

Changes to Faculty
Evaluations for Lecturer
(Temporary) Faculty (Policy
1336) and Probationary
Faculty (1328)

Some Terminology

- Performance Review (RTP):
 - is an actionable evaluation process by the DRTPC, Department Chair (if not serving on the DRTPC), Dean or Director by each higher level of review that results in a recommendation for a personnel action such as reappointment, tenure and/or promotion, using the Faculty Performance Review Form (RTP Form) consistent with CBA 15.38.
- Periodic Evaluation:
 - an intermittent evaluation process that includes review only by the department, Department Chair (if not serving on the committee), and Dean/Director.

Why are we modifying 1336? Evaluations for Lecturer (Temporary) Faculty

- Semester Conversion
- Setting university-wide guidance and standards for departments for evaluation of Lecturer Faculty.
- Modifying the Period of Review and setting a calendar.
- Move the process to an electronic medium (such as interfolio).

Why calendar year?

- All Peer evaluations and Student Evaluations can be included.

Establishing a Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee

- The Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee (TFEC) shall be elected by the probationary and tenured faculty of the department. Membership on the committee shall be restricted to the tenured faculty members of the department, including faculty on FERP, and there shall be a minimum of two members.

Temporary Faculty Evaluation Criteria Document (“criteria document”)

Each department shall develop a Temporary Faculty Evaluation Criteria Document (“criteria document”) approved by majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty and reviewed for feedback by the Dean/Director every five years. The department shall respond in writing addressing the input provided. In compliance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the faculty unit employee no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term. The criteria document shall address departmental expectations regarding the following:

- Teaching philosophy statement;
- Survey questions, procedures and minimum scores in student evaluations of teaching;
- Peer observation procedures, criteria, and rubric;
- Minimum syllabus and other class requirements.

Making the process more like other Periodic Reviews:

- Have a similar structure to
 - Post-Tenure Review
 - Probationary faculty not engaged in Performance Review (RTP).

Temporary faculty that require a periodic evaluation shall submit a “periodic evaluation report” comprised of the following sections:

1. An updated curriculum vitae;
2. A self-assessment narrative including a teaching philosophy statement, not to **exceed two pages**;
3. All peer classroom observations during the evaluation period. A minimum of one peer observation or more if required by the department is to be conducted;
4. Statistical summaries of student survey scores from the current evaluation period for all courses taught during the period of evaluation, as defined in Policy #1329;
5. Syllabi, exams and other course materials for each different course taught during the evaluation period, as required by the department;
6. Any responses to written student input, as defined by Policy #1329, received by the department during the evaluation period;
7. For those with non-instructional assigned duties, include supplementary documents directly related to the assignment, as appropriate.

- The evaluation committee and the department chair (if not serving on the evaluation committee), produce a report with constructive feedback and a copy of the report shall be placed in the faculty member's PAF.
- In the case of full-time temporary faculty members (full-time teaching load for two semesters during the academic year) a statement shall also be prepared by the appropriate dean/director. A copy of the report shall be placed in the faculty member's PAF.

For 3-year contracts:

1. An updated curriculum vitae;
2. A self-assessment narrative including a teaching philosophy statement, not to **exceed four pages**;
3. All peer classroom observations during the evaluation period. A minimum of one peer observation or more if required by the department is to be conducted;
4. Statistical summaries of student survey scores from the current evaluation period for all courses taught during the period of evaluation, as defined in Policy #1329;
5. Syllabi, exams and other course materials for each different course taught during the evaluation period, as required by the department;
6. Any responses to written student input, as defined by Policy #1329, received by the department during the evaluation period;
7. For those with non-instructional assigned duties, include supplementary documents directly related to the assignment, as appropriate.

Here are the changes:

- https://www.cpp.edu/~senate/documents/packets/2019-20/03.18.20/fa-001-190_report_first_reading_policy_attachment1_track_changes_03.10.20.pdf

Overview of changes to 1328 Evaluations for Probationary Faculty

- Why are we making these changes?
 - As the number of CPP tenure-track faculty increase, the number of Performance Reviews (Full reviews at every level) is increasing.
- Many CSUs have multi-year contracts for probationary faculty and have probationary faculty complete periodic evaluations when not going up for an action.
 - This includes, but is not limited to:
 - Cal State LA, Fullerton, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Sacramento, San Jose, SLO, and Sonoma

TWO-YEAR CONTRACTS!

- The proposed new abbreviated assessment process entails the awarding of reappointments in 2-year increments after a successful performance review (RTP)

Probationary Faculty would still be evaluated every year

- However, in non-action years they would complete a “periodic evaluation,” which ends at the dean’s level and does not result in a personnel action.
- The expected outcome is to provide the candidate a brief written document with input and guidance in preparation for their performance review scheduled in the second year of the 2-year reappointment.
- The proposal introduces 2-year reappointments as the default term beginning in **AY 2021/22**.

However,

- The DRTPC and/or other evaluators (e.g. department chair, dean, URTPC) may recommend a 1-year appointment (and a full performance review)
 - This should only happen if the evaluating body believes this is in the best interest of the candidate.
 - For instance, the faculty member is not quite meeting the standard RTP criteria.
 - The Provost will consider such recommendation(s) at all levels of review before rendering a final decision.

The “typical” scenario

- The 2nd and 4th year performance reviews are for consideration for a two-year reappointment (3rd-4th and 5th-6th probationary years)

Probationary Year	Types of Review	Outcomes
1	Periodic evaluation for Guidance (Pre-RTP)	This is the first year of employment; Pre-RTP; Stops at Dean’s level
2	Performance review (RTP) for reappointment to 3 rd and 4 th probationary years	Two years, or one-year reappointment if candidate is found to be in need of improvement
3	Periodic evaluation for Guidance	Stops at dean’s level; no personnel action
4	Performance review (RTP) for reappointment to 5 th and 6 th probationary years	Two years, or one-year reappointment if candidate is found to be in need of improvement
5	Periodic evaluation for Guidance	Stops at dean’s level; no personnel action
6	Performance review (RTP) for Tenure and Promotion consideration	T&P recommended, or terminal year granted

Five-Year Probationary Period (one year of service credit)

Probationary Year	Types of review and outcomes	Comments
1	Service credit	
2	Periodic evaluation for Guidance (Pre-RTP)	This is the first year of employment; Pre-RTP; Stops at dean's level
3	Performance review (RTP) for reappointment to 4 th and 5 th probationary years	Two years, or one-year reappointment if candidate is found to be in need of improvement
4	Periodic evaluation for Guidance	Stops at dean's level
5	Performance review (RTP) for reappointment to 6 th probationary year	Appointed to one-year reappointment
6	Performance review (RTP) for Tenure and Promotion consideration	T&P recommended, or terminal year granted

Unless you have an early action for T/P,

- All Probation faculty will have 3 Performance Reviews.

Candidates with two years of service credit and on probationary years 4 and 5 will undergo a performance review for consideration to a 1-year reappointment.

Probationary Year	Types of review and outcomes	Comments
1	Service credit	
2	Service credit	
3	Periodic evaluation for Guidance (Pre-RTP)	This is the first year of employment; Pre-RTP; Stops at dean's level
4	Performance review (RTP) for reappointment to 5 th probationary year	Appointed to one-year reappointment
5	Performance review (RTP) for reappointment to 6 th probationary year	Appointed to one-year reappointment
6	Performance review (RTP) for Tenure and Promotion consideration	T&P recommended, or terminal year granted

How does this effect current faculty?

2027/28						Tenure	
2026/27					Tenure	6th	
2025/26				Tenure	6th	5th	
2024/25			Tenure	6th	5th	4th	
2023/24		Tenure	6th	5th	4th	3rd	
2022/23	Tenure	6th	5th	4th	3rd	2nd	
2021/22*	6th	5th	4th	3rd	2nd	1st	
2020/21^	5th	4th	3rd	2nd	1st	N/A	
2019/20	4th	3rd	2nd	1st	N/A	N/A	
	PY4	PY3	PY2	PY1	(PY 20/21)	(PY 21/22)	

*Implementation Year for instituting 2-year reappointment; bold bordered box connotes 2-year reappointment

^An outreach educational campaign by way of RTP workshops will focus on explaining the New Abbreviated system that announces the 2-year reappointment term, distinguish between “performance reviews” and “periodic evaluations,” and define eligibility parameters.

Yellow boxes are years when probationary faculty would complete periodic evaluation.

Grey boxes are years when probationary faculty would complete performance review (RTP).

1st year faculty do Pre-RTP.

Candidate Status in Fall 2021

	CANDIDATE APPLIES FOR		UNDER NEW SYSTEM	
Candidate Status in Fall 2021	Under Current System, Performance Review Occurs Annually	Under NEW Abbreviated Review Process, Performance Review Occurs Every Other Year (Default is 2-year Re-Appointment)	“Periodic Evaluation” (Abbreviated) – PY when Conducted	Performance Review – PY when Conducted
PY 1*	PY2	PY2	N/A	N/A
PY 2	PY3	PY3 & PY4	PY3	PY4
PY 3	PY4	PY4 & PY5	PY4	PY5
PY 4	PY5	PY5 & PY6	PY5	PY6
PY 5	PY6	PY6	N/A	PY6
PY 6	Tenure & Promotion	Tenure & Promotion	N/A	Next Promotion

What goes into a Periodic Evaluation for probationary faculty?

1. An updated curriculum vitae;
2. A self-assessment narrative, not to exceed four pages, discussing strengths and areas for growth in teaching, research, scholarly and creative activities, and service and other professional activities as applicable from the current review period;
3. Two peer evaluations from the period of review (or more if required by the department); and
4. Statistical summaries of student survey scores and reviews from the current review period;
5. Any responses to written student input, as defined by Policy No. 1329, received by the department during the evaluation period.

Periodic Evaluation

- Stops at the Dean/Director level.
 - “The DRTPC, the department chair (if not serving on the DRTPC), and the dean shall produce a report with constructive feedback and clear guidance for improvement in preparation of the next year’s performance review.”

Performance Evaluation (RTP)

When a faculty member undergoes a performance review, the faculty member shall submit an RTP package that is comprised to the following items:

1. An updated curriculum vitae;
2. A self-assessment narrative (no page limit) discussing strengths and areas for growth in teaching, research, scholarly and creative activities and service from the current review period;
3. All peer evaluations since the previous performance review (in the case of reappointment) or all peer evaluations since appointment or last promotion (in the case of tenure and/or promotion);
4. Statistical summaries of student survey scores since the previous performance review (in the case of reappointment) or all student survey scores since appointment or last promotion (in the case of tenure and/or promotion);
5. Performance reviews require the use of the Faculty Performance Review Form (RTP Form);
6. Any responses to written student input, as defined by Policy No. 1329, received by the department during the evaluation period.

Here are the changes:

- https://www.cpp.edu/~senate/documents/packets/2019-20/03.18.20/fa-002-189_policy_1328-final_03.25.20.pdf