

PERIODIC EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY

INTRODUCTION

Tenured faculty have earned the right under California law to continued employment by virtue of probationary and tenured service during which both competence and performance have been rigorously reviewed and found to meet high professional standards. Therefore, in light of the special nature of tenured appointments, performance appraisals are formative in that the focus is upon the enhancement of instructional performance.

Periodic evaluation of tenured faculty serves as a means to stimulate the on-going professional development of faculty and to assure the overall quality of instruction. Further, Title 5, CSU Policy and collective bargaining agreement require that tenured faculty not subject to promotion review shall be evaluated at least every five years. The evaluation shall include assessment by the peer review committee, the department chair, and the dean of faculty responsibility including teaching effectiveness, professional development, and university and community service.

STANDARDS

Teaching Effectiveness: This will be assessed in accordance with the current Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness. (Academic Policy Manual, pg. 322-1)

Professional Development: The faculty member being evaluated must demonstrate a pattern of professional development consistent with the discipline.

University and Community Service: The faculty member being evaluated must provide evidence of consistent university and community service.

PROCESS

The periodic evaluation of tenured faculty shall be conducted by either a committee of the whole, or a committee consisting of a minimum of three (3) tenured full professors elected by the tenured faculty of the department. The department chair may concur with the assessment of the committee or may submit a separate assessment.

The faculty member being evaluated shall present a current vita, statement of accomplishment, a self-evaluation, and five-year report of professional development activities and university/community service to the department chair. All of these materials shall be a part of the assessment report. Departments may encourage faculty to develop five-year goals and objective statements to facilitate the evaluation process.

The committee shall develop an assessment report based upon the committee's evaluation of the quality and currency of: 1) materials submitted by the faculty member; 2) peer and student evaluations conducted since the last periodic evaluation which are representative of the faculty member's teaching responsibilities during the past five-year period; 3) relevant materials in the Personnel Action File; and 4) other written materials such as course syllabi, examinations, and assessments of research/scholarly activities.

The assessment report of the committee and the department chair will be shared with the tenured faculty member. The faculty member shall be provided the opportunity to make a thirty minute presentation to the committee and department chair if the assessment is a negative assessment. The faculty member may also submit his/her comments regarding the assessment in writing. The assessment report of the committee and the department chair, with relevant documents used in the evaluation process, shall be forwarded to the dean along with any recommendation the committee and/or chair choose to make. The dean shall consult with the chair and committee and may add an independent assessment before discussing the assessments and any recommendations with the faculty member. The entire assessment report, including the dean's assessment, shall be placed in the faculty member's Personnel Action File.

The faculty member being evaluated may submit a rebuttal within seven (7) days of the issuance of the final assessment report. This rebuttal is to be included in the Personnel Action File.

OUTCOMES

Following a positive review and in consultation with the department chair, department committee, as well as with the faculty member, the dean may take appropriate action in accordance with the university, school and department policies based upon the periodic evaluation. Possible actions include, but are not limited to: letters of commendation; special consideration for teaching assignments, professional travel, assigned time, professional development opportunities and recognitions or rewards.

Satisfactory performance in the teaching effectiveness area accompanied by an unsatisfactory evaluation of both professional development and university/community service shall mandate an interim evaluation the following year using the same criteria and standards.

An unsatisfactory evaluation of teaching effectiveness will also mandate that an interim evaluation to be conducted the following academic year using the same criteria and standards.

If the periodic evaluation conducted is a result of a previously unsatisfactory evaluation, the following actions may be taken: scheduling of further interim periodic evaluations; additional student and/or peer evaluations of teaching; establishment of performance goals with scheduled self-reporting of progress; other professional development activities designed to improve specified aspects of performance; and if appropriate, verbal or written recommendations (development program) or a recommendation for discipline pursuant to Article 19 of the collective bargaining agreement.

Approved by the Academic Senate
Approved by the President
Revised

May 1981
May 1981
February 1995