

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.

**Distribution List:**

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

Approved by the Academic Senate on June 5, 2014  
Sent to the President for approval on June 12, 2014  
Approved by the President on August 13, 2014

## **305.4 Performance Review of Faculty**

**Performance review shall serve to promote excellence in teaching, 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 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 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 shall involve multiple measures of a faculty's performance. In addition to the systematic review of the SOCI, course syllabi, and course materials (exams, handouts, etc.), the reviewers are expected to consider other appropriate measures of teaching performance submitted by the faculty member, such as:~~

##### **The evaluation of teaching effectiveness**

**Since teaching is a primary function of all CSUB faculty, a candidate for retention is expected to demonstrate his/her ability to teach effectively. 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 effectiveness 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.

**f. Evidence of currency in one's discipline and the integration of that currency into the classroom.**

#### **305.2.4.7 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.**

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

**Candidates for tenure or promotion shall demonstrate substantive and sustained 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.**

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

#### **305.4.2.9 Evaluation of Professionally-Related 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 and sustained service to two or more of the following: the school, the university, the university system, a professional association, or the community.**

**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.**

**The department or equivalent unit criteria shall determine whether service learning, if included, is evaluated as teaching or as service.**

### **305.4.2.10 The RTP 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. For example, the file, excluding SOCIs, should be no larger than could 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 may be contained 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 opinions of teaching. Except as limited below, faculty members will administer SOCI in all sections and place the results of all SOCIs in the ~~Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)~~ or RTP **(WPAF)** File for use by all levels of

review. The requirement for collection of SOCIs may be waived for sections with enrollments of fewer than 6 students or similar situations in which the anonymity of respondents would be compromised and sections in which the primary mode of instruction or the SOCI would not reasonably correlate with instructional methods. Within these guidelines, department chairs in consultation with their department shall determine which sections are eligible for this waiver. Documentation of the department decision to grant a waiver shall be included in each section of the file for which SOCIs are waived.

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).

**Faculty members shall administer SOCIs in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement.**

**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 **RTP File** (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.