for full professor, the dean will evaluate and provide guidance on the submitted professional plan in teaching, professional development, and service from the standpoint of its demonstrated commitment to career-long teaching effectiveness, a productive professional program capable of external validation, and a record of active service and participation in the University community. See Appendix A, Part 1F for details on the professional plan.

The dean will provide each candidate with a copy of the evaluation and recommendation for the required response period. The dean is encouraged to share the recommendation with previous levels of review during this response period if the evaluation/recommendation is substantially different. The dean will consider and act upon, as appropriate, any responses received and then forward the evaluations and recommendations with the files and all priority rankings to the next level, the vice-president for academic affairs and the president.

5. President and Provost

At the time of approval of this document, by university policy, the Provost makes decisions on reappointment, tenure and promotion.

D. Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

Tenure is the most important of all personnel actions. It is an expression of confidence in a faculty member's intellect, creativity, initiative, work ethic, and career-long value to Cal Poly. It presumes a loyalty and responsibility on the part of the faculty member to the University, students, and curriculum. With tenure comes the expectation that a faculty member will, during his or her career, accomplish a body of work in teaching, professional development, and service that is of recognizable value and importance and which constitutes a meaningful contribution to the mission of the University. Tenure expresses a belief in the future and the role of the tenured faculty in shaping it. Achieving tenure is an honor and privilege, an accomplishment of tremendous significance and with it come responsibilities and expectations of immense importance to the University.

When a faculty member is awarded tenure, it is with the expectation that the capability exists of meeting the requirements for full professor at some timely point during her or his career. A full professor is an effective and respected teacher who has a sustainable, career-long, creative professional development program, and who demonstrates thoughtful leadership in issues of shared governance including personnel decisions, curriculum and pedagogy development, utilization of resources, and matters of student welfare and success.

The faculty also has expectations of the State of California and the California State University. Prime among them is the responsibility to provide compensation commensurate with the responsibilities and expectations for achievement of the faculty and the resources required to fulfill these responsibilities and expectations successfully.

Following are criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The statements on teaching, professional development, and service are intended to provide a college philosophy which should be applied with flexibility and appreciation for differences in ideas, approaches, and contributions.

[Section VI.D. Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Continued]

The professional plan is an especially important part of the Working Personnel Action File. Criteria for personnel action in the College of Science and Mathematics are purposefully general. They are applied to each faculty member via the faculty member's individual professional plan that is developed to demonstrate career-long commitment in teaching, professional development with external validation, and active service and participation in the University community. The plan is evaluated as to whether or not it is an appropriate guide towards tenure and promotion and it thus serves as the faculty member's own personalized set of criteria.

Teaching

Teaching and promoting student learning and success are the most important responsibilities of a faculty member and this category is weighted most heavily in periodic reviews and performance evaluations. In evaluating teaching performance, many modes of instruction are recognized including classroom, laboratory, integrated lecture/laboratory courses, non-traditional courses, and supervision of student projects and research. Peer review, classroom visitations, student evaluations, and examination of course materials are among the methods to be used in assessing teaching performance. Quality performance is expected in the various aspects of teaching including the following:

Engagement and Guidance of Students in Learning

- Involvement of students in learning by inspiration: lecture or laboratory course content and delivery
- Involvement of student in learning by incentive: assignments and exams
- Guiding students to take responsibility for learning
- Engaging curiosity, imagination, creative and critical thinking in students
- Supervision of student projects and research.

Course Organization

- Informative and complete course syllabus
- Content appropriate to course objectives and level
- Effective organization and scheduling of topics, projects, papers, exams, and other assignments and methods of evaluation

Course Presentation

- Effective pedagogy
- Effective presentation techniques
- Clarity of expression
- Effectiveness in guiding student learning
- Satisfying intellectual experience for students

[Section VI.D. Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Continued]

Laboratory Teaching

- Respect for the hands-on, laboratory-intensive curriculum at Cal Poly and the resources required including instructor and technical staff salaries, operating expense, instrumentation, and facilities
- Effective use of the entire laboratory period of instruction
- Effective instructor interaction with students during laboratory sessions
- Quality of intellectual experience
- Quality of lab lectures and discussions
- Effective use of evaluation schemes such as lab reports and quizzes

Evaluation of Student Performance

- Quality and effectiveness of evaluation methods and instruments
- Application of high but reasonable and appropriate standards
- Assignment of grades appropriate to the course, students, and university standards

Promoting Student Success

- Acceptance of the responsibility of the College of Science and Mathematics to academically orient and foster success of new students from all colleges as most (especially those in the polytechnic majors) take their initial courses at Cal Poly in the College of Science and Mathematics
- Orienting and guiding students to academic success in all courses at all levels of the curriculum
- Fostering faculty/student interactions and providing student access to instructor
- Advising and mentoring of students
- Commitment to students and their personal and academic growth
- Promoting student success in all aspects of teaching

Contributions to the Curriculum

- Willingness to teach in all levels of the curriculum appropriate to the faculty member's expertise
- Respect for general education, support, major and elective courses and willingness to contribute in each area
- Contributions to curriculum and pedagogy development

Professional Development

Faculty members are expected to initiate, develop, and maintain career-long, creative professional development programs. These programs should be effective in maintaining connection, involvement, excitement, and life-long learning in one's field(s). Collaborative efforts involving students, such as in undergraduate research, are especially valued as are collaborative pursuits with faculty colleagues within departments and across the college and university.

[Section VI.D. Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Continued]

Many forms of professional development are encouraged including those presented in the Carnegie Foundation report *Scholarship Reconsidered: the Scholarships of Teaching, Discovery, Integration, and Application*. It is recognized that professional pursuits change and evolve during a career and could involve more than one of the following:

- The Scholarship of Teaching: involves not only transmitting knowledge, but transforming and extending it as well
- The Scholarship of Discovery involves research focused on contributing to the stock of human knowledge
- The Scholarship of Integration involves the work of interpreting, drawing together, and bringing new insight to original research
- The Scholarship of Application involves using knowledge and new research discoveries to solve problems

Professional development programs are expected to demonstrate external validation. External validation can take many forms including refereed publications, receipt of competitive grants, invited and competitively accepted papers/presentations, national or regional publication of educational materials such as textbooks and software, significant leadership activities in professional societies, and productive collaborations with the public or private sector.

Service

An engaged and committed faculty is essential to the strength and vitality of the university community. All faculty members are expected to engage in meaningful service activities in a way that emphasizes active involvement, achievement, and leadership. Service can be at the department, college, and university level and career or discipline related service in the community.

It is important for all faculty members to participate in service at the department level and be active participants in department affairs including governance, decision-making, and committee work, all of which are essential to the strength and development of the department and the personal growth and success of students, the staff, and members of the faculty. Every faculty member should make meaningful contributions in service to the department throughout their careers.

Expectations in service increase with experience and rank. Tenured associate and full professors are expected to contribute periodically at the college and university levels and exhibit increasing levels of leadership and accomplishment.

Faculty members are expected to become involved members of the campus community and participate in activities such as seminars and colloquia, academic orientation and advising of students, fall conference, commencement, functions of student clubs and honor societies, and other important events at the department, college, and university levels.

VII. **College of Science and Mathematics Voting Procedure for Prioritizing Candidates for Appointment and Promotion**

Appointment: In tenure track recruitments, if there are multiple finalists for one position it is necessary to rank the finalists.

Ranking must be done in a way that ensures integrity of the process. Preliminary categorizations such as “acceptable”, “maybe”, and “not acceptable” are permitted to simplify the final ranking process. Final rankings must be determined by the aggregate majority process as described in the following paragraph.

A ballot is conducted for the first position. If no one receives greater than 50% of the vote, the candidate(s) who are not part of an aggregate majority are eliminated and another ballot is taken on the remaining candidates. (An aggregate majority is the smallest set of candidates who together have over half of the votes, and each of whom has more votes than any individual not in the aggregate majority). The process is repeated until a candidate receives a majority vote. The second place is determined in a like manner and so on until all positions have been determined.

Promotion: In promotion actions a priority list is required. The aggregate majority method for ranking as described in this section is required for determining the priority order. If previous levels of review have prepared promotion priority lists, these will be considered as recommendations in preparing the promotion priority list. A candidate's personal ranking will be revealed to the candidate verbally upon request, with copies to the Working Personnel Action File only if the request is in writing and placement in the file is specifically requested.

VIII. **Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty Members**

A. *Periodic Review of Newly Promoted Tenured Associate Professors*

The purpose of this periodic review is to evaluate progress and provide mentoring to associate professors in their quest to achieve promotion to full professor.

When a faculty member is awarded tenure, it is with the expectation that the capability exists of meeting the requirements for full professor at some timely point during her or his career. Tenure expresses a belief in the future and the role of the tenured faculty in shaping it. Achieving tenure is an honor and privilege, an accomplishment of tremendous significance and with it come responsibilities and expectations of immense importance to the University. A full professor is an effective and respected teacher who has a sustainable, career-long, creative professional development program, and who demonstrates thoughtful leadership in issues of shared governance including personnel decisions, curriculum and pedagogy development, utilization of resources, and matters of student welfare and success.

Frequency of Evaluation

Normally, tenured associate professors become eligible for consideration for promotion to full professor during their fifth year in rank. Tenured associate professors will be subject to periodic review during fall quarter of their third year in rank to review progress and performance on the proposed professional plan in teaching, professional development, and service for promotion to full professor from the standpoint that it demonstrates commitment to career-long teaching effectiveness, a productive professional program capable of external validation, and a record of active service and participation in the University community. Early promotion is considered only under extraordinary conditions of performance and achievement. Tenured associate professors who do not achieve timely promotion to full professor must undergo post tenure periodic evaluation every five years (following the previously mentioned periodic review in their 3rd year in rank) using the procedure in VII.B.

1. Materials for Examination

Personnel Action File: The personnel action file will be provided by the dean's office after the faculty member has had the opportunity to check it for completeness and accuracy.

Working Personnel Action File: This file is to be initiated and submitted by the faculty member under review. It should contain materials described in Appendix A, Part 1, Sections A through G to include: Index of materials, current resume (distinguish new work as associate professor), summary table of grades assigned as associate professor, summary table of student evaluation results as associate professor, statement of teaching philosophy and approach, professional plan, and any needed response to evaluation for promotion to associate professor. Selected materials from Part 2 of Appendix A should also be included. As a minimum, course materials from representative courses taught during the first two years as associate professor should be made available for examination.

2. Levels of Review:

Following are the responsibilities at each level of review. Results of subsequent levels of review may be forwarded to previous levels of review.

At each level of review the recommendation/response will be provided to the candidate who will be given a 10 day response period [10 calendar days, excluding the first day and including the last, unless the last day is a holiday or weekend]. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall accompany the WPAF and also be sent to all previous levels of review (Art. 15.5, MOU).

Department Peer Review Committee

The Department Peer Review Committee is composed of all eligible tenured full professors of the department elected by the tenured faculty. It is acceptable to have subcommittees (minimum three members) do an in-depth review of submitted materials (*entire DPRC must review and sign signature logs in PAF and WPAF*) and write evaluative statements on the appropriateness of the professional plan and performance in teaching, professional development (including opportunities for external validation), and service for eventual promotion to full professor. It is required that the findings and statements of these subcommittees are shared with the entire Department Peer Review Committee of full professors and that a discussion meeting is held for input, comment, and approval.

Department Chair

The department chair is a separate level of review (except in the Physics Department) with responsibilities identical to those of the Department Peer Review Committee.

Dean

The dean may make additional evaluative statements or endorse those of the previous levels of review.

B. Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty Members

The purpose of periodic review of tenured faculty members is to ensure that the ideals and responsibilities of tenure are respected and faithfully pursued by each member of the tenured faculty, and to provide constructive feedback to assist tenured faculty members in fulfilling their responsibilities throughout their careers as described in the following statement:

Tenure is an expression of confidence in a faculty member's intellect, creativity, initiative, work ethic, and career-long value to Cal Poly. It presumes a loyalty and responsibility on the part of the faculty member to the University, students, and curriculum. With tenure comes the expectation that a faculty member will, during his or her career, accomplish a body of work in teaching, professional development, and service that is of recognizable value and importance and which constitutes a meaningful contribution to the mission of the University. Tenure expresses a belief in the future and the role of the tenured faculty in shaping it. Achieving tenure is an honor and privilege, an accomplishment of tremendous significance and with it come responsibilities and expectations of immense importance to the University.

Frequency of Evaluation

Tenured faculty members shall be subject to periodic review at least every five years*. The periodic review process will be replaced by a performance evaluation if the faculty member is being considered for promotion. Policies and procedures for performance evaluation are described in Section VI. Periodic reviews are performed to ensure maintenance and improvement of a tenured faculty member's effectiveness in teaching, professional growth, and service.

*Third year Associate Professor periodic review re-starts five year count.

1. Materials for Evaluation: Personnel Action and Working Personnel Action File

Tenured faculty members subject to periodic evaluation will establish a Working Personnel Action file by submitting an updated and current resume, a personal statement which focuses on activities and accomplishments during the previous five years in teaching, professional development, and service and a professional plan that demonstrates commitment to career-long teaching effectiveness, a productive professional program capable of external validation, and a record of active service and participation in the University community including events important to the department, college, and university. In addition, a summary table of student evaluations and of grading patterns is to be submitted (see Appendix A, Part 1 C and D for format). The resume, professional plan and student evaluations and grading summaries will become part of the Personnel Action File at the end of the review. The faculty member should ensure that sufficient materials are available for a meaningful evaluation such as course materials from representative courses and examples of professional accomplishment (see Appendix A, Part 2 for guidance).

2. Levels of Review

Following are the responsibilities at each level of review. Results of subsequent levels of review may be forwarded to previous levels of review.

At each level of review the recommendation/response will be provided to the candidate who will be given a 10 day response period [10 calendar days, excluding the first day and including the last, unless the last day is a holiday or weekend]. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall accompany the WPAF and also be sent to all previous levels of review (Art. 15.5, MOU).

Department Peer Review Committee

The Committee is composed of tenured full professors of the department elected by the tenured faculty. It is acceptable to have subcommittees actually review submitted materials (*entire DPRC must review and sign signature logs in PAF and WPAF*) and write evaluative statements. The evaluation should address performance in teaching, professional development, and service and the appropriateness of the professional plan from the standpoint of its demonstrated commitment to career-long teaching effectiveness, a productive professional program capable of external validation, and a record of active service and participation in the University community including events important to the department, college, and university. It is required that the findings and statements of these subcommittees be shared with the entire Department Peer Review Committee in a discussion meeting for input, comment, and approval.

Department Chair

The department chair is a separate level of review (except in the Physics Department) with responsibilities identical to those of the Department Peer Review Committee.

Dean

The dean can make additional evaluative statements or endorse those of the previous levels of review.

IX. Evaluation of Lecturers

Lecturers are essential and valued members of the faculty of the College of Science and Mathematics. Teaching is the main responsibility of Lecturers and likewise the primary focus of annual evaluations. The professional responsibilities of all faculty members including Lecturers include scholarly activities which contribute to their currency and their contributions to the classroom and their profession. Teaching effectiveness, a firm understanding of the teaching and learning process and currency in the subject matter of teaching assignments are expected. Educational attainment and experience are considered in making appointments and teaching assignments.

A. Periodic Evaluation of Part-Time and Full-Time Lecturers

Frequency of Evaluation

Full-time Lecturers and part-time Lecturers teaching two or more quarters in an academic year must be evaluated annually.

Full-time Lecturers and part-time Lecturers teaching two or more quarters in an academic year for five consecutive years will be evaluated during the fifth year using criteria and procedures in Section IXB.

Three Year Lecturers – Temporary faculty members holding three year appointments (per MOU article 12) must be evaluated at least once during the term of their appointment, (generally during 2nd year of 3-year appointment) and may be evaluated more frequently at the request of the employee or President (or Dean as designee).

Full-time Lecturers and part-time Lecturers teaching only one quarter in an academic year must be evaluated annually for the first two years and, at a minimum, at least every other year thereafter. The Lecturer or department may request more frequent reviews.

1. Materials for Evaluation

Lecturers should inspect the Personnel Action File for completeness and accuracy before the evaluation process begins.

Lecturers will develop a Working Personnel Action File that will serve to characterize the teaching responsibilities of the faculty member. The Working Personnel Action File shall include:

- **Current Resume:** The resume should be organized according to original education preparation, previous experience, and activities and accomplishments in teaching, professional growth and development, and service as appropriate. See Appendix A Section 1B for guidance.

Evaluation of Lecturers Continued

- **Grading Patterns:** Summary of grades assigned in all courses taught during the evaluation period. For continuing Lecturers, an on-going table should be kept and included for the time in employment or, for long term Lecturers, at least the previous five years. See Appendix A, Part 1C for format.
- **Student Evaluations:** Student evaluations summary for all courses evaluated during the evaluation period. For continuing Lecturers, an on-going table should be kept and included for the time in employment or, for long term Lecturers, at least the previous five years. See Appendix A, Part 1D for format and section XI for frequency and procedure
- **Course Materials for Examination:** For courses that characterize the Lecturer's teaching assignments, submit course materials including course syllabi, handouts, and exams. See Appendix A, Part 2A for guidance.
- **Other Materials:** If relevant, materials that characterize activities in professional development and service should be submitted. See Appendix A, Part 2 B-D for guidance.

2. Levels of Review

Following are the responsibilities at each level of review. Results of subsequent levels of review may be forwarded to previous levels of review.

At each level of review the recommendation/response will be provided to the candidate who will be given a 10 day response period [10 calendar days, excluding the first day and including the last, unless the last day is a holiday or weekend]. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall accompany the WPAF and also be sent to all previous levels of review (Art. 15.5, MOU).

Department Peer Review Committee

Department peer review committee participation is required in the evaluation of full-time, full-year Lecturers; it is optional with part-time Lecturers, although the opportunity must be provided for peer input (by full-time tenured faculty members). It is required for full-time Lecturers and part-time Lecturers teaching two or more quarters in an academic year for five consecutive years during the fifth consecutive year (see criteria and procedures in Section IXB).

The department peer review committee is composed of tenured faculty members elected by the probationary and tenured faculty. It is recommended that the committee be three tenured faculty members with the opportunity for input from the probationary and tenured faculty.

The Department Peer Review Committee will prepare a written evaluation (using the format in part 3 of this section) based on the Personnel Action File and Working Personnel Action File and any other appropriate reviews.

Department Chair

The department chair will participate in evaluations of Lecturers. The chair can be the sole departmental evaluator for part-time Lecturers except in the fifth year for those teaching five consecutive years with two or more quarters per year (See Section IXB). The department chair will review the Personnel Action File and Working Personnel Action File and perform any other appropriate reviews such as classroom visitation and interview of the candidate. Based on this review, the department chair will write an evaluative statement (using the format in part 3 of this section) or endorse the statement of the peer review committee.

Dean

The dean can make additional evaluative statements or endorse those of the previous levels of review.

3. *Evaluation Format*

Evaluators should use the following format for evaluation of Lecturers and provide statements under each of the following categories that validate the appropriateness of materials and performance, or provide guidance for needed improvement. The format is devised to provide efficient and effective evaluation and guidance.

- Comments on Course Syllabus and Course Materials
- Comments on Grading Schemes and Grade Assignments
- Comments on Course Content and Level, and Level/Difficulty of Exams
- Analysis of Student Evaluation Results
- Comments on Teaching Performance
- Other Comments as Applicable (such as professional accomplishments and service)

B. Lecturer Range Elevation and Lecturers in Fifth Consecutive Year Appointment: Criteria and Procedures

Application

The evaluation of Lecturers applying for Lecturer Range Elevation and Lecturers in fifth (5th) consecutive year of appointment will follow the procedures described in this section.

Criteria for Evaluation

Lecturers will be evaluated according to the category or categories (teaching, professional development, service) relevant to the assignment.

Expectations in all areas of evaluation increase with rank.

Continuous improvement in performance and currency in the discipline as described in the following paragraphs are critical criteria.

- **Educational Preparation:** Normally, the following degrees relevant to the discipline are required for appointment: for Lecturer L, a bachelor's degree; for Lecturer A, a master's degree; and for Lecturers B, C, and D, a Ph.D. Examples of evidence of continuous improvement and currency in the discipline under this category include earning an appropriate advanced degree, earning credit for advanced coursework, taking a professional leave, or performing additional and relevant research in the discipline.
- **Teaching:** Lecturers must demonstrate evidence of sustainable excellence in teaching, currency in the discipline, ability to teach at appropriate levels of the curriculum and continuous improvement in performance.
 - **Excellence in Teaching:** Evidence includes strong student and peer evaluation profiles, high quality course syllabi and materials, appropriate use of technology, and appropriate levels of student learning and success. Excellence in teaching is characterized by a learning environment that fosters excitement and curiosity, critical and creative thinking, and intellectual stimulation and development. Course topics and materials should be current and challenging, appropriate in scope and level, and show a thoughtful balance between theory and application. Academic standards consistent with the mission of the University are expected as is a classroom atmosphere and teaching approach that encourages student engagement and success. See section VI.D. on Teaching for additional evaluative criteria.
 - **Currency in the Discipline:** Evidence could include making significant contributions to the curriculum such as incorporating current topics and relevant material into courses, engaging students with innovative pedagogies, and developing new and modern laboratory experiences. Currency can also be established by presenting at educational conferences and workshops, publication of textbooks and other educational materials, or publishing in peer reviewed education journals.

- **Ability to Teach at Appropriate Levels of the Curriculum:** Lecturers in Range L or A are normally expected to teach at the lower levels of the curriculum. Lecturers in Ranges B, C, and D are expected to have the expertise to increasingly teach more fully in the curriculum including upper division lecture and laboratory courses.
- **Continuous Improvement in Performance:** Increasing excellence in teaching, currency in the discipline, and ability to teach at appropriate levels of the curriculum are expected.
- **Professional Growth:** Lecturers are normally employed to support the teaching function of the College. A documented and continuing professional development program with external validation though desirable is not normally required for advancement. In some cases, Lecturers can be appointed to a position that includes teaching and professional development. In these cases, evaluation for range elevation involves both teaching and professional development. Success in professional development is normally demonstrated by external validation. External validation can take many forms including refereed publications, receipt of competitive grants, invited and competitively accepted papers/presentations, national publication of educational materials such as textbooks and software, leadership activities in professional societies, and productive collaborations with the public or private sector.) See section VI.D. on Professional Development for additional evaluative criteria.
- **Service:** Active and productive service strengthens a Lecturer's case for appointment or advancement but is not normally required unless specified in the appointment.

Materials for Submission

Personnel Action File: Lecturers should inspect the Personnel Action File for completeness and accuracy before the evaluation process begins.

- **Current Resume:** See Appendix A, Part 1B for guidance. The resume should be organized according to original education preparation, previous experience, and activities and accomplishments in teaching, (and professional growth and service as appropriate). The resume should be specific, include dates, and emphasize activities completed during employment at Cal Poly and specifically during the period within the current Lecturer range or for 12.12 appointment.
- **Grading Patterns:** Summary of grades assigned in all courses each quarter during the current range (or for at least the previous five years). See Appendix A, Part 1C for format.
- **Student Evaluations:** Table should include all years, or at least the previous five years). See Appendix A, Part 1D for format and section XI for frequency and procedure
- **Course Materials for Examination:** For courses that characterize the Lecturer's teaching assignments, submit course materials including course syllabi, handouts, and exams. See Appendix A, Part 2A for guidance.

- **Case for Advancement and Professional Plan:** It is important to prepare a well organized case for appointment to a sixth year or for range elevation that demonstrates growth and achievement consistent with the **category or categories (teaching, professional development, service) relevant to the assignment**. In addition, a professional plan must be presented that describes future plans for growth and continuous improvement as well as sustainability of effort and contribution.
- **Other Materials:** Materials that characterize activities in professional development and service should be submitted as appropriate. See Appendix A, Part 2 B-D for guidance.

Evaluation Process

Following are the responsibilities at each level of review. Results of subsequent levels of review may be forwarded to previous levels of review.

At each level of review the recommendation/response will be provided to the candidate who will be given a 10 day response period [10 calendar days, excluding the first day and including the last, unless the last day is a holiday or weekend]. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall accompany the WPAF and also be sent to all previous levels of review (Art. 15.5, MOU).

1. Department Peer Review Committee

The Department Peer Review Committee will be comprised of tenured faculty members elected by probationary and tenured faculty members. Generally all eligible faculty members are expected to participate on all department peer review committees unless not elected, cannot serve because of a conflict of interest (such as evaluation of a close relative), or, for other appropriate reasons.

The Department Peer Review Committee has the following responsibilities:

- a. **Review of Submitted Materials:** Each committee member will carefully review the candidate's submitted materials and qualifications by examining the:
 - **Personnel Action File**
 - **Working Personnel Action File** including resume, teaching philosophy, student evaluations, grading patterns, case for advancement, professional plan and materials submitted for examination.
- b. **Direct Observation of Teaching:** The Committee will arrange for and ensure visitation of classroom and laboratory teaching of each candidate for the purpose of evaluation of teaching effectiveness.
- c. **Recommendation on Proposed Action:**
For each candidate, the Department Peer Review Committee will select a subcommittee to produce the written evaluation (it is permissible to use the same subcommittee for all candidates). It is the responsibility of the entire Department Peer Review Committee to ensure that the candidate's qualifications have been seriously considered. The subcommittee must provide a reliable and substantive process for gathering information and evaluative input from the Department Peer Review Committee prior to writing the evaluation. This can be accomplished by soliciting written comments (these will not become part of the Working Personnel Action File or Personnel Action File) and/or scheduling discussion meetings.

The subcommittee must produce a written evaluation for each candidate that can be supported by a majority of the Department Peer Review Committee. Minority reports are permissible from individuals or groups within the Department Peer Review Committee who do not agree with the Committee report. DPRC members must sign the DPRC report or a minority report.

The Department Peer Review Committee must recommend for or against the proposed action by voting. The numerical results of the vote must be reported as for, against, or abstain. The votes of individual Committee members are not reported. The Department Peer Review Committee will provide each candidate with a copy of the Committee evaluation and recommendation for the required response period. The Committee will consider any responses received and may revise its evaluation and recommendation. The final recommendations with the files will be forwarded to the next level of review, the department chair.

2. Department Chair

The department chair will oversee the entire department review process to ensure that required actions are accomplished according to schedule and in a fair and equitable manner.

The department chair is a separate level of review (except in the Physics Department where the chair is a member of the Department Peer Review Committee) with responsibilities that are essentially the same as the Department Peer Review Committee. In addition to the materials submitted by the candidate, the department chair will consider the evaluation and recommendation of the Department Peer Review Committee and any responses by the candidate.

The department chair will provide each candidate with a copy of the evaluation/recommendation for the required response period. The chair is encouraged to share the recommendation with the department peer review committee during this response period if the evaluation/recommendation is substantially different. The chair will consider any responses received and may revise the evaluation and recommendation. The final chair level recommendations with the files will be forwarded to the next level of review.

3. College Peer Review Committee

- a. **Election of the College Peer Review Committee:** See Section VI.C.3. Normally this is the same College Peer Review Committee elected for tenure and promotion cases in an academic year.
- b. **Evaluation Responsibilities:** The College Peer Review Committee will review the Personnel Action File and Working Personnel Action File of each candidate including evaluation and recommendation materials forwarded from previous levels of review and any responses and rebuttals received. Based on this review, the committee will generate an evaluation statement for each candidate.

- c. **Recommendation:** The committee will recommend for or against the action under consideration and report the vote as for, against, or abstain. The votes of individual Committee members are not reported. Written evaluations by individual committee members are authorized in cases where agreement cannot be reached on the content of the committee report. The College Peer Review Committee will provide each candidate with a copy of the evaluation/recommendation for the required response period. The College Peer Review Committee is encouraged to share the recommendation with previous levels of review during this response period if the evaluation/recommendation is substantially different. The committee will consider any responses received and may revise its evaluation and recommendation. The final recommendations with the files will be forwarded to the next level of review, the dean.

4. College Dean

The dean will make a determination to grant or deny Lecturer Range Elevation with a statement of rationale after reviewing the Personnel Action File, Working Personnel Action File, and evaluations and recommendations from previous levels of review including any responses and rebuttals received. The dean will provide each candidate with a copy of the determination and evaluation for the required response period. The dean is encouraged to share the recommendation with previous levels of review during this response period if the evaluation/recommendation is substantially different. The dean will consider and act upon, as appropriate, any responses received and either confirm or modify the determination or evaluation.

X. Evaluation of Teaching Associates

A. Appointment

Appointment of Graduate Teaching Associates will be made by the dean based on recommendations by the department chair. Recommendations and appointments will be made of graduate students who are determined to have the interest, knowledge, and potential ability to be good instructors.

B. Training and Mentoring Program

Departments will provide a required training program for Graduate Teaching Associates which will be completed prior to commencement of teaching duties. Among topics to be covered are course content, preparation of a course syllabus, teaching methods and techniques, course assignments and exams, grading and evaluation, grading procedures and patterns, and other academic content and delivery issues. For Teaching Associates with laboratory assignments, safety issues will be carefully covered. Proper relationships with students will also be a required topic. Teaching Associates will be assigned a faculty member or course coordinator who will serve as a monitor, consultant, and mentor. The Teaching Associate and mentor/coordinator will meet weekly (the meetings can be less frequent for experienced Teaching Associates).

C. Evaluation

Periodic evaluations of Teaching Associates are performed by the department chair (or designee) and are based on classroom performance, course materials including course syllabus and exams, grading patterns, and student evaluations which must be performed in every course, every term. Informal inspection and evaluation using the materials described above are normally expected each term. Formal written evaluations will be provided annually for submission to the dean.

Evaluation material is normally due from the Teaching Associate by the end of the fourth week of the quarter in which evaluations are conducted. A draft evaluation will be provided for review five (5) days before being placed in the personnel action file. The Teaching Associate will be given opportunity to meet and discuss the draft evaluation within ten (10) days of requesting a meeting. Teaching Associates shall have 14 days to submit a written rebuttal or response to accompany the final evaluation submitted to the dean for inclusion in the personnel action file. A copy will be provided to the Teaching Associate within 5 days after placement in personnel file. (CSU-UAW CBA Article 8) The College of Science and Mathematics Personnel Policies, Procedures and Evaluation Criteria are available on our website at: cosam.calpoly.edu/faculty_staff_information/index.htm.

XI. Student Evaluations

A. Form

Numerical Portion: The student evaluation program will consist of numerical ratings and written responses by students. Departments may devise their own forms with appropriate and reasonable questions. All forms must provide the student the opportunity to provide an overall rating of the faculty member.

Written Portion: Students will also be given the opportunity to provide written comments on student evaluations.

B. Frequency

Following is the frequency for conducting student evaluations for inclusion in Personnel Action Files. Faculty members have the responsibility to ensure that student evaluations incorporated into their Personnel Action Files effectively represent the types of teaching assignments they receive.

1. **Probationary Faculty Members:** all teaching assignments every quarter. No more than one teaching assignment can be excluded.*
2. **Tenured Associate Professors:** all teaching assignments at least two quarters per academic year.*
3. **Tenured Full Professors and FERPs:** all teaching assignments for one representative quarter per academic year which must include a minimum of two courses
4. **Lecturers:** all teaching assignments every quarter. No more than one teaching assignment can be excluded.*
5. **Teaching Associates:** all teaching assignments every quarter

*Exceptions can be made in courses with such low enrollments (such as independent study, senior projects) where student anonymity would be compromised.

C. Procedure for Conducting Student Evaluations

Each department will prepare evaluation packets for faculty members. The packets will contain sufficient evaluation forms for the class enrollment and instructions for the student monitors conducting the evaluation. Evaluations will be conducted no earlier than the last week of classes. The faculty member will select a student(s) to distribute and collect forms in the class or lab and transport them to the department office or designated collection location as described by instructions in the evaluation packet. Preferably, the faculty member should leave the room during the process. If this is not possible (such as evaluations being submitted during an exam or for safety reasons in a lab) the completed forms should be submitted to the student monitor in a place where the faculty member cannot see the responses.

D. Review of Student Evaluation Results

The department chair will review the numerical result and peruse the written student comments of the student evaluations performed in the department each quarter. Departments can develop processes for examining and summarizing student comments.

Campus "Faculty Personnel Actions – Cal Poly, SLO" document, approved 9/1/2009, stipulates: 'Department Chairs must use Form AP109 (Faculty Evaluation Form) to evaluate faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure. Comments regarding student evaluations must be included in section 1 of AP109.'

E. Placement of Student Evaluation Results in Personnel Action Files

The numerical results of required student evaluations will be placed in a faculty member's Personnel Action File with a copy to the faculty member. Numerical student evaluation results beyond those required will be placed in the Personnel Action File by request of the faculty member.

XII. Professional Leaves

A. Application

Applicants for professional leaves, either sabbatical or difference in pay leaves, should prepare the application using appropriate university forms, with consideration of the guidelines for professional leave applications presented in this section, and with submission by announced deadlines.

B. Department Review

A professional leave committee of tenured faculty members will be elected by the probationary and tenured faculty. Applicants for professional leaves cannot serve on the committee. The committee will recommend for or against the leave based on the quality of proposal. The department chair makes a recommendation for or against the leave based on the ability of the department to offer the curriculum and meet student needs in the absence of the faculty member. If the department chair is a professional leave applicant, the department committee will make this judgment.

C. Department Review

The probationary and tenured faculty members of each department will elect a representative to the College Professional Leave Committee. The College Professional Leave Committee will review the applications for sabbatical and difference in pay leaves, interview the applicants, and recommend for or against each based on quality of proposals. Applicants should be recommended to the dean in categories such as recommend enthusiastically, recommend, recommend with reservations, not recommended.

D. Final Decision:

The dean recommends candidates to the provost who makes the final decision.

E. Guidelines for Professional Leave Applications

The foremost consideration for any professional leave is its potential benefit to the university.

Leaves with pay are intended to provide a benefit to the university through research, scholarly and creative activity, instructional improvement, or faculty retraining. Lower priority will be given to leaves for other purposes unless the applicant can demonstrate significant potential benefits to the university or show a significant relationship of the activities to research or scholarship.

Proposals will be reviewed on scientific merit and potential benefit to the university. The proposal should show thoroughness of planning and clearly present the following information

- A detailed description of the proposed plan including a justification of the time requested.
- Supporting documentation from sponsors or hosts for the applicant or the proposed project.
- Statement of benefit which will accrue to the university, to the applicant's professional development and/or to the students.
- Applicant's background in relation to the project.
- Urgency of the proposed leave in relation to the university's program or mission.

In the case of all other considerations being equal, the review committees may consider other factors including: weighing the benefits of collaborations, giving preference to applicants with fewer or no professional leaves and giving preference to projects that can lead to continued and sustainable increase in collaboration, research, scholarly or creative activity. Preference will be given to applications that appear to have a high probability of completion.

Appendix A: Working Personnel Action File

Outline for Faculty Members Preparing Working Personnel Action Files

PART 1: Index of Materials, Resume, Summary Table of Grades Assigned, Summary Table of Student Evaluation Results, Statement of Teaching Philosophy and Approach, Professional Plan, and Response to Previous Evaluations.

Please place these materials in the small 3-ringed binder with each section well identified with tabs.

A. Index of Materials

B. Resume: Please provide a full professional resume using the following outline, distinguishing work accomplished prior to appointment at Cal Poly from Cal Poly accomplishments, beginning with most recent.

- 1. Educational Preparation: higher education since high school**
- 2. Employment: since Ph.D. unless prior employment is relevant**
- 3. Teaching Related Activities:**
 - Courses taught (prefix, number, title, quarters)
 - Honors/Awards
 - Special contributions to the curriculum, course coordination
 - Undergraduate research and senior projects (list grants, presentations, publications in the next section "Professional Development Activities")

4. Professional Development Activities:

a. Publications

- Publications: List under "Publications" only those actually published, in press, or accepted for publication. Under each compose a short description that unambiguously addresses the following:
- Date of Work: Distinguish work done at Cal Poly from work done prior to arrival at Cal Poly. For example, a publication from a Ph.D. dissertation based solely on work done at the graduate institution but dated in the journal subsequent to arrival at Cal Poly should not be attributed to work done at Cal Poly. A publication that is from prior work but with significant enhancement at Cal Poly can be listed as work at Cal Poly with proper explanation. For associate professors being considered for promotion to professor, it is important to indicate accomplishments resulting from work performed since promotion to associate professor. For example, a paper accepted for publication while an assistant professor but with a publication date after promotion to associate professor should not be counted as an accomplishment while in rank of associate professor. However, any manuscript submission (and subsequent acceptance for publication) that occurs after a faculty member has submitted their materials for promotion would be used in consideration for their next promotional step.
- Journal: Briefly describe the type of journal (affiliation, peer-reviewed, etc)
Authors: Clearly identify Cal Poly student co-authors and indicate whether they are graduate or undergraduate students. Identify other co-authors (title, institution, relationship) and the extent of collaboration. Describe your role in the work.
- Manuscripts: List manuscripts in the categories of "Manuscripts Submitted" (indicate journal and date of submission) or "Manuscripts In-Preparation" (indicated projected date for submission).
- Educational Materials: This section is for textbooks and other educational materials. Provide date of publication and publisher. If textbook is under contract but not yet published, indicate the expected date of publication.
- Project and Technical Reports: Reports on work done for a company, government agency, or professional laboratory should be listed in this category.
- Articles: This category should contain non-refereed articles.

b. Presentations

- External Presentations
- Date of Work: Distinguish work presented from that done at Cal Poly as opposed to work completed prior to arrival at Cal Poly. Similarly, distinguish work done as assistant professor from that done as associate professor (see guidelines under publications).
- Type: Distinguish among talks, posters, and symposia.
- Professional Meeting: Indicate the venue of the presentation such as national or regional professional society meeting, invited or refereed, presentation at another university, and date.
- Presenter(s): When listing a presentation with multiple authors, indicate who actually did the presentation, identify the co-authors, and especially identify Cal Poly students and indicate whether they are undergraduate or graduate.
- Proceedings and Abstracts: A pre-conference abstract probably should not be listed as a publication. A substantial and refereed article in a conference proceedings publication might qualify as a publication.
- Short Courses and Workshops: Give title or description of the workshop, whether on- or off-campus, and if the presentation is to a mostly external constituency. Provide dates, location, and approximate number of participants.
- Cal Poly Presentations: On-campus professional presentations to members of the campus community should be listed but done so separately. Examples would be department seminars and student presentations of research you mentored at the CSM Student Research Conference. Guest lecturers in Cal Poly classes generally would not be listed.
- Community Presentations: A community presentation related to your discipline and expertise should be listed here.

c. Grants and Contracts

- External: List each grant or contract separately and identify the date, purpose, source, and amount. Describe your role: PI, researcher, and relative proportion of the grant in which you participated or are participating. Identify other PI's/participants. Are Cal Poly students involved? Distinguish graduate and undergraduate and give names.

- Grant Applications: List external grant applications and submission dates that were not funded on which you were a PI or co-PI.
 - Internal: List internal grants received such as the State Faculty Support Grants.
- d. **Professional Honors and Leadership Activities:** Please list and describe awards from professional organizations and leadership activities such as officer in a professional society or journal editor.
- e. **Other:** Please list any other important activities that are part of your accomplishments under professional development.
5. **Service:** This is the primary documentation of service. Arrange as best describes your contributions. A common organization uses the headings of department, college, university, professional, community. Please include evidence of your participation in the University community such as in attending/organizing seminars and colloquia, academic orientation and advising of students, fall conference, commencement, functions of student clubs and honor societies, and other important events at the department, college, and university levels.

C. Summary Table of Grades Assigned: Please develop and keep up to date annually a summary table for the entire period in rank for graded courses and labs in which you were responsible for assigning student grades for official student transcripts. Grades should be reported in percents in the following format. Reporting course gpa is optional.

Year and Quarter	%	%	%	%	%	%
Course (prefix and number)	A	B	C	D	F/WU	W/I

D. Summary Table of Student Evaluation Results: Please develop and keep up to date annually a summary table for the entire period in rank of student evaluation scores. Please report by year and quarter and by course/lab (prefix and number; be sure to distinguish lab from lecture/studio courses). Report the score (indicate point base; most departments are 4.00) for the overall instructor rating.

E. Statement of Teaching Philosophy and Approach: In this essay, describe the role you have established for yourself in teaching, guiding students in the learning process, and promoting student success.

F. Professional Plan: The professional plan is an especially important part of the Working Personnel Action File. Criteria for personnel action in the College of Science and Mathematics are purposefully general. They are applied to each faculty member via the faculty member's individual professional plan that is developed to demonstrate career-long commitment in teaching, professional development with external validation, and active service and participation in the University community. An approved plan is a faculty member's own personalized set of criteria for tenure and promotion and thus provides security as one pursues such goals. The plan may undergo change as long as the final achievements are reasonably comparable to those proposed and previously approved and/or clearly appropriate for tenure or promotion.

In the professional plan the faculty member should propose significant achievements in the areas of evaluation: teaching professional development, and service. Teaching and professional development should be the emphasis for assistant professors with the expectation of increasing levels of service for associate and full professors.

Professional plans should be presented in two sections.

Section 1: One page (or two).

This section concisely lists proposed achievements for tenure and/or promotion in teaching, professional development, and service. The prospective achievements should be described with reasonable specificity for a diverse audience, but need not be fully explained. This part will be read by many evaluators at all levels, some without expertise in the discipline (for example, the College Peer Review Committee has representatives from each department and the School of Education). Here are some examples:

Teaching

- Teach introductory course sequence X,Y,Z.
- Teach upper division courses T, U, and V.
- Professional growth in teaching by attending (suggest meetings, workshops), consulting with colleagues etc.
- Develop/improve lab experiments for course C.
- Join committee to study content (amount/level) and student success in first year course sequence.
- Contribution to the curriculum.

Professional Development

Using a Research Example: Each research project should be described with a title and one to two short sentences and the journal(s) likely to be targeted for eventual publication including a possible title. This is followed by a brief description of how the achievement will be pursued such as establishing a student research group, seeking grant support, and involving students and the faculty member in presentations at professional meetings. The plan can include a timeline but this is not necessary. Following is an example. This should be done for each distinct research proposal.

Determination of the Influence of AB on YZ

Possible journal: *The Journal of Alphabetical Influences*

Possible title: *Influence of AB on YZ under the Conditions of TUV*

Short Paragraph (a couple of sentences here describing the research as much as possible for a diverse audience).

Brief outline of plan for pursuit of the achievement such as:

- Establish a student research group and/or collaboration with colleagues.
- Seek internal and/or external grant funding throughout from the following proposed granting agencies.
- Involve students in the College of Science and Mathematics Student Research Conference..
- Student/faculty presentations at regional and/or national professional meeting.
- Publication.

Service (This particular example is more focused on assistant professors; associate and full professors would add examples to these that enhance level of service.)

- Attend commencement and Fall Conference each year.
- Serve on department committee (give name)
- Become academic advisor
- Participate in Summer Advising and Academic Day of Week of Welcome.
- Participate in New Student Day of Open House.

Section 2: (Multiple pages okay)

In section 2, you can elaborate on your proposed achievements in teaching, professional development, and service. This is important as the department peer review committee needs to fully understand the pursuits and be able to validate them as worthy and reasonable. This does not have to be written for a diverse audience and should be more complete than what is described in Section 1.

G. Case for Tenure/Promotion: It is important to prepare a well organized case for tenure and/or promotion in teaching, professional development, and service, and a professional plan for the future. The case should demonstrate growth and achievement in rank and the professional plan should demonstrate sustainability of effort and continued growth and achievement in the future.

Achievements: Usually one or two pages.

This section concisely lists achievements under the headings of teaching, professional development, and service. The achievements should be described with reasonable specificity, but need not be fully explained. Organize so the achievements are obvious and not lost in verbiage explaining the activity. This part will be read by many evaluators at all levels, some without expertise in the discipline.

Teaching: List major achievements like those expressed in Section F, professional plan.

Professional Development: Using research as an example. List manuscripts accepted or published with journals, co-authors (and who they are), your role, date of publication. Provide the same type of information with grants (including amount), presentations and other activities. It is okay to list manuscripts submitted (not necessary) but not in preparation as they will be part of your plan for the future. See other parts of this appendix for more information on expressing professional achievements.

Service: List items like those expressed in Section F, professional plan. Provide dates.

Professional Plan for the Future

If you are being considered for promotion to associate professor, you should write a professional plan leading to promotion to full professor. If you are being considered for promotion to full professor, or you are a full professor being considered for tenure, you should write a professional plan for the first five years following the advancement. Guidelines for expressing a professional plan are in the previous section (Appendix A, section F).

H. Response to Previous Evaluations: A response should be made to a significant suggestion, statement of guidance, or criticism that was made in the previous year's evaluation cycle.

Part 2: Materials for Examination in Teaching, Professional Development, and Service.

Please submit these materials in a separate medium to large three ring binder with sections well identified with tabs. Hard copies of these materials are requested. Special materials adequately appreciated only electronically can be submitted with a website address or CD (consult with your department chair about the logistics of viewing the CD with a dedicated computer or multiple copies).

A. Teaching:

Retention Candidates: For each different lecture, studio, or laboratory course taught in the previous year, submit a complete set of materials, specifically: syllabus including grading scheme, quizzes, and all exams including the final exam. If there are other materials you think would be useful to examiners that you would like to present, such as sample handouts, representative power points, description of website etc. please do include these. In addition, please submit the materials for courses taught in previous years that differ from those of the past probationary year; use the most recent example only.

Tenure, Tenure and Promotion, or Promotion Only Candidates: For those up for tenure or promotion, please submit the above materials for teaching assignments representative of your service in rank or for the previous five years (for example, if you have taught multiple sections of a course, submit materials for only a single experience).

B. Professional Development: Please submit examples of achievements as practical and appropriate. For example, copies of publications are usually helpful. Submitting a textbook is cumbersome but acceptable; alternatively, a copy of the cover and a short section like the introduction or preface may give evaluators an idea of the work. Complete grant applications are not necessary but the introductory or summary statement is helpful.

C. Service: If there is something significant you would like to share that supports the entries in Part 1, please do so.

D. Other: Some faculty members wish to submit the comments from their student evaluations. If you wish to and it can be done reasonably in this second binder, please feel free to do so. If they are likely to make this second binder large, cumbersome, and difficult to navigate, please use an exclusive third binder.

Appendix B: Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) Composition, Election and Duties Table

Summary of DPRC Sections of CSM Personnel Document

Review Type	DPRC Composition	Elected by	Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) Responsibilities
<p>Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty</p> <p>[Associate Professor 3rd Year Periodic Review]</p>	<p>All eligible <u>tenured full professors</u>;</p> <p>Acceptable to select subcommittees (min 3) to do in-depth review of materials and write evaluative statements.</p> <p>Subcommittee findings and statements must be shared with entire DPRC in a discussion meeting for input, comment, and approval.</p>	<p>Tenured faculty [by simple majority]</p> <p>May vote on each eligible DPRC member for each candidate, or on DPRC as a whole.</p>	<p><u>Purpose of 3rd year associate professor periodic review:</u> Evaluate progress and provide mentoring in their quest to achieve promotion to full professor.</p> <hr/> <p><i>When a faculty member is awarded tenure, it is with the expectation that the capability exists of meeting the requirements for full professor at some timely point during her or his career. Tenure expresses a belief in the future and the role of the tenured faculty in shaping it. Achieving tenure is an honor and privilege, an accomplishment of tremendous significance and with it come responsibilities and expectations of immense importance to the University. A full professor is an effective and respected teacher who has a sustainable, career-long, creative professional development program, and who demonstrates thoughtful leadership in issues of shared governance including personnel decisions, curriculum and pedagogy development, utilization of resources, and matters of student welfare and success.</i></p> <hr/> <p>Evaluation should address performance in <u>teaching</u>, <u>professional development</u>, and <u>service</u> and appropriateness of <u>professional plan</u> from standpoint of demonstrated commitment to career-long teaching effectiveness, a productive professional program capable of external validation, and a record of active service and participation in university community including events important to department, college, and university. Subcommittee findings and statements must be shared with entire DPRC in discussion meeting for input, comment, and approval. <u>Entire DPRC must review (and sign signature logs) PAF and WPAF.</u></p>

Review Type	DPRC Composition	Elected by	Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) Responsibilities
<p>Periodic Review of Tenured Full Professors</p>	<p>Tenured full professors;</p> <p>Acceptable to select subcommittees (min 3) to do in-depth review of materials and write evaluative statements.</p> <p>Subcommittee findings and statements must be shared with entire DPRC in discussion meeting for input, comment, and approval.</p>	<p>Tenured faculty [by simple majority]</p>	<p><u>Purpose of periodic review of tenured faculty members:</u></p> <p>Ensure ideals and responsibilities of tenure are respected and faithfully pursued and provide constructive feedback to assist tenured faculty members in fulfilling their responsibilities throughout careers as described in following statement:</p> <hr/> <p><i>Tenure is an expression of confidence in a faculty member's intellect, creativity, initiative, work ethic, and career-long value to Cal Poly. It presumes a loyalty and responsibility on the part of the faculty member to the University, students, and curriculum. With tenure comes the expectation that a faculty member will, during his or her career, accomplish a body of work in teaching, professional development, and service that is of recognizable value and importance and which constitutes a meaningful contribution to the mission of the University. Tenure expresses a belief in the future and the role of the tenured faculty in shaping it. Achieving tenure is an honor and privilege, an accomplishment of tremendous significance and with it come responsibilities and expectations of immense importance to the University.</i></p> <hr/> <p>Evaluation should address performance in <u>teaching</u>, <u>professional development</u>, and <u>service</u> and <u>appropriateness of professional plan</u> from standpoint of its demonstrated commitment to career-long teaching effectiveness, a productive professional program capable of external validation, and a record of active service and participation in University community including events important to department, college, and university.</p> <p>Subcommittee's findings and statements must be shared with entire DPRC in discussion meeting for input, comment, and approval. Entire DPRC must review (and sign signature logs) PAF & WPAF).</p>
<p>General Periodic Review of Probationary Faculty</p>	<p>At least 3 tenured faculty members</p> <p>*A tenured associate professor may serve on an assistant professor's periodic review DPRC, even if tenured associate professor is undergoing their 3rd year associate professor periodic review. They may <u>not</u>, however, serve on another associate professor's 3rd year periodic review, or on a full professor's post tenure review.</p>	<p>Probationary & Tenured faculty [by simple majority]</p>	<p><u>Purpose of general periodic review:</u></p> <p>Provide mentoring and guidance verbally and in writing to probationary faculty members. It is not a performance evaluation and does not result in a personnel decision. Evaluators at all levels are encouraged to <u>direct written comments primarily to faculty member</u> rather than to subsequent levels of review.</p> <p>Produce single document - provide evaluative and guidance comments useful in pursuing probationary years and preparing for next performance evaluation. <u>Guidance on professional plan</u> is important part of peer review. Elected committee <u>not</u> required to report to tenured faculty at large.</p>

Review Type	DPRC Composition	Elected by	Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) Responsibilities
<p>General Performance Evaluation [Retention, Promotion, Tenure]</p>	<p><u>Tenured</u> faculty members.</p> <p>For each promotion candidate, DPRC members must have higher rank than candidates being considered for promotion.</p> <p>Faculty members being considered for promotion may not serve on promotion or tenure DPRCs (MOU 15.40).</p> <p>Generally all eligible faculty members expected to participate on all DPRCs unless not elected, conflict of interest (e.g. close relative), or, for other reasons, choose not to serve (e.g., associate professors not comfortable making retention or tenure recommendation on full professor).</p> <p>For <u>reappointment</u> and <u>tenure</u> reviews, DPRC members [and department chair] must be full-time tenured faculty employees; may be of any rank.</p> <p>For <u>promotion</u> reviews DPRC members [and department chair] must have higher academic rank than those being considered.</p>	<p>Probationary & Tenured faculty [by simple majority]</p> <p>* May vote on each eligible DPRC member for each candidate, or on DPRC as a whole.</p>	<p>Review Submitted Materials: Each DPRC member must carefully review candidate's submitted materials & qualifications by examining:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel Action File with emphasis on materials generated by levels of review <u>subsequent</u> to DPRC in previous year's personnel action and before. • Working Personnel Action File including resume, teaching philosophy, student evaluations, grading patterns, professional plan, responses to previous evaluations, and materials submitted. <p>Direct Observation of Teaching: <i>Committee arranged visitation of classroom and laboratory teaching for evaluation of teaching effectiveness [Must give at least 5 day notice of classroom visit and provide post visit consultation (15.14)].</i></p> <p>Evaluation Responsibilities: <i>Committee produces single written performance evaluation in areas of <u>teaching</u>, <u>professional development</u>, and <u>service</u> which includes strengths, accomplishments, guidance, and suggestions for improvement. Evaluation will include <u>evaluation of professional plan</u>. In producing evaluations, criteria in section VI.D. must be considered and commented upon as appropriate. Evaluative statement should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching: In addition to other comments committee chooses to include, written evaluation should address appropriateness of course content, organization, and level; course materials including course syllabus; quality of presentation; quality, level, and appropriateness of exams and evaluation methods; comments on grade distributions; and comments on student evaluations. • Professional Development: Professional achievements should be evaluated and validated so subsequent levels of review can understand significance of achievements. • Service: Report and evaluate participation in department responsibilities. Evaluate contributions in terms of active involvement, achievement, leadership, and level of service (department, college, and university level). Comment on involvement in campus community and participation in events important to department, college, and university. <p>Review Professional Plan: review and evaluate professional plan in teaching, professional development, and service, provide guidance as necessary.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">[General Performance Evaluation <i>continued next page</i>]</p>

Review Type	DPRC Composition	Elected by	Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) Responsibilities
<p>Continued: General Performance Evaluation [Retention, Promotion, Tenure]</p>			<p>[Continued: General Performance Evaluation [Retention, Promotion, Tenure]</p> <p>For <u>probationary faculty members working towards tenure</u>, make <u>definitive statement</u> as to whether <u>professional plan</u> is <u>appropriate</u> for <u>eventual achievement of tenure</u>.</p> <p>For <u>performance evaluation of a candidate for associate professor</u>, provide <u>evaluation</u> and <u>guidance</u> on <u>submitted professional plan</u> for <u>eventual promotion to professor</u>.</p> <p>For <u>performance evaluation of candidate for full professor</u>, <u>evaluate</u> and provide <u>guidance</u> on <u>submitted professional plan</u> in <u>teaching, professional development, and service</u> from standpoint of its <u>demonstrated commitment to career-long teaching effectiveness, a productive professional program capable of external validation, and a record of active service</u> and participation in University community. See Appendix A, Part 1F for details on professional plan.</p> <p>For each candidate for <u>reappointment, tenure, and promotion</u>, DPRC will <u>select</u> a <u>subcommittee</u> to produce written evaluation (<i>permissible to use same subcommittee for all candidates</i>).</p> <p>Responsibility of <u>entire DPRC</u>: ensure candidate's qualifications have been seriously considered. Subcommittee must provide reliable and substantive process for gathering information and evaluative input from DPRC prior to writing evaluation (can be accomplished by soliciting written comments however these will not become part of WPAF or PAF), and/or discussion meetings.</p> <p>Subcommittee must produce written evaluation for each candidate that can be supported by majority of DPRC. Required that DPRC <u>meet as group to discuss, propose changes, and approve written evaluation</u>. <u>Minority reports</u> permissible from individuals or groups within DPRC who do not agree with Committee report. <u>DPRC members must sign the DPRC report or a minority report</u>.</p> <p>Recommendation on Proposed Action: DPRC must recommend for or against proposed action <u>by voting</u>. <u>Numerical results of vote must be reported as for, against, or abstain</u>. Votes of individual committee members not reported. DPRC will provide each candidate with copy of evaluation and recommendation for required response period. Committee will consider any responses received and <u>may</u> revise evaluation and recommendation. Final recommendations with files will be forwarded to next level of review (department chair).</p> <p>DPRC must rank candidates it positively recommends for promotion.</p>

Review Type	DPRC Composition	Elected by	Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) Responsibilities
<p>Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor</p>	<p><u>Tenured</u> faculty members.</p> <p>For each <u>promotion</u> candidate, department peer review committee members [and department chair] must have higher rank than those being considered for promotion.</p> <p>Faculty members being considered for promotion may not serve on promotion or tenure PRCs (MOU 15.40).</p> <p>Generally all eligible faculty members expected to participate on all DPRCs unless not elected, cannot serve because of conflict of interest (e.g. evaluation of close relative), or, for other reasons, choose not to serve (e.g., associate professors not comfortable making retention or tenure recommendation on a full professor).</p> <p>For <u>reappointment</u> and <u>tenure</u> reviews, DPRC members [and the department chair] must be full-time tenured faculty employees; may be of any rank.</p>	<p>Probationary & Tenured faculty [by simple majority]</p> <p>* May vote on each eligible DPRC member for each candidate, or on DPRC as a whole.</p>	<p>Same as General Performance Evaluation (above)</p>

PRC General Notes:

Recommendation/response to candidate: Give 10 day response period [10 calendar days, excluding first day and including last, unless last day is holiday or weekend]. Copy of response or rebuttal to accompany WPAF and sent to previous levels of review (MOU 15.5). Other than reconsidering original recommendation, no response to rebuttal statements.

Classroom Visits: Must provide minimum 5 day notice that classes will be observed, and consultation between candidate and faculty evaluator required following classroom visit.

Promotion Actions: Rank ordered lists forwarded by departmental elected DPRC with evaluations.

DPRC Elections: Requirement for a vote by the tenured and tenure track faculty to elect RPT committees is per the faculty unit contract article 15.38: "The probationary and tenured faculty unit employees of the department or equivalent unit shall elect a peer review committee of tenured faculty unit employees for the purpose of reviewing and recommending faculty unit employees who are being considered for retention, award of tenure, and promotion. Probationary and tenured faculty unit employees shall elect tenured faculty unit employees to serve on higher level peer review committee(s). When there are insufficient eligible members to serve on the peer committee, the department shall elect members from a related academic discipline(s). At the request of a department, the President may agree to permit faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program to run for election for membership on any level peer review committee...."