I. Minutes: January 7. 2020 minutes (pp. 2-3)

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office:
C. Provost:
D. Statewide Senate:
E. CFA:
F. ASI:

IV. Special Reports:
A. [TIME CERTAIN 3:45 P.M] Immediate Access Program Ethical Risks Presentation: Ryan Jenkins, Ethics + Emerging Sciences Group (to be distributed at meeting)
B. Cal Poly Marking Presentation: Royaa Silver, Robyn Tanner and Marya Figueroa, University Marketing

V. Business Item(s):
A. Appointment of Joongmin Shin as the OCOB rep for the Fairness Board for the 2019-2021 term
B. Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Subchapter 6.3: Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Pattern: Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee (pp. 4-10)
C. Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 7: Personnel Actions Eligibility and Criteria: Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee (pp. 11-18)

VI. Discussion Item(s):
A. ASI President and Board of Directors voting in Academic Senate

VII. Adjournment:
Meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee
Tuesday, January 7, 2020
01-409, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: M/S/P to approve the November 5, 2019 and December 12, 2019 Academic Senate Executive Committee minutes.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none.

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, reported that there will be three working groups created by the Year-Round Task Force and each group will focus on concept, budget and operational continuity respectively. Stegner also reported that the Provost Search Committee has been making progress and will have a formal report in February.
B. President’s Office: Jessica Darin, President’s Chief of Staff, announced that the search for a new Cal Poly Corporation CEO has begun and the search for a new Vice President for Development will begin in next month and take about six months to complete. Justin Wellner, Director of Government Relations, gave a brief presentation explaining Proposition 13: The Public Preschool, K-12 and College Health and Safety Bond Act of 2020.
C. Provost: none.
D. Statewide Senate: none.
E. CFA: Lewis Call, CFA President, announced that CFA Bargaining Team has developed “sunshine” proposals based on the results of the recent Bargaining Survey and is waiting for approval by the CFA Board of Directors.
F. ASI: Mark Borges, ASI President, announced that ASI will continue their civic engagement efforts throughout winter quarter. A campaign forum with the county’s District 5 Board of Supervisors seats will be hosted on campus on February 18, 2020, which is also deadline for voter registration for the California primaries.

IV. Business Item(s):
A. Appointment of Rachel Fernflores to the Course Renewal Task Force for the 2019-2020 term.
   M/S/P to appoint Rachel Fernflores, Philosophy, to the Course Renewal Task Force to represent the General Education Governance Board (GEGB) for the remainder of 2019-2021 term.
B. Appointment of Sophia Forster as a substitute for Kathryn Rummell on the Double Major Task Force for the 2019-2020 term.
   M/S/P to appoint Sophia Forster, English, as a substitute for Kathryn Rummell as the CLA representative on the Double Major Task Force for the remainder of the 2019-2020 term.
C. Appointment of Denise Isom as a substitute for José Navarro on the GE Governance Board for winter quarter 2020.
   M/S/P to appoint Denise Isom, Ethnic Studies, as a substitute for José Navarro as the CLA representative on the GE Governance Board with winter quarter 2020.
D. Resolution on Subject Area Guidelines (II) for General Education 2020. Gary Laver, GE Governance Board Chair, presented a resolution establishing new guidelines for Areas C, D and E general education courses for the 2020-2021 and subsequent catalogs that reflect EO 1100. M/S/P to agendize the resolution.
E. Resolution on Discontinuation of M.A. in Education Degree Program. Kevin Taylor, School of Education Director, proposed a resolution to discontinue the M.A. in Education degree program in light of the creation of
four new, specialized degree programs that stand alone within the School of Education. M/S/P to agendize the resolution.

F. **Resolution on Adding a Sustainability Catalog Option to Schedule Builder.** David Braun, Sustainability Committee Chair, introduced a resolution that would introduce a new feature to Schedule Builder to allow users to specifically search for SUCAT classes, or classes that deal with sustainability. M/S/P to agendize the resolution.

V. **Discussion Item(s):** none.

VI. **Adjournment:** 4:34 p.m.

Submitted by,

Katie Terou

Katie Terou
Academic Senate Student Assistant
RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES
SUBCHAPTER 6.3: POST-TENURE FACULTY EVALUATION PATTERN

Impact on Existing Policy: This resolution revises academic personnel policies contained in University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) 6.3, which was established by AS-874-19.¹

WHEREAS, AS-687-09 established University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA) as Cal Poly’s governing document concern faculty evaluation; and

WHEREAS, UFPA VI.B.1.a.(2) requires associate professors and associate librarians to undergo a periodic post-tenure evaluation in their third year at rank; and

WHEREAS, Policies on post-tenure faculty evaluation from UFPA are now contained in University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) chapter 6.3; and

WHEREAS, University policy requiring a third-year associate professor/librarian post-tenure evaluation has long been widely ignored around campus; and

WHEREAS, Consultation with colleges and the library reveals that they prefer the choice of whether or not to implement a third-year associate professor/librarian post-tenure evaluation to be determined at the college level; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The policy included in the report “Proposed Revision of University Faculty Personnel Policies UFPP subchapter 6.3 Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Pattern” replace the policies currently in UFPP 6.3, and be it further
RESOLVED: Colleges and the Library revise chapter 6 of their personnel policy documents by Fall 2020 to reflect whether or not they implement the third-year associate professor/librarian post-tenure evaluation.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee  
Date: [Sometime in 2020]

---

1 (1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.  
(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.  
(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies which specifies the nature of consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and provides a clear accounting of which policy documents have been superseded by the proposed change. FAC has used this process to construct a new University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) document and is now employing the same process to revise or propose new personnel policies to UFPP on an as-needed basis.

In creating UFPP FAC has adopted a guiding principle that, as far as possible, the migration of existing personnel policies from the former governing personnel policies document, University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA), into UFPP shall not change those policies as they are in UFPA, but instead just reformulate them into the new style and structure of UFPP. Once the policies previously in UFPA are in place in UFPP, FAC may then visit them for subsequent revision in the form of presenting to the Academic Senate revisions to chapters and sections of UFPP.

In AY 2018-2019 the Academic Senate moved policies concerning the multi-year patterns of faculty evaluations from UFPA into chapter 6 of UFPP. One policy from UFPA requires associate professors undergo a periodic evaluation in their third-year post-tenure. This policy, though it has been established by Academic Senate resolution AS-687-09, has been widely ignored. When the Senate considered UFPP chapter 6 the presence of this policy and the widespread disregard of it initiated some discussion about whether or not to preserve this policy. In light of the widespread disregard for this policy, and in light of the value of this policy in those few quarters on campus that follow it, our interim Provost, Mary Pedersen, asked that in AY 2019-20 the Senate consider whether to keep this policy and require conformity across campus, or revise the policy to reflect the current practices around campus by rendering this review optional.

FAC has consulted with the colleges and the library on this matter and now proposes a revision to our policies to preserve existing practice. The upshot of this consultation is that the colleges that conform with this policy want to preserve it and those which have not conformed do not want to implement it. In short, colleges want the option to decide at their level whether or not to require a third-year associate professor periodic review and not have such a review be required at the university level. FAC agree that rendering this review optional is a good policy.

Summary of subchapter 6.3 Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Pattern

The policy requiring a third-year associate professor periodic evaluation is stated in UFPP:

6.3.1 A Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation shall be conducted during the third year in which a tenured faculty employee has served in the academic rank of Associate Professor or Associate Librarian. The purpose of the evaluation is formative and intended to assist and guide the Associate Professor or Associate Librarian in their preparation for subsequent promotion review.
## Proposed Revision of University Faculty Personnel Policies

### UFPP subchapter 6.3 Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Pattern

This policy is a restated version of the original policy at UFPA VI.B.1.a.(2) established by the Academic Senate in resolution AS-687-09 that created UFPA as the governing faculty personnel policy document at Cal Poly:

**A periodic evaluation is conducted during the third year in which a tenured faculty employee has served in the academic rank of Associate Professor, Associate Librarian, or SSP-AR II. The purpose of the evaluation is formative and intended to assist and guide the Associate Professor, Associate Librarian, or SSP-AR II in their preparation for subsequent promotion review.**

The proposed revision to subchapter 6.3 of UFPP replaces “shall” with “may” in the policy in question, and adds a requirement that if any college or the library or a department decides to require such a periodic evaluation, that this requirement be stated in their personnel policies. Rendering this policy optional at the college level warrants moving it to a place later in that subchapter, below the general allowance of ad hoc post-tenure evaluations off the normal five-year calendar. And so the sections of this subchapter are rearranged. We’ve also implemented one editorial change, replacing “reviews” for “evaluations” in 6.3.1.

### Impact on Existing Policy

UFPP subchapter 6.3 is current Cal Poly policy as part of UFPP Chapter 6 established by AS-874-19. These policies about third-year associate professor/librarian evaluation are from UFPA, established by AS-687-09. Enforcing this policy would change practices in most colleges and the library which have not adhered to this policy.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) requires tenured faculty to be evaluated at intervals of no greater than five years (CBA 15.35). Timelines for periodic evaluations are determined by faculty units and approved by the President (CBA 15.4). Nothing in the CBA prohibits post-tenure evaluation cycles of less than five years, so long as the timeline is established as a matter of policy.

If the Senate rejects this revision to UFPP 6.3, then the existing policy requiring a third-year associate professor/library evaluation would be tacitly reaffirmed and Academic Personnel would assist the colleges and library in implementing the existing policy.

If the Senate accepts the proposed revision to UFPP 6.3, then the current and long-standing practices at the colleges and library would now conform with university policy.

### Implementation

If the Senate rejects the revision to this policy, the third-year associate professor evaluation remains in Cal Poly policy. Implementation of the policy in college and library faculty evaluation calendars would start AY 2020-2021.

Faculty Affairs Committee, Winter 2020
If the Senate revises this policy to render the third-year associate professor evaluation optional, then practices in the colleges and library could continue as they have, though any college or the library may need to revise their policy documents effective the following academic year to reflect their practices in relation to university policy.

What follows is text of the proposed revision of UFPP 6.3. The first version presents the proposed new policy and the second version reveals the revision with markup formatting with existing policy language in black text, moved but otherwise preserved policy in green text with double-strikeout and double-underlining, and revisions to policy text are noted in red with strikeouts for deletions and underlining for new policy text ...
6.3. Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Pattern

6.3.1. A Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation of tenured faculty employees at any rank shall be conducted at least once every five years after promotion or appointment to their respective academic rank. Performance evaluations for promotion can serve in lieu of periodic evaluations.

6.3.2. More frequent periodic evaluation of a tenured faculty employee may be conducted by request of the faculty member, the department chair/head, or dean. After such a request, the periodic evaluation shall be conducted as soon as possible.

6.3.3. A Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation may be conducted during the third year in which a tenured faculty employee has served in the academic rank of Associate Professor or Associate Librarian. The purpose of the evaluation is formative and intended to assist and guide the Associate Professor or Associate Librarian in their preparation for subsequent promotion review. Colleges and other faculty units requiring this evaluation shall include that requirement in their personnel policies documents.

6.3.4. Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) shall not be required to undergo a periodic evaluation unless an evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant or the appropriate administrator (CBA 15.35).

6.3.5. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor requires a Five-Stage Performance Evaluation.
6.4.6.3. Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Pattern

6.4.4.1.1.1. A Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation shall be conducted during the third year in which a tenured faculty employee has served in the academic rank of Associate Professor or Associate Librarian. The purpose of the evaluation is formative and intended to assist and guide the Associate Professor or Associate Librarian in their preparation for subsequent promotion review.

6.4.2.6.3.1. A Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation of tenured faculty employees at any rank shall be conducted at least once every five years after promotion or appointment to their respective academic rank. Performance reviews evaluations for promotion can serve in lieu of periodic evaluations.

6.4.3.6.3.2. More frequent periodic evaluation of a tenured faculty employee may be conducted by request of the faculty member, the department chair/head, or dean. After such a request, the periodic evaluation shall be conducted as soon as possible.

6.3.3. A Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation may be conducted during the third year in which a tenured faculty employee has served in the academic rank of Associate Professor or Associate Librarian. The purpose of the evaluation is formative and intended to assist and guide the Associate Professor or Associate Librarian in their preparation for subsequent promotion review. Colleges and other faculty units requiring this evaluation shall include that requirement in their personnel policies documents.

6.4.4.6.3.4. Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) shall not be required to undergo a periodic evaluation unless an evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant or the appropriate administrator (CBA 15.35).

6.4.5.6.3.5. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor requires a Five-Stage Performance Evaluation.
RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES
CHAPTER 7: PERSONNEL ACTIONS ELIGIBILITY AND CRITERIA

Impact on Existing Policy: This resolution establishes the statement of policy about faculty evaluation cycle patterns. Its impact on existing policy is described in the attached report.1

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee is constructing a document entitled “University Faculty Personnel Policies” (UFPP) to house all university-level faculty personnel policies; and

WHEREAS, AS-859-18 resolved that “The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee construct UFPP by proposing university-level faculty personnel policies to the Senate in the form of chapters or portions of chapters of UFPP according to the procedures approved in AS-829-17”; and

WHEREAS, AS-859-18 resolved that “By the end of Spring 2020 Colleges and other faculty units reorganize their faculty personnel policy documents to conform their documents to the chapter structure of UFPP”; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The policy document contained at the end of the attached report “Proposed Chapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document: CHAPTER 7: Personnel Actions Eligibility and Criteria” be established as Chapter 7: Personnel Actions Eligibility and Criteria of UFPP, and be it further

RESOLVED: Colleges and the Library revise their personnel policy documents by Spring 2020 to have chapter 7 of their documents cover personnel actions eligibility and criteria as per chapter 7 of UFPP.
Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: [Sometime in 2020]

(1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.

(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.

(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies. This process specifies the nature of consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and provides a clear accounting of which policy documents have been superseded by the proposed change. It also allows the Senate Executive Committee to place non-controversial updates to personnel policies on the Senate consent agenda. Using the new process, FAC will replace the current University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA) document piece by piece to construct a new University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) document. FAC may then employ the same process to update sections of the new UFPP on an as-needed basis.

The guiding principles in reforming the UFPA into the new UFPP are the following:

- **Clarify existing policies** that are common and already in place across the university.
- **Standardize procedures** for faculty evaluation at the university level.
- **Set baseline expectations and offer guiding principles** with directives to the colleges and departments to specify their criteria accordingly attuned to the disciplinary considerations specific to their programs.
- **Establish a common structure for all personnel policy documents across campus.**

The Senate has approved a resolution (AS-859-18) establishing the general structure of the UFPP in the form of its main chapter divisions, each containing thematically unified selections of policy:

1. Preface
2. Faculty Appointments
3. Personnel Files
4. Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes
5. Evaluation Processes
6. Evaluation Cycle Patterns
7. Personnel Action Eligibility and Criteria
8. Evaluation of Teaching and Professional Services
9. Evaluation of Professional Development
10. Evaluation of Service
11. Governance
12. Workload
13. Appendices

In replacing UFPA with UFPP FAC is proposing to the Senate individual chapters of UFPP, each covered by its own Senate resolution. A draft of one of these chapters follows in this document, preceded by a summary of its content, impact, and implementation.

FAC has consulted with the colleges, the library, and Counseling Services about this chapter. The only notable results of this consultation pertained to the application of these policies to the non-tenure-track faculty classifications in Counseling Services.

Faculty Affairs Committee, Winter 2020
Summary of CHAPTER 7: Personnel Actions Eligibility and Criteria

This chapter compiles the policies concerning eligibility and criteria for personnel actions such as retention, tenure, promotion, and lecturer range elevation.

Impact on Existing Policy

This chapter establishes no new policy, but restates existing policy. The policies on personnel actions for probationary and tenured faculty are drawn from University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA). The policies on lecturer range elevation are drawn from an administrative memo on lecturer range elevation from 2016, and from AS-538-00/FAC which required colleges and faculty units to draft lecturer range elevation policies.

Implementation

The establishment of UFPP by the Academic Senate would oblige the Colleges and Library to restructure their faculty personnel policy documents into the same chapter division as UFPP. When a chapter of UFPP is approved by the Academic Senate and ratified by the President, the Colleges and the Library will now have a focused area of new or revised policy that they must consult and, if necessary, use to revise their documents accordingly. Colleges need to place any of their policies on faculty personnel actions into chapter 7 of their personnel policy documents.

As these policies are currently in effect, there is no implementation of policy by the Senate action of approving the inclusion of this chapter into UFPP. The policies currently reside in UFPP in an appendix containing an editorial revision of UFPA.

What follows is the proposed text of the chapter...
7. Personnel Action Eligibility and Criteria

7.1. Summary

7.1.1. This chapter covers the eligibility for personnel actions (including retention, promotion, tenure, range elevation) and the general principles according to which the colleges, library, and departments would specify the criteria for warranting personnel actions. Colleges and departments would expand greatly on these policies with their own criteria mindful of how the diversity of disciplines within the college manifest the teacher/scholar model.

7.1.2. [CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION].

7.2. Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria

7.2.1. The quality of faculty performance is the most important element to consider in evaluating individual achievement. Although teaching effectiveness is the primary and essential criterion, it alone is not sufficient for retention, promotion, and tenure. The degree of evidence will vary in accordance with the academic position being sought by the applicant. 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.

7.2.2. Recommendations for retention, promotion, and tenure of instructional faculty are based on the exhibition of merit and ability in each of the following University criteria:

- Teaching performance
- Professional development
- Service
- Other factors of consideration

7.2.3. Recommendations for retention, promotion, and tenure of library and non-instructional faculty are based on the exhibition of merit and ability in each of the following University criteria:

- Professional performance
- Professional development
- Service
- Other factors of consideration

7.2.4. Recommendations for retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty may also include criteria set by colleges. Departments may also have additional criteria established in their approved personnel policy documents.

7.2.5. Teaching performance

7.2.5.1. In formulating recommendations for the retention, promotion, and tenure of teaching faculty, evaluators will place primary emphasis on success in instruction.

7.2.5.2. Evaluators shall consider such factors as the applicant’s competence in the discipline, ability to communicate ideas effectively, versatility and appropriateness of teaching techniques, organization of courses, relevance of instruction to course objectives, methods of evaluating student achievement, relationship with students in class, effectiveness of student advising, and other factors relating to performance as an instructor.

7.2.5.3. Evaluators shall consider results of the formal student evaluation in formulating recommendations based on teaching performance.

7.2.6. Professional performance
7.2.6.1. In formulating recommendations on the retention, promotion, and tenure of librarians, evaluators shall place primary emphasis on effectiveness as a librarian as evaluated by colleagues and library users.

7.2.6.2. Evaluators shall consider such factors as furthering objectives of the library and the University by cooperating with fellow librarians; applying bibliographic techniques effectively to the acquisition, development, classification, and organization of library resources; initiating and carrying to conclusion projects within the library; demonstrating versatility, including the ability to work effectively in a range of library functions and subject areas; and supervisory and/or administrative abilities.

7.2.6.3. Evaluation of non-instructional faculty shall consider professional performance appropriate to the position of the faculty under evaluation.

7.2.7. **Professional growth and scholarly achievement**

7.2.7.1. In formulating recommendations on the retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty, evaluators shall place emphasis on the professional growth and scholarly achievement of the applicant.

7.2.7.2. Evaluators shall consider such factors as the applicant’s educational background and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, scholarly and creative achievements, participation in professional societies, publications, presentation of papers at professional and scholarly meetings, and external validation and peer review of scholarly and creative activities.

7.2.8. **Service**

7.2.8.1. In formulating recommendations on the retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty, evaluators shall place emphasis on the service the applicant performs in relation to the university and the community.

7.2.8.2. Evaluators shall consider such factors as the applicant’s participation in academic advisement; placement follow-up; co-curricular activities; membership of department, college, the Academic Senate and its committees, and University committees; individual assignments; systemwide assignments; and, service in community affairs directly related to the applicant’s teaching and/or research areas as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities.

7.2.9. **Other factors of consideration**

7.2.9.1. In formulating recommendations on the retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty, evaluators shall place emphasis on collegiality (working collaboratively and productively with colleagues and participation in traditional academic functions); initiative; cooperativeness; and dependability.

7.3. **Retention eligibility**

7.3.1. Performance reviews for the purpose of retention shall be in accordance with Articles 13 and 15 of the CBA.

7.3.2. It is the responsibility of applicants to provide sufficient evidence that they have fulfilled the criteria for retention.

7.3.3. The normal probationary period is six academic years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment).

7.3.4. Evaluation of probationary faculty involves a comprehensive assessment of performance during the entire probationary period with retention seen as leading to tenure.

7.3.5. Retention is not a guarantee of tenure.

7.3.6. Faculty who have not demonstrated the potential to achieve tenure should not be retained.
7.3.7. In the event of a non-retention decision, a probationary faculty employee who has served a minimum of three years of probation (including any credit for prior service) will be extended a terminal year of employment with no further appointment rights.

7.4. Promotion eligibility

7.4.1. Promotion eligibility shall be governed by the terms of Article 14 of the CBA. Promotion in rank is not automatic and is granted only in recognition of teaching competency or effectiveness as a librarian, professional growth and scholarly achievement, and meritorious service during the period in rank. The application of criteria will be more rigorous for promotion to Professor or Librarian than to Associate Professor or Associate Librarian.

7.4.2. Applicants for promotion to the academic rank of Professor or Librarian must be tenured or concurrently be granted tenure.

7.4.3. An application for promotion to Associate Professor or Associate Librarian is considered normal if the applicant is eligible and both of the following conditions hold:
   - The applicant is tenured or the applicant is also eligible for and applying for normal tenure.
   - The applicant has completed at least the equivalent of four years in their academic rank at Cal Poly.

7.4.4. An application for promotion to Associate Professor or Associate Librarian is considered “early” if one of the following conditions holds:
   - The applicant is a probationary faculty employee who is not in their sixth probationary year and is not eligible for normal tenure.
   - The applicant is a tenured faculty employee and has not satisfied the equivalent service requirements of at least four years in their academic rank at Cal Poly.

7.4.5. Early promotion will be granted only in exceptional cases. The circumstances and record of performance which make the case exceptional shall be fully documented by the applicant and validated by evaluators.

7.4.6. The fact that an applicant has reached the maximum salary in their academic rank or meets the performance criteria for promotion does not in itself constitute an exceptional case for early promotion.

7.5. Tenure eligibility

7.5.1. Tenure eligibility shall be governed by the terms of Article 13 of the CBA.

7.5.2. Possession of the doctorate or other designated terminal degree from an accredited institution is required for tenure.

7.5.3. Applicants for appointment with tenure shall normally be tenured professors or tenured librarians at other universities. Exceptions to this provision must be carefully documented. The President may award tenure to any individual, including one whose appointment and assignment is in a management position, at the time of appointment. Appointments with tenure shall be made only after an evaluation and recommendation by tenured faculty in the appropriate department.

7.5.4. Normal tenure is for applicants who have accrued credit for six academic years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment).

7.5.5. Early tenure is for applicants who have not yet achieved credit for six academic years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment).
7.5.6. An applicant for early tenure must meet department, college, or library criteria for normal tenure and provide evidence of outstanding performance in each of the following performance areas: teaching, library, or professional effectiveness, professional growth and scholarship, and service to the University and community.

7.5.7. An applicant for early tenure should, at a minimum, receive a favorable majority vote from the department peer review committee.

7.6. **Tenure criteria**

7.6.1. Tenure represents the University’s long-term commitment to a faculty employee and is only granted when there is strong evidence that the individual who, by reason of their excellent performance and promise of long-range contribution as a teacher-scholar to the educational purpose of the institution, is deemed worthy of this important commitment. Tenure means the right of a faculty employee to continue at Cal Poly unless voluntarily terminated or terminated for cause, lack of funds, or lack of work.

7.6.2. Tenure decisions are considered more critical to the University than promotion decisions.

7.6.3. An applicant who does not have the potential for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor should not be granted tenure.

7.6.4. To be recommended for tenure, an applicant must be rated during the final probationary year within one of the top two performance categories listed in Section V of Form AP 109 (Faculty Evaluation Form).

7.6.5. Retention is not a guarantee of tenure.

7.6.6. Tenure is not a guarantee of promotion.

7.6.7. Early promotion is not a guarantee of tenure.

7.7. **Lecturer range elevation**

7.7.1. Policies for lecturer range elevation are governed by CBA 12, and the memo “Amendments to the Range Elevation Procedures 2016.” Cal Poly requirements about colleges and faculty units establishing their own lecturer range elevation criteria were established by AS-538-00/FAC, which is superseded by UFPP.

7.7.2. Colleges and faculty units shall establish range elevation criteria for temporary lecturer faculty. Faculty, including temporary lecturer faculty, shall formulate such policies.

7.7.3. The university shall notify lecturer faculty in a timely manner of their eligibility to be considered for range elevation.

7.7.4. Temporary lecturer faculty members shall submit requests to be elevated to a higher range according to the university timeline accompanying the notification of eligibility. Faculty members shall document the reasons for which they believe that they should be elevated in the materials submitted in their WPAF.

7.8. **Counseling faculty**

7.8.1. Criteria and eligibility for counseling faculty with classification of Student Services Professional-Academic Related I (SSPAR I) shall be modeled after criteria and eligibility for lecturer faculty and stated in their faculty unit policy document.