

**AGENDA**  
Executive Committee Meeting  
CSUSM Academic Senate  
Wednesday ~ March 12, 2014 ~ Kellogg 5207 ~ 12-2 pm

- I. Approval of agenda
- II. Approval of minutes of 03/05/2014 meeting
- III. Chair's report, [Vivienne Bennett](#)
  - Referrals: NEAC Standing Rules: disposition of items removed from Consent Calendar
  - FAC Review of proposed CEHHS-SoN RTP policy revision
- IV. Provost's report, Graham Oberem
- V. Discussion items
  - A. NEAC Constitutional changes *attached*
  - B. FAC CEHHS RTP policy revision *attached*
  - C. BLP Moving Self-Support Academic Programs to State Support *attached*
  - D. EC Institutional Learning Objectives, Eisenbach/Meulemans ***Time certain 1:30***
  - E. FAC Post tenure review policy revision *attached*
  - F. Senate chair & vice chair terms
- VI. EC members' concerns & announcements

*Next meeting: March 19, 12-2 p.m. ~ Kellogg 5207*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

**Spring 2014**  
**Referendum on Amendments to the**  
**Constitution and Bylaws of the University Faculty and the Academic Senate**  
**California State University San Marcos**

**Wording and Explanation of the Proposed Amendments**

**Amendment 1: Number of student representatives on the Academic Policy Committee (APC)**

**Article 6.5: Academic Policy Committee (APC)**

The Academic Policy Committee shall consist of voting faculty members drawn from the eligible faculty. The eligible faculty of each college-level unit shall elect a representative from the eligible faculty of that college-level unit to serve as a member of the committee. One additional faculty member shall be elected by the eligible faculty to represent the faculty at large. The membership of the Academic Policy Committee shall also include as non-voting members the Associate Vice President for Academic Programs, the Dean of Graduate Studies & Associate Vice President for Research, the Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management Services, the Dean of Extended Learning or designee, and the Project and Degree Audit Coordinator. ~~One~~ **Two** student representatives appointed by the Associated Students Incorporated shall also be ~~a non-voting members~~ of this committee.

*Rationale: APC has noted that they would like to have the input of two student non-voting representatives to help the committee in its formulation of policies.*

**Amendment 2: Conflicts of Interest and Voting Membership on the Program Assessment Committee (PAC)**

**Article 6.11: Program Assessment Committee (PAC)**

The Program Assessment Committee shall consist of voting members drawn from the eligible faculty. The eligible faculty in each college-level unit shall elect representatives from the eligible faculty of their college-level unit to serve on the committee as follows: two faculty members from the College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences (one from a discipline in Humanities and Arts and one from a discipline in Behavioral and Social Sciences); two faculty members from the College of Education, Health and Human Services (one from Education and one from another discipline); and one faculty member from each of the other college-level units. One additional faculty member shall be elected by the eligible faculty to represent the faculty at large. The committee shall include as a non-voting member, the Dean of Graduate Studies and Associate Vice President for Research, a representative from the Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Programs, and the Learning Outcomes Assessment Fellow (or equivalent). **When a program from a committee member's department or associated program is under review, the member may engage in discussions about it, but shall be considered a non-voting member for the purposes of the review.**

*Rationale: PAC would like their current procedures for dealing with conflicts of interests to be included in the description of their committee.*

**Amendment 3: Update to Student Affairs Committee's Duties**

**Article 6.13.1: Student Affairs Committee Duties**

~~The Student Affairs Committee shall provide advice and recommend policy on all student issues including but not limited to policies and procedures related to academic environments, student government, student diversity, student organizations or activities, athletics, student discipline and welfare, student research competition, lottery grants, and matters concerning admissions, retention, advising, and commencement.~~ **Recognizing that the student experience is both academic and non-academic, the Student Affairs Committee shall be a bridge between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. SAC shall have general oversight to inform and advise policies and procedures related to student co-curricular and associated academic experiences while enrolled at CSUSM. Furthermore, the committee shall make recommendations to the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs. In pursuit of these duties, the committee may create ad hoc subcommittees.**

*Rationale: These changes in SAC's duties constitute a needed update to reflect the committee's current operations.*

56 **Amendment 4: Update to University Curriculum Committee Duties**

57  
58 **Article 6.14.1: University Curriculum Committee Duties**

59 The University Curriculum Committee shall have general oversight of all issues related to the review of proposed  
60 curriculum. The committee shall review stateside and self-supported proposals for new and revised curricula,  
61 courses, and degree programs, and teacher preparation programs and it shall make recommendations to the Senate  
62 regarding their approval. Through the review of proposed curriculum, the committee is charged with oversight for  
63 the academic soundness and quality of the curriculum. As directed by the Senate, the committee shall review  
64 articulation agreements with community colleges for consistency with established graduation requirements. ~~The~~  
65 ~~UCC, in collaboration with the Dean of Extended Learning, shall originate and review proposals affecting Extended~~  
66 ~~Learning.~~ In pursuit of these duties, the committee may create ad hoc subcommittees.

67  
68 *Rationale: The addition of language that points out that stateside and self-supported proposals related to curricula*  
69 *reflects the breadth of the current review process of UCC. The reference to the origination of proposals related to*  
70 *Extended Learning in conjunction with UCC is no longer accurate and needs to be removed from the listing of the*  
71 *committee’s duties.*

72  
73 **Amendment 5: Conflicts of Interest and Voting on Committees**

74  
75 **Article 7.1: Voting**

76 All decisions of the Faculty or the Academic Senate, their committees and subcommittees, shall be made by  
77 majority vote except where parliamentary procedure or the Constitution and the Bylaws specify otherwise.  
78 Each committee shall develop a definition of 'conflict of interest' for its committee's work per its charge, and shall  
79 develop a procedure for when conflict of interest exists. Committees shall include a provision in their procedures  
80 that those with a potential conflict must disclose it, and then if it is determined to be an actual conflict, they shall be  
81 prohibited from voting on any matter that relates to it. The vote shall be recorded as an abstention.

82  
83 *Rationale: Senate leadership has noted that it is important to add language related to conflicts of interest and*  
84 *committee voting.*

85  
86 **Amendment 6: Changes to the Constitution and Bylaws’ Description and Endnotes related to Faculty**  
87 **Membership**

88  
89 **Article 3: Faculty Membership**

90 Voting members of the Faculty shall consist of tenured and tenure-track persons holding faculty rank, library  
91 faculty, Student Services Professional-Academic Related faculty (hereafter, SSP-AR), and full-time temporary  
92 faculty holding at least one-year appointments in academic departments.<sup>1</sup> Faculty with the voting franchise shall be  
93 called eligible faculty.<sup>2</sup> ~~Persons with substantial managerial and supervisory responsibilities that involve faculty and~~  
94 ~~academic programs are excluded from membership. Persons holding MPP appointments are excluded.<sup>3,4,5</sup> Persons~~  
95 ~~with work assignments that are substantially similar to the duties and responsibilities of persons holding MPP~~  
96 ~~appointments are excluded.<sup>3,4,5</sup>~~

97  
98 **Endnotes**

99 1. Disputes shall be resolved by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

100  
101 2. See Article 2 of the current CBA for further information about the definition of faculty.

102  
103 ~~23. “MPP”-addressing~~ refers to the employment rights, benefits, and conditions of ~~The~~ CSU employees designated  
104 as 'management' or 'supervisory' under the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA). The  
105 Calif. Code of Regulations, Title 5.Education.Division 5: Board of Trustees of The CSU, Article 2.2: Management  
106 Personnel Plan uses definitions as specified in HEERA. Supervisory and managerial employee work assignments  
107 are described in HEERA.

108  
109 34. Article 6.5, Section 3580.3, of the HEERA California Government Codes Government Code, Section 3580.3  
110 states the following in regard to supervisory employees: "Supervisory employee" ~~...~~ means any individual,

111 regardless of the job description or title, having authority, in the interest of the employer to hire, transfer, suspend,  
112 lay off, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward, or discipline other employees, or responsibility to direct them, or  
113 to adjust their grievances, or effectively to recommend such action, if, in connection with the foregoing, the exercise  
114 of authority is not of a merely routine or clerical nature, but requires the use of independent judgment. With respect  
115 to faculty or academic employees, any department chair, head of a similar academic unit or program, or other  
116 employee who performs the foregoing duties primarily in the interest of and on behalf of the members of the  
117 academic department, unit or program, shall not be deemed a supervisory employee solely because of such duties....  
118 ~~Employees whose duties are substantially similar to those of their subordinates shall not be considered to be~~  
119 ~~supervisory employees.~~

121 45. Article 1, Section 3562, subsection (k) of the HEERA California Government Codes, states the following in  
122 regard to managerial employees, ~~Government Code, Section 3560-3562.1. Definitions: Section 3562 (1)–~~  
123 "managerial employee means any employee having significant responsibilities for formulating or administering  
124 policies and programs. No employee or group of employees shall be deemed to be managerial employees solely  
125 because the employee or group of employees participate in decisions with respect to courses, curriculum, personnel  
126 and other matters of educational policy. A department chair or head of a similar academic unit or program who  
127 performs the foregoing duties primarily on behalf of the members of the academic unit or program shall not be  
128 deemed a managerial employee solely because of those duties."  
129

130 ~~5. CBA 2002 contract, Article 20, Workload: Administrator as used in the CBA refers to an employee serving in a~~  
131 ~~position designated as management or supervisory in accordance with HEERA. The CBA provides further~~  
132 ~~definitions of faculty.~~

133  
134 ~~—"The primary professional responsibilities of instructional faculty members are: teaching, research, scholarship,~~  
135 ~~creative activity, and service to the University, profession and to the community. The performance of instructional~~  
136 ~~responsibilities extends beyond duties in the classroom and includes such activities as: preparation for class,~~  
137 ~~evaluation of student performance, syllabus preparation and revision, and review of current literature and research in~~  
138 ~~the subject area, including instructional methodology. Research, scholarship and creative activity in the faculty~~  
139 ~~member's field of expertise are essential to effective teaching. Mentoring students and colleagues is another~~  
140 ~~responsibility that faculty members are frequently expected to perform.~~

141  
142 ~~—The assignment of a librarian may include, but shall not be limited to, library services, reference services,~~  
143 ~~circulation services, technical services, online reference services, teaching in library subject matter, service on~~  
144 ~~system wide and campus committees and task forces and activities that foster professional growth, including~~  
145 ~~creative activity and research.~~

146  
147 ~~—The assignment of Counselor faculty may include, but shall not be limited to, individual counseling, group~~  
148 ~~counseling, consultation and referral, intern training and supervision, teaching, service on system wide and campus~~  
149 ~~committees and task forces and activities that foster professional growth, including creative activity and research.~~

150  
151 ~~Faculty members have additional professional responsibilities such as: advising students, participation in~~  
152 ~~campus and system wide committees, maintaining office hours, working collaboratively and productively with~~  
153 ~~colleagues, and participation in traditional academic functions."~~

154  
155 *Rationale: Article 3 language did not reflect the fact that Unit 3 employees with the title of Director are eligible*  
156 *voters. In addition, the endnotes need to be updated and streamlined in order to reflect proposed changes to the*  
157 *Article 3 language.*

## FAC: CEHHS - Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Standards

*Rationale: FAC approved the following changes to the CEHHS RTP Document. The changes update the document with correct program names and accrediting bodies.*

Definition: Standards governing RTP process for faculty in the College of Education, Health, and Human Services (CøEHHS).

Authority: The collective bargaining agreement between The California State University and the California Faculty Association.

Scope: Eligible CøEHHS faculty at California State University San Marcos.

### Procedure

#### I. CEHHS RTP STANDARDS

##### A. Preamble

1. This document sets forth general standards and criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion of full-time faculty in the School of Education (SoE), School of Nursing (SoN), Human Development Department (HD), and Kinesiology Department (KINE), Speech-Language Pathology Department (SLP) and Social Work Department (SW) as six as four distinct units within the College of Education, Health, and Human Services.
2. The provisions of this document are to be implemented in conformity with University RTP Policies and Procedures; the CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), Articles 13, 14, 15; and the University Policy on Ethical Conduct.
3. The College is guided also by the standards of the ~~National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)~~ Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), American Speech Language Hearing Association (ASHA), and the national accrediting agency for schools, colleges, and departments of education and California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). The College is additionally also guided by the standards for the SoN by the Board of Registered Nursing, the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN), and the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE). The college is additionally guided by the standards for Social Work by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE).

##### B. Definitions of Terms and Abbreviations

1. The CEHHS uses the same definitions, terms, and abbreviations as defined in the University RTP document. For clarity, the use of "is" is informative, "shall" is mandatory, "may" is permissive, "should" is conditional, and "will" is intentional.
2. A "standard" is a reference point or formalized expectation against which progress can be measured for retention, tenure, and promotion.

- 47 3. Faculty have a right to clearly articulated performance expectations. Departmental  
48 and School RTP Standards provide consistency in guiding tenure-track faculty in the  
49 preparation of their working personnel action files (WPAFs).
- 50 4. Departmental, and School RTP Standards educate others outside of the discipline,  
51 including deans, university committees, and the provost, with respect to the practice  
52 and standards of a particular department/discipline/field.
- 53 5. Departments and Schools must respect the intellectual freedom of their faculty by  
54 avoiding standards that are too prescriptive. Department and School standards should  
55 be as brief as possible with emphasis on the unique nature of the department.
- 56 6. All College, Department, and School RTP Standards shall conform to the CBA and  
57 University and School RTP documents. The SoE, SoN, HD, KINE, SLP and SW RTP  
58 Standards documents shall contain the elements of School/ Department RTP  
59 standards described in RTP documents for each unit and shall not repeat the CBA, or  
60 University RTP document, or include School-specific advice.
- 61 7. All College, Department, or School RTP Standards must be approved by a simple  
62 majority of all tenure-track faculty within a Department or School and then be  
63 approved by College/School/Department/ Library and the Academic Senate before  
64 any use in RTP decisions.

## 65 | **II. ELEMENTS OF THE SoE, SoN, HD, KINE, SLP and SW RTP DOCUMENTS**

### 66 | **A. Introduction and Guiding Principles**

- 67
- 68
- 69
- 70 1. All standards and criteria reflect the University and School/Department Mission and  
71 Vision Statements and advance the goals embodied in those statements.
- 72 2. The performance areas that shall be evaluated include scholarly teaching, scholarly  
73 research/creative activities, and scholarly service. While there will be diversity in the  
74 contributions of faculty members to the University, the School/Department affirms  
75 the university requirement of sustained high quality performance and encourages  
76 flexibility in the relative emphasis placed on each performance area. Candidates must  
77 submit a curriculum vita (CV) and narrative statements describing the summary of  
78 teaching, research/creative activity, and service for the review period. The faculty  
79 members must meet the minimum standards in each of the three areas.
- 80 3. Items assessed in one area of performance shall not be duplicated in any other area of  
81 performance evaluation. Items shall be cross-referenced in the CV, narrative  
82 statements, and WPAF to demonstrate connections across all three documents.  
83 Candidates who integrate their teaching, research/creative activities, and/or service  
84 may explain how their work meets given standards/criteria for each area.
- 85 4. The School/ Department recognizes innovative and unusual contributions (e.g.,  
86 supervising research, using particularly innovative or challenging types of pedagogy,  
87 writing or rewriting programs, grant writing, conference or community presentations,  
88 regional or national profile committee/commission membership, grant reviews,  
89 consultancy to community, curriculum development, assessment development,  
90 accreditation or other required report generation).
- 91 5. Retention, tenure, and promotion decisions are made on the basis of the evaluation of  
92 individual performance. Ultimate responsibility for understanding the standards,

- 93 meeting the standards, and effectively communicating how they have met the  
94 standards rests with the candidate. In addition to this document, the candidate should  
95 refer to and follow the University RTP Policies and Procedures. Candidates should  
96 also note available opportunities that provide guidance on the WPAF and describe the  
97 responsibilities of the candidate in the review process (e.g., Provost's RTP meetings;  
98 Faculty Center Professional Development, and advice and counsel by tenured  
99 faculty.) Candidates are encouraged to avail themselves of such opportunities.
- 100 6. Candidates for retention will show effectiveness in each area of performance and  
101 demonstrate progress toward meeting the tenure requirements in the areas of  
102 scholarly teaching, scholarly research/creative activities, and scholarly service.
- 103 7. Candidates for the rank of associate professor require an established record of  
104 effectiveness in scholarly teaching, scholarly research/creative activities, and  
105 scholarly service to the School/ Department and University.
- 106 8. Candidates for the rank of professor require, in addition to continued effectiveness, an  
107 established record of initiative and leadership in scholarly teaching, scholarly  
108 research/creative activities, and scholarly service to the School/ Department,  
109 University, community, and profession. Promotion to the rank of professor will be  
110 based on the record of the individual since promotion to the rank of associate  
111 professor.
- 112 9. The granting of tenure at any rank recognizes accomplishments and services  
113 performed by the candidate during the individual's career. The record must show  
114 sustained and continuous activities and accomplishments. The granting of tenure is  
115 an expression of confidence that the faculty member has both the commitment to and  
116 the potential for continued development and accomplishment throughout the  
117 individual's career. Tenure will be granted only to individuals whose record meets  
118 the standards required to earn promotion to the rank at which the tenure will be  
119 granted.

### 120 121 **III. GENERAL STANDARDS**

- 122
- 123 A. Retention: A positive recommendation for retention requires that the candidate's record  
124 clearly meets the articulated standards for the granting of a retention decision in each of  
125 the three areas: scholarly teaching, scholarly research/creative activities, and scholarly  
126 service.
- 127
- 128 B. Tenure and/or Promotion: A positive recommendation for tenure or promotion requires  
129 that the candidate's record clearly meets the articulated standards for the granting of a  
130 tenure/promotion decision in each of the three areas: scholarly teaching, scholarly  
131 research/creative activities, and scholarly service.
- 132
- 133 C. Early Tenure (prior to the 6th year in rank): This option for assistant professors is  
134 considered an exception. A positive recommendation for early tenure requires that the  
135 candidate's record clearly meets the articulated standards for the granting of a  
136 tenure/promotion decision in ALL areas. To be eligible for early tenure, a candidate must  
137 show a sustained record of successful experience at a university, and that experience must

138 include at least one full year at California State University San Marcos prior to the year  
139 of review for tenure.

140

141 D. Early Promotion (prior to the 6th year in rank): This option for associate professors is  
142 considered an exception. A positive recommendation for early promotion requires that  
143 the candidate's record clearly meets the articulated standards for the granting of a  
144 tenure/promotion decision in ALL areas. To be eligible for early promotion a candidate  
145 must show a record of successful experience at a university, and that experience must  
146 include at least one full year at California State University San Marcos prior to the year  
147 of review for promotion.

148

149 E. Faculty who are hired at an advanced rank without tenure may apply for tenure after two  
150 years of service at CSUSM (i.e., in fall of their third year at CSUSM). A positive  
151 recommendation requires that the candidate's record at CSUSM clearly demonstrates a  
152 continued level of accomplishment in all areas and, together with the candidate's  
153 previous record, is consistent with the articulated standards for the granting of tenure at  
154 the faculty member's rank.

155

156 F. Standards and criteria for Scholarly Teaching, Scholarly Research and Creative  
157 Activities, and Scholarly Service can be gleaned from the School/ Department Standards  
158 | for each unit: SoE, SoN, HD, and KINE, [SLP and SW](#).



## BLP: Moving Self-Support Academic Programs to State Support

**Rationale:** As CSUSM first contemplated opening new academic programs via Extended Learning as fully self-support programs, many asked how such programs might be moved "stateside" once California's budget situation improved and CSUSM could again contemplate enrollment expansion. As we stand now at the cusp of such long-awaited growth, we should examine how such moves might happen. While it is possible to bring self-support programs into the state-supported budget, the benefits and costs (including potential costs to other stateside programs) must be evaluated before any such moves are made. Such a proposal must ultimately be approved by the Chancellor's Office. This document establishes a consistent, consultative process for considering whether existing self-support programs should be moved to the "stateside" budget. We are aware of no such proposals at this time; this document is intended as a preemptive measure to allay possible concerns.

**Definition:** Policy and procedure for the moving of self-support, for-credit programs to state support

**Authority:** The President of the University.

**Scope:** Self-support, for-credit programs considered for moves to EL

**Principles:** Any proposed move of a self-support program to the state-supported budget would require consideration of the following:

1. What potential costs and benefits will accrue to a self-support program moved to the state-supported budget? For example:
  - a. how would moving the program stateside affect student tuition/fees?
  - b. can we anticipate any impact on student recruitment?
  - c. what impact can we anticipate on revenues?
  - d. how would currently enrolled students be affected?
2. What potential costs and benefits will accrue to other existing state-supported programs and other units if an existing self-support program is moved to the state-supported budget?
  - a. what is the anticipated effect on FTES?
  - b. what existing (and new) program costs would be added to the Academic Affairs budget? These costs should include FTES, FTEF, Library resources, IITS, advising and other staff resources, and lab and any equipment costs.
  - c. any other potential impacts on existing stateside programs should also be taken into account, including space needs and prioritizations for space assignments.
3. Any other potential costs and benefits, including those to the community and the region, should be addressed.

**Process:** When the Academic Senate is asked to approve any new program, the Budget & Long-Range Planning (BLP) committee assesses likely resource impacts. Moving existing self-support offerings to the state-supported budget requires a re-assessment of resource impacts. Before any existing self-support program moves to the state-supported budget, a proposal addressing all of the points noted above shall be developed by a current CSUSM faculty member. The review of that proposal, submitted by a faculty member from within the program in question, will include the following steps:

1. review by any appropriate College-level committees;
2. review by the Dean of the appropriate College(s) as well as the Dean of Extended Learning;
3. review by BLP;
4. consideration for approval by the Academic Senate.

## FAC: Post tenure review policy revision

FAC's response to EC feedback on Post Tenure Review Policy:

The FAC rationale on the document is designed for senators but this memo is intended only for EC, to reply in detail about FAC's response to the feedback and FAC's actions. In short, we have considered EC feedback, made some changes to the document, but not all of the changes requested by EC. The document has been approved by FAC. And now want to address our thinking to EC.

First, FAC members must quote the CBA.

### *CBA--Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Unit Employees*

#### *15.34*

*For the purpose of maintaining and improving a tenured faculty unit employee's effectiveness, tenured faculty unit employees shall be subject to periodic performance evaluations at intervals of no greater than five (5) years.*

*Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) shall not be required to undergo evaluation unless an evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant or the appropriate administrator. Such periodic evaluations shall be conducted by a peer review committee of the department or equivalent unit, and the appropriate administrator. For those with teaching responsibilities, consideration shall include student evaluations of teaching performance.*

#### *15.35*

*A tenured faculty unit employee shall be provided a copy of the peer committee report of his/her periodic evaluation. The peer review committee chair and the appropriate administrator shall meet with the tenured faculty unit employee to discuss his/her strengths and weaknesses along with suggestions, if any, for his/her improvement.*

#### *15.36*

*A copy of the peer committee's and the appropriate administrator's summary reports shall be placed in the tenured faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File.*

Second, here is our item-by-item response.

- EC requested that there be separate sections for pre-Full and post-Full faculty, and more instructions for pre-Full.

FAC made some changes but wants to emphasize this distinction does not exist in the CBA. Therefore, FAC believe it is unadvisable to direct pre-full PETF Candidates to complete a larger/more complex report than the Full Candidates.

- EC requested the addition of the requirement to include all course evaluations, or, only the reports. FAC believes that adding the requirement that all student evaluations be included in the PETF would in effect change this document into a kind of WPAF. That is not called for in the CBA nor does FAC believe we should impose this on ourselves.

FAC emphasizes that the PETF is not a summative review—it is a formative or developmental review. FAC understands that PRC members may wish for more information in the report, but this evaluation process is different from probationary evaluations and reviews for promotion.

FAC points out that the section on the student evaluations was not changed in substance but was simply moved.

*All teaching faculty shall include consideration of student evaluations of teaching as partial evidence of teaching effectiveness. This consideration may take various forms; for example, a description of student evaluations may be included in the narrative, or a page from the summary statistics provided with the student evaluations of instruction obtained for each of the chosen classes, or a single table summarizing item statistics for all courses to be highlighted in the review may be included with the PTPE.*

This language offers the Candidate three options. The PETF Candidate gets to choose. FAC did not agree that FAC should limit the options. However, the departments/program/college/school may support or proscribe one or the other option in their RTP documents, and that would be appropriate.

- EC requested that we change “summary report” so that it is clear that the PRC’s and deans should evaluate and not merely summarize. FAC inserted this terminology because the CBA uses it. That said, we should all understand that in no case is a PETF a summative evaluation; in all cases it is formative or developmental. So while summary report is the correct term, FAC hopes that PRCs and deans will do more than simply summarize. We believe the changes we have made will encourage just that.

---

#### ~~Post-Tenure Review Policy~~ Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (PETF)

**Rationale:** *FAC has approved changes to the “Post-Tenure Review Policy” (Approved by the Academic Senate 04/06/2005). Overall, the main change is to distinguish between post-tenure periodic evaluation for faculty who have the rank of Associate Professor and faculty with the rank of Full Professor.*

*In section III.B, we rewrote the entire section to remove the menu of three options for their report and now require all Candidates to follow one format for the report. By requiring all Candidates to present a comprehensive curriculum vitae (in the format recommended for the WPAF) and a narrative of between 1,250-1,750 words (five-to-seven pages), we have changed the report into something we believe will be more useful to all post-tenure Candidates, and will also be more useful for PRC members and deans.*

*FAC has added language to guide PETF Candidates and their PRCs about the two different kinds of PETFs—the PETF for the Candidate who is an Associate professor with tenure, and the PETF for the Candidate who is Full professor with tenure.*

FAC did not change the requirements about the student evaluations of teaching (the section was moved). The CBA is clear that this is a formative evaluation—it is not summative. Faculty who apply for promotion must submit a WPAF; the PETF does not and should not require the Candidate to prepare something like a WPAF.

As result of the detailed discussion, the following changes were also made:

The title of the document was changed to cohere with the CBA-- <del>Post-Tenure Review Policy</del> Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (PETF)
The rule stating that FERP faculty "...shall maintain their five-year review cycle" was removed because the rule has changed in the new CBA.
In appropriate instances, the "faculty" member is referred to as "Candidate," which is the format of the updated University RTP document.
A line was added to encourage but not require that the Candidate submit the Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (PETF) electronically.
An established step in the process was made explicit in the document by adding the sentence: "The PRC will review the PETF and write a summary report."

## I. Introduction

The purpose of ~~Post-Tenure~~ Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (PTPE) (PETF) is to provide periodic feedback to faculty members<sup>1</sup> on their effectiveness in all areas considered for retention, tenure, and promotion in order to maintain and improve faculty performance.

~~PTPE (PETF) should be seen as~~ is an important part of a faculty member's professional growth, ~~which provides faculty members with a regular opportunity to assess and revise their professional development plans and goals~~ and may serve different needs at different points in the faculty member's career.

- For faculty aspiring to promotion to Full Professor, the PETF will provide feedback about maintaining and improving the faculty member's effectiveness and also feedback about strengths and weaknesses relevant to a future application for promotion to full professor.
- For faculty who have achieved the rank of Full Professor the PETF will provide feedback about maintaining and improving the faculty member's effectiveness.

## II. Required Review Intervals

- A. Faculty unit employees not being considered for promotion are subject to review every five years following the awarding of tenure.
- B. Faculty on sabbatical or leave of absence during the scheduled year of review shall undergo ~~PTPE~~PETF upon return to campus.

<sup>1</sup> The term "faculty member" refers to instructional faculty, librarians, and SSP-ARs.

C. Faculty who are participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) shall maintain their five-year review cycle shall not be required to undergo evaluation unless an evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant or the appropriate administrator.

### III. Procedure and Timeline

A. A peer review committee (PRC) of the department or equivalent unit and the Dean/Director of the College/Library/unit shall conduct the ~~PTPE~~ PETF.

B. ~~PTPE~~ PETF Report -- Faculty undergoing a fifth-year ~~PTPE~~ PETF shall submit a ~~PTPE~~ PETF report. The ~~PTPE~~ PETF report shall address the faculty member's work in all areas considered for retention, tenure, and promotion for the years under review. For faculty with teaching responsibilities, the ~~PTPE~~ PETF report will cover the areas of Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service. For librarians, the ~~PTPE~~ PETF report will cover the areas of Professional Performance, Research/Creative Activity, and Service. For SSP-ARs, the ~~PTPE~~ PETF report will cover the areas of Professional Performance, Professional Development, and Service.

1. The PETF Report shall consist of:

- A comprehensive curriculum vitae (in the format recommended for the WPAF). For instructional faculty, the CV shall contain sections on Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service. For librarians and SSP-ARs, the CV shall contain a section of Professional Performance/Professional Development, Research/Creative Activity, and Service.
- A narrative of 1,250-1,750 words (approximately 5-7 pages) highlighting the Candidate's accomplishments during the period covered in the PETF.
  - The Candidate should indicate their goals for the evaluation, including if they believe they may apply for promotion to full professor following the PETF.
- All teaching faculty shall include consideration of student evaluations of teaching as partial evidence of teaching effectiveness. This consideration may take various forms; for example, a description of student evaluations may be included in the narrative, or a page from the summary statistics provided with the student evaluations of instruction obtained for each of the chosen classes, or a single table summarizing item statistics for all courses to be highlighted in the review may be included with the ~~PTPE~~ PETF.
  - The Candidate should indicate their goals for the evaluation, including if they plan to apply for promotion to full professor following the PETF.

2. The Candidate ~~faculty member~~ shall submit a copy of the ~~PTPE~~ PETF report to the office of the Dean/Director of the College/Library/unit.

In recognition that PTPE may serve different functions at various points in a faculty member's career, the PTPE report may take one of three possible forms. The faculty member under review shall determine the form best suited for the particular PTPE review. The forms are as follow:

- a. — A complete curriculum vitae (in the format recommended for the WPAF<sup>2</sup>) and up to a three-page narrative highlighting the faculty member's accomplishments since the last review. The complete CV shall contain sections on Teaching (for instructional faculty) or Professional Performance/Professional Development (for librarians and SSP ARs), Research/ Creative Activity (if appropriate), and Service.
  - b. — Five annual reports and up to a three-page narrative highlighting the faculty member's accomplishments since the last review. Each annual report shall contain sections on Teaching (for instructional faculty) or Professional Performance/Professional Development (for librarians and SSP ARs), Research/ Creative Activity (if appropriate), and Service.
  - c. — A five to seven page narrative highlighting the faculty member's accomplishments in Teaching (for instructional faculty) or Professional Performance/Professional Development (for librarians and SSP ARs), Research/ Creative Activity (if appropriate), and Service.
2. — All teaching faculty shall include consideration of student evaluations of teaching as partial evidence of teaching effectiveness. This consideration may take various forms; for example, a description of student evaluations may be included in the narrative, or a page from the summary statistics provided with the student evaluations of instruction obtained for each of the chosen classes, or a single table summarizing item statistics for all courses to be highlighted in the review may be included with the PTPE.
  3. — Any reviewer may request of the candidate additional information on their PTPE report.
  4. — Upon the request of the PRC and/or the Dean/Director, faculty shall be prepared to provide evidence of accomplishments listed in the annual reports.

### C. Evaluation of the Candidate's Report

1. The PRC shall review the Candidate's report and write a summary report. If the Candidate has stated that they may apply for promotion

---

<sup>2</sup> Please refer to the RTP Handbook produced by the Faculty Center.

to full professor following the PETF, the PRC shall provide feedback about strengths and weaknesses.

- D. 2. The Dean/Director will review the ~~PTPE~~ Candidate's report and the PRC report, and write a summary report.
- E. 3. The ~~faculty member~~ Candidate shall be provided a copy of the PRC and Dean/Director reports.
- F. 4. The PRC chair and the Dean shall meet with the ~~faculty member~~ Candidate, upon completion of his or her evaluation to discuss strengths and weaknesses. If necessary, a plan for improvement will be developed that shall include periodic status reports.
- G. 5. The ~~faculty member~~ Candidate may submit a written response to the PTPE assessment.
- H. 6. A copy of the PRC's report, the Dean's/Director's summary report, the improvement plan (if any), and the ~~faculty member~~ Candidate's response (if any) shall be placed in the ~~faculty member~~ Candidate's Personnel Action File.
- I. 7. Academic units may develop guidelines for the appropriate level of performance in each of the areas covered by the ~~PTPE~~ PETF report.
- J. 8. ~~PTPE~~ PETF Calendar

March 1:	Fifth-year <del>PTPE</del> <u>PETF</u> reports due
April 1	PRC report due to <del>faculty member</del> <u>Candidate</u>
May 1	Dean/Director's summary due
End of semester	Meeting with PRC chair and Dean completed