

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD  
ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA  
Thursday, February 27, 2014  
Health Center Conference Room  
9:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

1. **Call to Order**

2. **Approval of Minutes** – February 20, 2014 (pages 2-3)

Editorial corrections should be sent or provided to Tawnya Walker. Comments regarding accuracy or content of the Minutes should be brought forward for discussion.

3. **Announcements and Information**

4. **Approval of Agenda**

5. **ASCSU Report**

6. **Provost's Report (S. Coley)**

8. **Committee Reports and Requests**

(Minutes from AAC, AS&SS, BPC and FAC are posted on the Academic Senate Webpage)

- a. Academic Affairs Committee (J. Talamantes)
- b. Academic Support & Student Services Committee (J. Tarjan)
- c. Budget & Planning Committee (A. Hegde)
- d. Faculty Affairs Committee (K/ Hartlep)
- e. Executive Committee (R. Negrini)
- f. Staff Report (K. Ziegler)
- g. ASI Report (H. Nieblas)
- h. Rumor and Gossip Control

9. **Resolutions - (Time Certain 10:45 A.M.)**

a. **Consent Agenda**

The above Item(s) marked by asterisk (\*), have been placed on the consent agenda. Any Senate member objecting to placement of an item on the consent agenda may remove it. The item will then be taken up in its regular order on the agenda.

b. **Old Business:**

- GEIC Recommendations: Governance and Transition Plan for the GE Program at CSU, Bakersfield RES 1314049 (EC) (Second Reading) (page 8)
- Performance Review of Faculty RES 1314045 (FAC) (First Reading Continued) (pages 9-16)

c. **New Business:**

10. **Open Forum Items (Time Certain 11:15 a.m.)**

11. **Adjournment**

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD**  
**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**  
**ADDITIONAL MEETING**  
**Thursday, February 20, 2014**  
**Health Center Conference Room**  
**10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.**

**MEMBERS:** D. Boschini, S. Campagna-Pinto, S. Coley, D. Dodd, J. Emery, A. Gebauer, K. Hartlep, B. Hartsell, A. Hegde, J. Kegley, H. McCown, J. Millar, M. Moe, C. Murphy (ALT), R. Negrini, P. Smith, J. Talamantes, J. Tarjan (ALT), K. Ziegler (ALT)

**ABSENT:** H. Nieblas, C. Petit, R. Provencio, M. Rush,

**VISITORS:** S. Bozarth, K. O'Bannon, J. Pratt, J. Moffit, C. Lam, D. Jackson, D. Schecter, M. Dansforth, P. Newberry, E. Case, C. Kemnitz, V. Kohli, D. Saiki, K. Haddad, C. Kelsey

1. **Call to Order** -Meeting called to order by Chair Kegley.

2. **Approval of Minutes** –February 13, 2014

**Motion/Second/Approved:** Motion made by Senator Hartlep and seconded by Senator Dodd to approve the minutes. The minutes from February 13, 2014 are approved with one abstention.

3. **Announcements and Information**

- A meeting with Administration and faculty to discuss Q2S Student Success is scheduled for February 28, 2014.
- Faculty surveys to weigh in on the themes proposed are due on February 21, 2014.

4. **Approval of Agenda**

**Motion/Second/Approved:** The minutes from February 13, 2014 are approved with one abstention.

5. **Resolutions**

a. **Old Business:**

- **GEIC Recommendations: Governance and Transition Plan for the GE Program at CSU, Bakersfield RES 1314049 (EC) (First Reading)**-In his absence, Senator Hegde read a statement on behalf of Senator Tarjan, Chair of the GEIC urging the Senate to approve a governance structure which has the potential to support the timely implementation of the new program.

C. Kemnitz distributed and summarized the “Summer 2013 GE Task Force Recommendations to the University” as well as the “General Education Organizational Chart”. He stated that “the proposed structure is more centralized so it is more coherent around making sure that we have even and directed approach to themes and skills reinforcement”.

Provost Coley stated that once it is clear what the structure will be, Administration wants to support the opportunity for faculty to get together and think through the learning goals and create a model that they are comfortable with. She added that Administration would also like

to provide opportunities for faculty to provide input for speakers and to attend conferences that reinforce the understanding about how to enrich the experience.

For clarification purposes, C. Kemnitz stated that this proposal is different from the current structure in that the subcommittees contain a substantial portion of the General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo) which is charged with maintaining the holistic vision; the subcommittees are not entirely whole and are not standing subcommittees; they are charged with a specific charge by GECCo.

Discussion continued following Open Forum.

6. **Open Forum Items**-None

**New Business continued:**

- **GEIC Recommendations: Governance and Transition Plan for the GE Program at CSU, Bakersfield RES 1314049 (continued)** – Comments and suggestions from the floor were provided to the GEIC. First reading concluded.

**Motion/Second/Passed:** Motion made by Senator Negrini and seconded by Senator Gebauer to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed.

7. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:23.

**Academic Affairs Committee: (Jorge Talamantes,Chair-Meets in DDH B108 at 10:00 am) (9/19, 10/03, 10/17, 10/31, 11/14, 1/09, 1/23, 2/06, 2/20, 3/06, 4/03, 4/17, 5/01, 5/15, 5/29)**

DATE:	ITEM:	STATUS:	ACTION:	APPROVED BY SENATE:	SENT TO PRESIDENT:	APPROVED BY PRESIDENT:
09/17/13	Policy on the Formation of New Departments (2013-2014 001)	APPROVED	On Senate Agenda 10/24/13 RES 1314039	10/24/2013	11/4/2013	11/14/2013
10/10/13	Name Change Department of Chemistry (2013-2014 002)	APPROVED	On Senate Agenda 10/24/13 RES 1314040	10/24/2013	11/4/2013	11/14/2013
10/15/13	Engineering and the 120/180 Unit Cap (2013-2014 003)	COMPLETED	On Senate Agenda 10/24/13 RES 1314041	10/24/2013	11/4/2013	N/A
11/04/13	Academic Plan Through 2023 (2013-2014 005)	APPROVED	On Senate Agenda 11/21/13 RES 1314044	11/21/2013	12/3/2013	12/19/2013
11/05/13	Moratorium M.A. Degree in Anthropology (2013-2014 006)	COMPLETED				
11/19/13	120 Cap for Engineering (2013-2014 007)	PASSED	On Senate Agenda 1/30/14 RES 1314046	1/30/2014		
01/07/14	Catalog Revisions (2013-2014 009)					
02/05/14	Proposed Changes to Minor (2013-2014 0102)					
02/12/14	Recommendations of Ethnic Studies and Community College BA (2103-2014 0014)					
02/18/14	Conversion of BA in Natural Sciences (2013-2014 0015)					

**Academic Support & Student Services Committee: (John Tarjan, Chair-Meets in DDH A108 at 10:00 a.m.) (9/19, 10/03, 10/17, 10/31, 11/14, 1/09, 1/23, 2/06, 2/20, 3/06, 4/03, 4/17, 5/01, 5/15, 5/29)**

DATE:	ITEM:	STATUS:	ACTION:	APPROVED BY SENATE:	SENT TO PRESIDENT:	APPROVED BY PRESIDENT:
01/07/14	Handbook Structure (2013-2014 008)	COMPLETED	Report submitted to the EC			

**Budget & Planning Committee: (Aaron Hegde, Chair- Meets in SCI III Room 100 at 10:00 ) (9/19, 10/03, 10/17, 10/31, 11/14, 1/09, 1/23, 2/06, 2/20, 3/06, 4/03, 4/17, 5/01, 5/15, 5/29)**

DATE:	ITEM:	STATUS:	ACTION:	APPROVED BY SENATE:	SENT TO PRESIDENT:	APPROVED BY PRESIDENT:
02/26/13	Extended University Issues-Indirects (2012-2013 025)	Feedback Forthcoming				
09/17/13	Policy on the Formation of New Departments (2013-2014 001)	APPROVED	On Senate Agenda 10/24/13 RES 1314039	10/24/2013	11/4/2013	11/14/2013
10/10/13	Name Change Department of Chemistry (2013-2014 002)	APPROVED	On Senate Agenda 10/24/13 RES 1314040	10/24/2013	11/4/2013	11/14/2013
10/20/13	Q2S Four Year Calendar (2013-2014 004)					
11/05/13	Academic Plan Through 2023 (2013-2014 005)	APPROVED	On Senate Agenda 11/21/13 RES 1314044	11/21/2013	12/3/2013	12/19/2013
11/12/13	Moratorium M.A. Degree in Anthropology (2013-2014 006)	COMPLETED				
02/18/14	Conversion of BA in Natural Sciences (2013-2014 0015)					

**Faculty Affairs Committee: (Karen Hartlep, Chair-Meets in EDUC 123 at 10:00 am (9/19, 10/03, 10/17, 10/31, 11/14, 1/09, 1/23, 2/06, 2/20, 3/06, 4/03, 4/17, 5/01, 5/15, 5/29)**

DATE:	ITEM:	STATUS:	ACTION:	APPROVED BY SENATE:	SENT TO PRESIDENT:	APPROVED BY PRESIDENT:
09/12/12	University RPT Criteria (2012-2013 0002)	<b>FIRST READING CONTINUED</b>	Supersedes RES 1213027. On Senate Agenda 2/27/14 RES 1314045			
04/03/13	Search Committee Composition (2012-2013 0028)	<b>PASSED</b>	On Senate Agenda 11/07/13 RES 1213024	11/21/2013	12/3/2013	
01/23/13	SOCI Waiver Procedures (2012-2013 0022)	<b>APPROVED</b>	On Senate Agenda 4/25/13 RES 1213023	4/25/2013	5/7/2013	10/1/2013
09/17/13	Policy on the Formation of New Departments (2013-2014 001)	<b>APPROVED</b>	On Senate Agenda 10/24/13 RES 1314039	10/24/2013	11/4/2013	11/14/2013
01/07/14	Responsibilities of Faculty (2013-2014 0010)					
01/21/14	Exam Scheduling (2013-2014 0011)					
02/12/14	Recommendations on Eligibility of Lecturers for Emeritus Status (2013-2104 0013)	<b>COMPLETE</b>				

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD  
ACADEMIC SENATE

GEIC Recommendations: Governance and Transition Plan for the GE Program at  
CSU, Bakersfield

RES 1314049

EC

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate recommends approval of the “GEIC proposals entitled ‘Governance of the General Education Program at CSU, Bakersfield ‘ and ‘Transition Plan for the General Education Program at CSU, Bakersfield.’

Rationale: In March 2013 the Academic Senate approved a set of “Guiding Principles for General Education Reform at CSUB.” It also established a Task-Force to develop models for a General Education Program based on these principles with a report due back on University Day fall 2013. This report was made to the university community in fall 2013; a series of workshops and sessions were held on GE. The GE Task Force reported their recommendations to the Academic Senate. In November the Academic Senate approved the appointment of a General Education Implementation Committee with the following charge: “The General Education reform implementation committee shall develop Model 3, while paying careful attention to the most valuable features of Model 2, as reflected in the findings of the Task Force on General Education's report to the Academic Senate. In doing so, it may wish to consult with university constituencies, such as Student Affairs and others with expertise in advising, enrollment management, the first year experience, and instruction in basic skills.”

The GEIC met during the month of December, made a preliminary report to the university community on January 10 and to the DCLC on January 15<sup>th</sup>. This committee has now submitted its recommendations to the Academic Senate.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD  
ACADEMIC SENATE

**Performance Review of Faculty**  
RES 1314045

FAC

**RESOLVED:** that the Academic Senate recommend to the President that the University Handbook be amended to include the following changes to Performance Review of Faculty (deletions in strikethrough, additions in bold underline).

**RATIONALE:** The Faculty Affairs Committee has considered the need for improved clarity and increased consistency of RTP standards across the university while recognizing the variety of methods by which faculty members in different disciplines demonstrate scholarship and creative activity.

The Committee believes that no policy can address every possible contingency and that good policy therefore focuses on process and reflects trust in the goodwill of individuals.

We believe the proposed policy provides appropriate balance between the need for consistency and for variation within parameters. We believe it also provides appropriate balance between upholding high standards and supporting faculty members.

Toward those ends, the proposed changes introduce two primary elements to the RTP process: A faculty development plan, and a faculty mentor. The faculty development plan will increase communication and thus clarify expectations among stakeholders. We believe that existing policy provides adequate mechanisms for addressing issues that may arise despite the proposed policy revisions. For example, existing policy gives the University Review Committee responsibility for reviewing “the appropriateness of recommendations made at all prior levels of the review process regarding retention, the award of tenure, and/or promotion,” thus assuring faculty oversight of the process. Existing policy also provides mechanisms for appeals, and we believe that the proposed changes will reduce the need for such appeals.

**Distribution List:**

President  
Provost & V.P. for Academic Affairs  
School Deans  
Department Chairs  
General Faculty

## **305.4 Performance Review of Faculty**

**Performance review shall serve to promote professional development, currency in the field, and engagement with the academic community.**

### **305.4.1 General Provisions**

- a. Performance reviews are required of faculty for purposes of retention, the award of tenure, and promotion. All faculty, except faculty who are awarded credit towards tenure, will undergo performance reviews in years 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 of their probationary period. Faculty who are awarded credit towards tenure are reviewed every year. At any level of the 3rd year review a request for a full review during the 4th year may be made, as part of that review. The probationary faculty member may ask for a full review during the 4th year.
- b. The P&VPAA annually establishes timelines for the performance reviews, after considering recommendations from relevant faculty committees. The timelines shall specify the dates by which the RTP file is to be ready for review and the dates by which each level of review is to have completed its work.
- c. There are three RTP cycles during each academic year:
  1. Fall RTP cycle—review of second-year probationary faculty;
  2. Winter RTP cycle—review of 3rd, 5th, and 6th year probationary faculty, 4th year faculty if requested according to the provisions of 305.4.1a or if required (faculty with credit toward tenure), and tenured faculty requesting consideration for promotion; and
  3. Spring RTP cycle—review of first-year probationary faculty and temporary faculty.
- d. Unit RTP criteria shall be used at each level of review for each faculty.
- e. All eligible tenured faculty are obligated to serve on peer review committees, if elected.
- f. Faculty shall not sit in review of their own cases, or that of a close relative or domestic partner.
- g. Faculty who are undergoing review in a given RTP cycle shall not serve on any review committee in that cycle
- h. All deliberations and recommendations pursuant to this section shall be confidential. Only the affected faculty, peer review committee members, appropriate administrators, and the President shall have access to the performance review documents.

### **305.4.2 Criteria for Performance Review of Faculty**

#### **305.4.2.1 Teaching Faculty**

The principal areas in which teaching faculty performance shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, the award of tenure, or promotion are **include the following:**

- a. Teaching success, which is the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion;
- b. Scholarly/or creative activity of high quality that has received favorable peer review in the discipline and may include, but not be limited to, research and publication; and
- c. Professionally related services to the discipline, the University and the community.

~~In evaluating the faculty's performance in categories a, b, and c, particular consideration may be given to contributions to university wide initiatives and the accomplishment of university mission and goals.~~

### **305.4.2.2 Librarians**

The principal areas in which librarians shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, the award of tenure, or promotion are **include the following**:

- a. Performance, which is the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion;
- b. Scholarly/or creative activity of high quality that has received favorable peer review, and;
- c. Professionally related services to the discipline, the University and the community.

~~In evaluating the librarian's performance in categories a, b, and c, particular consideration may be given to contributions to university wide initiatives and the accomplishment of university mission and goals.~~

### **305.4.2.3 Counselors**

The principal areas in which counselors shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, the award of tenure, or promotion are:

- a. Performance, which is the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion;
- b. Scholarly/or creative activity of high quality that has received favorable peer review, and;
- c. Professionally related services to the discipline, the University and the community.

~~In evaluating the counselor's performance in categories a, b, and c, particular consideration may be given to contributions to university wide initiatives and the accomplishment of university mission and goals.~~

### **305.4.2.4 Unit RTP Criteria**

Units may have different perspectives, priorities, or procedures in evaluating the performance or estimating the promise of their members. Without altering the scope of the three areas in 305.4.2.1, and 305.4.2.2, **and 305.4.2.3** above, units shall interpret and elaborate the three areas

in order to assess the level and quality of a unit member's performance. The unit RTP criteria shall be used at all levels of review for a given faculty.

Faculty under consideration for retention, tenure, and promotion shall have the option of a performance review under either the unit RTP criteria operative at the time of their hiring or under any subsequent revision of the unit RTP criteria during the probationary period.

#### **305.4.2.5 Revision of Unit RTP Criteria**

Unit RTP criteria shall be formally reviewed at least once every five (5) years. Any faculty may propose changes in unit RTP criteria at any time. After approval by a majority vote of all tenured and probationary faculty, changes in the unit RTP criteria shall be forwarded to the school dean and the P&VPAA. Revised RTP criteria cannot apply to an RTP cycle already underway.

Given the critical importance of the RTP process, the P&VPAA, school deans, and units are encouraged to make every attempt to resolve amicably any differences of opinion concerning the proposed criteria. In the event that the differences cannot be resolved, the P&VPAA shall request the University Review Committee to arbitrate and to determine a resolution.

#### **305.4.2.6 The Faculty Development Plan**

**At the beginning of each review cycle, the faculty member shall, in consultation with the faculty mentor, department chair, and dean, prepare a Faculty Development Plan outlining goals for teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and professional service. The Faculty Development Plan should address coherence and prioritization among its elements.**

**Disputes about the Faculty Development Plan should be resolved in consultation between the department and the dean. Disputes that are not resolved at that level shall be resolved by the University Review Committee, whose determination shall be final.**

**Faculty members shall review and update, as appropriate, the plan, in consultation with the mentor, department chair, and dean, following each performance review.**

**The Faculty Development Plan shall document the resources and services that the department and university will provide to support the plan.**

#### **305.4.2.7 The Faculty Mentor**

**The Associate Vice-president for Faculty Affairs, in consultation with the department chair and the faculty member, shall assign an individual from another school within CSUB to serve as faculty mentor until the new faculty member obtains tenure. The faculty mentor shall help orient the new faculty member to campus procedures and shall assist the new faculty member in the development and implementation of the Faculty Development Plan.**

### **305.4.2.68 Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness**

Although this handbook currently identifies the Student Opinion on Curriculum and Instruction (SOCI) as the primary instrument used to collect student evaluations of teaching, this tool is not intended to be the only tool **to evaluate teaching, and the SOCI shall not be weighted more than 50% in the evaluation of teaching.** The evaluation of teaching **effectiveness** shall involve multiple measures of a faculty **member**'s performance. In addition to the systematic review of the SOCI, course syllabi, and course materials (exams, handouts, etc.), reviewers are expected to consider other appropriate measures of teaching performance submitted by the faculty member, such as:

- a. Introspective self-assessments for formative assessment of teaching and learning in courses during the terms of the review cycle.
- b. Faculty-developed instruments for formative assessment of teaching and learning in courses during the terms of the review cycle.
- c. Peer assessments based upon a mutually-agreed schedule of classroom visits during the review cycle.
- d. Formal assessments performed by the Faculty Teaching & Learning Center at the request of the faculty member during the review cycle.
- e. Self-reflection of grades awarded for courses taught during the review cycle.

#### **305.2.4.8.1 Classroom Observation**

**Evaluation of teaching of probationary and temporary faculty members shall include at least one observation of teaching during each academic year.**

**Each department shall develop procedures for the observation.**

**The faculty member shall include the observation report in the RTP file.**

#### **305.4.2.9 Evaluation of Scholarly or Creative Activity**

**Candidates for tenure or promotion shall demonstrate substantive contributions to knowledge in the discipline. Candidates for tenure shall demonstrate these contributions via works that have received favorable peer review from individuals outside of CSUB. Tenured faculty members may demonstrate these contributions through alternative means described in the Faculty Development Plan.**

**In all instances, quality of work shall be considered the primary criterion for evaluating scholarly or creative activity.**

### **305.4.2.10 Evaluation of Professional Service**

**Faculty members shall prioritize their activities so service does not interfere significantly with teaching or scholarly or creative activity. Faculty members shall document active service to the department that includes, at a minimum, collaborative participation in department decision making. Associate Professors and Professors shall also document significant service to one or more of the following: the school, the university, the university system, or a professional association.**

**Service learning, if included, shall be addressed in the faculty development plan, which shall determine whether service learning is evaluated as teaching or as service.**

### **305.4.2.11 The File**

**Each faculty member subject to performance review shall prepare a file containing a representative sample of materials from the period under review. The file should be prepared with attention to the demands on reviewers. The file, excluding SOCIs, should be no larger than can be held in one three-inch binder. If electronic files are approved, the documents in the electronic file should be capable of being held in one three-inch binder if they were printed. SOCIs shall be submitted in a separate file.**

### **305.4.3 Levels in the Performance Review Process**

Performance review for retention, tenure, and promotion proceeds through the following levels.

a. Unit RTP Committee (for additional details, see 305.6)

1. The department/program chair of the unit may submit a separate evaluation and recommendation, which occurs after the unit RTP committee completes its review. Unit chairs choosing to submit a separate evaluation and recommendation shall not participate in the deliberations of the unit RTP committee.

2. For librarians, there is no unit chair.

3. For counselors, the unit chair is the Director of the Counseling Center.

b. School Dean (for additional details, see 305.7)

1. For librarians, the school dean is the Dean of University Libraries

2. For counselors, the school dean is the Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA)

c. University Review Committee (for additional details, see 305.8)

d. P&VPAA (for additional details, see 305.9)

e. President (for additional details, see 305.10)

#### **305.4.4 Student Role in the Performance Review Process**

Student evaluation of teaching by faculty is a required component of the performance review process. The Student Opinion on Curriculum and Instruction (SOCi) shall be the primary instrument used to collect student evaluations of teaching. The faculty shall place the results of all SOCis in the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) or RTP File for use by all levels of review. With the concurrence of the unit and the appropriate administrator, students may also be allowed to consult with the unit RTP committee during its deliberations.

a. The SOCi shall be anonymous and identified only by course and/or section. The format of the SOCi provides both quantitative information (ratings of course and instructor attributes) and qualitative information (comments about the course and instructor). Anonymous student communications or evaluations outside of the SOCi process shall not be included in the RTP File.

~~b. Probationary faculty must administer the SOCi in accordance with established departmental policy and for a minimum of two classes for each year taught during the probationary period and place those SOCis in the WPAF (RTP File).~~ **Faculty members shall administer SOCis in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement.**

~~c. Tenured faculty must administer the SOCi in a minimum of two (2) classes each year. These classes shall be representative of the tenured faculty's teaching assignment and shall be jointly determined in consultation between the tenured faculty and his/her department/program chair. In the event of disagreement, each party shall select 50% of the courses to be evaluated. During the performance review for promotion, the tenured faculty shall place in the RTP File SOCis for a minimum of two (2) classes for each of the years since the award of tenure and/or promotion.~~

#### **305.4.5 External Reviewers in the Performance Review Process**

Any party in the performance review process may initiate a request for the external review of materials submitted by faculty, especially materials for scholarly/creative activities that have not been peer reviewed. Such a request shall (1) justify the special circumstances necessitating an external reviewer, and (2) describe the nature of the materials to be evaluated by the external reviewer. The request for external review may be submitted at any time during a given RTP cycle and must be approved by the P&VPAA with the concurrence of the faculty.

#### **305.4.6 Personnel Evaluations and Recommendations**

Decisions relating to retention, tenure, promotion, or termination shall be based on the PAF, and decisions related to retention, tenure, and promotion shall include review of relevant material in the WPAF. The unit RTP criteria shall be the basis of all evaluations and recommendations at all levels of review. Reviewers at all levels may also include in their evaluations and recommendations comments on programmatic considerations that may affect the case of the faculty member being evaluated. Should the President make a personnel decision on any basis not directly related to the professional qualifications, work performance, or personal attributes of the individual faculty member in question, those reasons shall be entered into the PAF as a written document, which shall be immediately provided to the faculty member.

#### **305.4.7 Copies of Evaluations and Recommendations to Faculty**

At all levels of review, before evaluations and recommendations are forwarded to a subsequent review level, faculty shall be given a copy of the evaluation and recommendation from that level. Copies shall also be provided to all previous levels of review.