WHEREAS, Campus Administrative Manual (CAM), section 341.1, is currently out-of-date; therefore, be it
RESOLVED: That the current CAM 341.1 be deleted; and, be it further
RESOLVED: That the following CAM 341.1 be added:

CAM 341 EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA
341.1 Academic Employees
A. Procedures

1. Evaluations shall be conducted in accordance with Article 15 of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the California State University (CSU) and Unit 3 Faculty.

2. Each school or other organizational unit (e.g., library) shall develop its own written statement of procedures and criteria for each type of personnel action. (In this section, the use of the word school includes the library and other organizational units covered under the Unit 3 contract.) Departments desiring to develop statements to serve as addenda to the school-wide statement may do so. Full-time probationary and full-time tenured faculty may participate in the development and/or subsequent amendment of these procedures and criteria. School and department statements are subject to review and approval by the school dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and shall be in accordance with the MOU and university policies.

3. Timetables for evaluations shall be published annually and shall be developed in consultation with the Academic Senate.
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4. The terms Personnel Action File and Working Personnel Action File are defined in Article 2.17 of the MOU and will hereafter be referred to as the Files. All evaluators must sign the logs in the Files before they make their recommendations. It is the professional obligation of all evaluators to review the information in the Files before they vote or provide a written recommendation.

5. At the department level, the department head/chair is the custodian of the Working Personnel Action File and, if appropriate, the Personnel Action File; at the school level, the custodian of the Files is the dean; at the university level, the custodian is the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Custodians of the Files and Peer Review Committee (PRC) chairs shall ensure the confidentiality of the Files. Normally, there shall be no duplication of file materials except for copies made for the candidate or appropriate administrator, or for distribution at PRC meetings. At the conclusion of each PRC meeting, the PRC chair is responsible for the collection of all duplicated materials. The only exception to this policy is that copies of the candidate's resume may be distributed to PRC members for use at times other than PRC meetings. After the PRC has made its recommendation, the copies of the resume shall be collected by the chair.

6. Each PRC evaluation report and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of that committee. There are occasions when a member of a PRC may feel that s/he cannot evaluate a candidate for some reason; e.g., conflict of interest, prejudice, or bias, etc. In such a case, that committee member will not participate or vote in the evaluation of that candidate. For purposes of determining a simple majority vote of the PRC, the membership of the committee shall be defined as those faculty casting yes or no votes.

7. Evaluative statements shall be based on the Files and should be validated with evidence
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such as class visitation, measurement of student achievement, course outlines and tests, significant curricular, scholarly, and committee contributions, and opinions of peers and students. If, at any level, the evidence is judged unsatisfactory, or if it does not appear to support the recommendations made, the Working Personnel File shall be returned to the appropriate level for clarification.

When recommendations at other levels of review are not in conformity with the recommendations of the department PRC, a full explanation of the reasons for the contrary recommendation shall be conveyed, in writing, to the department PRC by the first level of review at which the contrary recommendation is made.

8. Recommendations of PRC's at each level (department or school) must be accompanied by one of the following:
   a. A majority report and a minority report (if applicable). Both reports must include substantiating reasons and each report must be signed by those PRC members who support the report and the substantiating reasons.
   b. Individual recommendations from each PRC member (who participated in the evaluation). These recommendations must include substantiating reasons and must be signed.
   c. A combination of "a" and "b" above: a majority report, a minority report (if applicable), and individual recommendations from those members of the Peer Review Committee who support neither the majority nor the minority report. In any event, each report or recommendation must include substantiating reasons and must be signed by those who support it.

9. Deans shall use the Faculty Evaluation Form (Form 109) to evaluate faculty for retention, tenure, and promotion, as shall the heads/chairs of departments in which they are a separate level of review. Comments regarding student evaluations must be
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included in Section 1 of Form 109.

10. Guidelines for student evaluations are found in Administration Bulletin 74-1. School and department procedures for student evaluations shall be in accordance with this administrative bulletin and the MOU.

B. Criteria

1. Evaluative criteria shall emphasize teaching performance, but also should include professional growth and achievement, service to the university and community and possession of appropriate academic preparation. Although teaching effectiveness is the primary and essential criterion, it alone is not sufficient for retention, tenure, and promotion.

2. The intensity of the evaluation process will vary in accordance with the academic position of the candidate. For example, the granting of tenure requires stronger evidence of worthiness than retention, and promotion to Professor requires a more rigorous application of criteria than promotion to Associate Professor.

3. Evaluation of probationary faculty involves a "comprehensive assessment" with appointment and retention seen as leading to tenure. It should be understood that if a faculty member does not have the potential to achieve tenure, then that individual should not be reappointed. Similarly, a candidate who does not have the potential for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor should not be granted tenure. This does not mean that retention is a guarantee of tenure nor is tenure a guarantee of promotion.
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Evaluation Procedures and Criteria

A. Consultative Procedures

Only tenured faculty, department heads, and other academic administrators may participate in deliberations, voting, and formal recommendations at all levels of review on appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and termination of faculty. Such recommendations must originate at the department or, where applicable, school or division level, and pass through appropriate levels to the University President or a designee.

Information from other faculty members, students, and any other sources is to be considered by those who originate the first-level recommendations and by those who review those recommendations.

The Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate shall serve as a university-wide level of review of faculty personnel actions relating to retention, tenure, promotions, termination, and leaves with pay. Although this committee does not function as a grievance body, it may review and make recommendations within the guidelines outlined below in those cases where there is disagreement among the recommendations made by the department committees, department heads, and school deans; or in other cases when a faculty member believes that unusual circumstances have resulted in an unjust decision. However, the committee shall not review a case unless the faculty member has requested such review in writing. The findings and recommendations of the Personnel Review Committee shall be submitted to the President via the Vice President for Academic Affairs with a copy to the school dean in accordance with dates specified in subsequent sections. (See Appendix V.)

To insure consistency in the application of criteria by individual departments, divisions or schools, the Personnel Review Committee shall have access to a sampling of positive recommendations for comparison purposes.

Professional judgments are not subject to review by the Personnel Review Committee except in cases when there is an indication that prejudice, capriciousness, discrimination, or other improper conditions were involved. Where no improper circumstances are found to exist, the resources of the Personnel Review Committee should not be used to question the professional judgments of those fixed with a more immediate responsibility for faculty performance. Therefore, in reviewing cases the Personnel Review Committee should be concerned only with whether:

1. Established procedures were followed;
2. The recommended action was based on discrimination or prejudice;
3. Sufficient information was considered in the procedures to warrant the recommendation;
4. All relevant information was considered; and
5. Departments, divisions or schools were consistent in the application of stated or established criteria.

Upon receipt from the Vice President for Academic Affairs of the names of individuals whose cases represent disagreement among recommendations cited above or whose recommendations were all negative, the Chairperson of the Personnel Review Committee shall inform these individuals that they may request a review by the committee. In such invitation the Chairperson shall make it clear that the Personnel Review Committee will be concerned with any or all of the five items enumerated above.
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Further, the Chairperson shall direct those persons requesting review to restrict any comments and supporting data to the five items enumerated above. Those requesting review shall also send copies of their request, comments, and supporting data to their department head and to their dean or division head.

Upon receipt of such a request the committee Chairperson shall notify the dean and department head concerned. The dean and department head shall send copies of their comments, if any, to the PRC and to the faculty member requesting review. The Personnel Review Committee shall review the case and make a report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

B. Performance Evaluations for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

Performance evaluations of all academic employees are made annually for promotions, for tenure, for reappointments, and for any other recommended personnel action. Performance evaluations for full- and part-time lecturers are made annually by June 1. (See Faculty Evaluation Form, Appendix I.)

It is the responsibility of the department head to render all possible advice and assistance to members of the department in carrying out their teaching assignments, and particularly to new members of the department. This would include personal observation of the classes assigned new faculty members. The purpose of such observation is to assist the teacher through constructive criticism, to provide a more systematic basis for the evaluation process, and to assure that the fundamental objective of quality instructional programs is being met. Regular periodic conferences should be held at least once during the reappointment cycle and at other times as deemed necessary by the tenured reviewing faculty and academic administrators with each probationary faculty member to provide the latter with full perspective concerning strengths and weaknesses, possible means of improvement, and the current prospect for reappointment or tenure.

C. Post Tenure Peer Review

Schools and departments, with student participation, should develop procedures for peer evaluation of tenured faculty instructional performance including currency in the field, appropriate to university education. The procedures shall be compatible with the following University guidelines:

1. Annually, department heads and deans will be required to evaluate tenured Assistant Professors, steps 1 - 4; tenured Associate Professors, steps 1 - 4; and tenured Professors, steps 1 - 3, for merit salary adjustment purposes only. This will be accomplished by using pages 4 and 5, Form 109 (Faculty Evaluation Form).

   Assistant Professors, step 5; Associate Professors, step 5; and Professors, steps 4 and 5, shall undergo post-tenure peer review at least once every five years. In addition, if a department head or dean has reason to believe that a faculty member is performing unsatisfactorily, a post-tenure peer review by the departmental full Professors shall be conducted as soon as possible.

2. Post-Tenure review of Professors

   a. All Professors at Step 4 shall undergo a post-tenure peer review by the departmental tenured full Professors prior to June 1 of the academic year they reach that rank/step.

   b. Peer review of tenured Professors, Step 5, shall occur at least once every five years after initial evaluation.

      (1) Only departmental tenured full Professors are eligible to participate at the first level of peer review.

Revised November, 1980
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(2) If the department has no tenured Professors, the evaluation shall be conducted only by the department head and dean. Consideration shall be given to student evaluations.

(3) The criteria for post-tenure review of full Professors will be the same as for promotion to the Professor level, unless supplemental department or school criteria are approved.

3. Post-tenure peer review of Associate Professors
   a. During the academic year that a tenured Associate Professor reaches Step 5, one of the following two courses of action shall be taken:
      (1) If the professor requests promotion consideration, the evaluation shall be conducted under established promotion procedures and criteria. Such evaluation will be considered as satisfying the requirements for post-tenure peer review.
      (2) If promotion consideration is not requested, a peer review by the departmental professors shall be made in accordance with Board of Trustee policy.
         (a) The criteria for post-tenure review shall be the same as for promotion to Associate Professor, unless supplemental department or school criteria are approved.
         (b) If the department has no tenured Professors, the evaluation shall be conducted by the department head and dean. Consideration shall be given to student evaluation.
         (c) Peer review of tenured Associate Professors, Step 5, shall occur at least once every five years.
   b. Although post-tenure peer review of Associate Professors below Step 5 is not required, such faculty shall arrange for periodic conferences with the department head and senior faculty for advice and assistance regarding progress toward promotion during the year they are at Step 3.

4. Post-tenure Review Assistant Professors
   a. During the academic year that a tenured Assistant Professor reaches Step 5, one of the following two courses of action shall be taken:
      (1) If the professor requests promotion consideration, evaluation shall be under established promotion procedures and criteria. Such evaluation will be considered as satisfying the requirements for post-tenure review.
      (2) If promotion consideration is not requested, peer review by the department Professors shall be made in accordance with Board of Trustee policy.
         (a) The criteria for evaluation shall be the same as for the award of tenure, unless supplemental department or school criteria are approved.
         (b) If the department has no tenured Professors, the evaluation shall be conducted by the department head and dean. Consideration shall be given to student evaluations.
   b. Post-tenure review of tenured Assistant Professors, step 5, shall occur at least once every five years.
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5. The Faculty Evaluation Form 109 can be used in its present form or modified as appropriate to meet specific departmental or school needs. The peer evaluation may be in a written narrative form signed by the committee chairman or by individuals who reviewed the professor. The evaluation shall include the process used, the reasons for recommendations, and evidence in sufficient detail to validate the findings. In those instances where the consultative evaluations represent a consensus opinion signed by the committee chairperson, the filing of a minority report by committee member(s) whose opinions differ from the views expressed in the majority report should accompany the majority report at the time it is forwarded to the department head.

6. Post-tenure peer evaluations shall be forwarded to the department head no later than May 1. Department heads' and deans' evaluations should be completed prior to June 1, using Faculty Evaluation Form 109. The department head shall meet with each faculty member evaluated to discuss the results of the evaluations. If, areas for improvement are identified, the department head shall advise the faculty member of avenues for assistance available within the department or university. The written evaluations shall be placed in the faculty member's personnel file which is maintained in the school dean's office.

D. Evaluation Criteria

Each school or other organizational unit shall develop, consistent with general university policy, its own written statement of procedures and criteria for each type of personnel action. Departments desiring to develop statements to serve as addenda to the schoolwide statement may do so. Members of the school and/or department, whether tenured or not, shall equally participate in the development and/or subsequent amendment of these procedures and criteria. School and departmental statements are subject to review and approval by the school dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The President will approve criteria for personnel actions for the Division of Student Affairs.

Evaluative criteria shall emphasize teaching performance, but also should include scholarly and creative achievements, contributions to the community, contributions to the institution, and possession of appropriate academic preparation. Although teaching effectiveness is the primary and essential criterion, it alone is not sufficient for appointment, retention, tenure, and promotion. The intensity of the evaluation process will vary in accordance with the academic position of the faculty member. Thus, granting of tenure requires stronger evidence of worthiness than reappointment; promotion to Professor requires a more rigorous application of criteria than promotion to Associate Professor, etc.

However, evaluation of faculty involves a "comprehensive assessment" with appointment and retention seen as leading to tenure. It should be understood that if a faculty member is not likely to pass the test for obtaining tenure, then the individual should not be reappointed; if the faculty member does not have the potential for promotion to Associate Professor or beyond, tenure should not be accorded.

Each faculty member subject to evaluation shall update his/her personnel file, using the Faculty Resume Worksheet appearing in CAM Appendix XII as a guide. The basic evaluation of a faculty member's teaching ability and professional competence will be made by colleagues in that field and the department head. The faculty member will be evaluated in accordance with the established criteria for professional performance and comparatively against the performance of colleagues.

In those schools and/or departments where the evaluation procedure calls for a vote by faculty members conducting the evaluation and making a recommendation, the statement of procedures and criteria shall identify how abstention votes are to be treated.
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Faculty members should be advised prior to initial appointment about the importance of teaching effectiveness and the emphasis on particular criteria which will prevail in later decisions on reappointment, tenure, and promotion. For example, if the doctorate is required for tenure, the faculty member should be so advised.

E. Justification for Recommendations

Evaluative statements should be validated with reliable evidence such as class visitation, measurement of student achievement, course outlines and tests, committee work, publications, opinion of peers and students, and statement of the faculty member being evaluated. If, at the level of the department head or dean, the evidence is judged to be unsatisfactory, or if it does not appear to support the recommendations made, the file will be returned to the previous level for amplification.

When recommendations of the department head and/or the dean are not in conformity with, or are subsequently changed so they are not in conformity with, the recommendations of the faculty unit or committee consulted, full explanation of the reasons for a contrary recommendation should be conveyed to the faculty unit or committee consulted and to the individual involved by the first level reviewer expressing a contrary recommendation.

F. Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty

See Administrative Bulletin 74-1 in the Appendix.

341.2 Support Staff Employees

Performance evaluations of support staff employees will be made after 3, 6, and 9 months of employment during the probationary period; and for permanent employees, annually. Permanent status is established after 12 months of approved full-time service. (See Support Staff Employee Performance Evaluation Form, Appendix II)

The supervisor will use the Support Staff Employee Performance Evaluation Form to evaluate staff employees during their first year of probation and annually thereafter.

The Staff Personnel Officer will act as the reviewing officer for the purpose of verifying completion of all evaluations and noting any problems that appear to require further action.

341.3 Administrative Employees

Performance evaluations for administrative employees will be made at the end of the 6, 12, and 18 months of employment during the probationary period; and for permanent employees, annually. Permanent status is established after two years of approved full-time service. The supervisor will use the Administrative Employee Evaluation Form in Appendix III to evaluate administrative employees.

341.4 Instructional Department Heads and Academic Deans

See Administrative Bulletins 77-2 and 74-2 in the Appendix.

341.5 Evaluation of Academic Administrators

The following resolution was adopted by the Board of Trustees regarding the evaluation of academic administrators:

"Academic administrators serve at the pleasure of the President. It is the policy of the CSUC that all academic administrators be evaluated at regular intervals. It is necessary that the evaluator be aware of the perception of those who work with the administrator. The President shall develop procedures for the systematic acquisition of information and comments, and from
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Promotions

Criteria for Support Staff and Administrative Promotions

Whenever possible, promotions will be made from within the staff based upon the following factors of evaluation as listed in order of importance:

A. Demonstrated ability in terms of the job to be done
B. Reliability
C. Willingness to work with and cooperative attitude toward fellow workers
D. Loyalty
E. Length of service

Academic Promotions

A. Eligibility

1. Persons occupying academic rank positions but assigned full time to non-instructional duties will be considered for promotion by the administration; persons assigned to both teaching and instructional-administrative duties will be considered for promotion in both areas.

2. Normally promotions of academic employees may be made only after the completion of at least one full academic year of service in the fifth salary step of the rank. In case of overlapping steps in salary ranges between academic ranks, an individual will receive at the time of promotion a one-step increase in salary. Individuals are not eligible for promotion in academic
Thank you for transmitting the resolution on faculty evaluation procedures and criteria. Since personnel procedures cannot become effective until the personnel cycle has been concluded, the above resolution is approved with an effective date of June 15, 1990, and with the following modifications:

1. 341.1A.5--in order to clarify that those identified in this section are temporary file custodians only during the evaluation process and not permanent file custodians, the first sentence will be modified to read: "During performance reviews, the department head/chair is the custodian of the Working Personnel Action File at the department level and, if appropriate the Personnel Action File;..."

2. 341.1A.6--to ensure that the PRC member who declares a conflict of interest does not inadvertently affect the voting, the third sentence will be modified to read: "In such a case, that committee member should withdraw from the candidate's Peer Review Committee, thereby removing his/her eligibility to participate will not participate or vote in the evaluation of that candidate."

3. 341.1A.7--since reasons and recommendations by subsequent levels of review should be made available to the department PRC regardless of whether such recommendations are contrary to the department PRC, the last paragraph has be reworded as: "The written reasons and the recommendations by subsequent levels of review shall be made available to the department PRC. When recommendations at other levels of review are not in conformity with the recommendations of the department PRC, a full explanation of the reasons for the contrary recommendation shall be conveyed, in writing, to the department PRC by the first level of review at which the contrary recommendation is made."

4. 341.1A.9--in order to clarify the expectations of second and third levels of review, the first sentence will read: "Deans shall use the Faculty Evaluation Form (Form 109) to evaluate faculty for retention, tenure, and promotion, as shall the department heads/chairs in which they are a separate level of review."

5. 341.1A.10--because AB 74-1 is being replaced, this section will read: "Guidelines for student evaluations are found in the Campus Administrative Manual Administration Bulletin 74-1. School and department procedures for student evaluations shall be in accordance with those guidelines this administrative bulletin and the MOU."