EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY

Academic Senate Policy #F84-122

At its meeting of September 18, 1984, the Academic Senate approved the following policy on the evaluation of tenured faculty:

The Agreement between the Board of Trustees of the California State University and the California Faculty Association: August 16, 1983 - June 30, 1986 (Article 15.1-15.20, 15.29-15.31) mandates the periodic performance evaluation of tenured faculty unit employees.

Purpose:

Evaluation of ourselves as tenured faculty is consistent with the University’s mission of educational excellence. The primary purpose of the evaluation of tenured faculty is to benefit the faculty member through peer review. The evaluation is the department’s responsibility. The most positive effects of the evaluation will be obtained at the department level and accrue to the individual. The evaluation should encourage and recognize the accomplishments of tenured faculty, and make recommendations for correcting any deficiencies. In addition, the purpose of the evaluation of tenured faculty is to consider the relationship of the faculty member to new and on-going programs of the department.

Eligibility:

All tenured faculty unit employees, including faculty on the early retirement program, are covered by the mandate except for those tenured faculty who are undergoing or have undergone, in the preceding five year period, a performance review for tenure or promotion.

Frequency of Evaluation

Tenured faculty members shall be evaluated according to these procedures at least once every five years. Because tenured faculty on leave status are continuing faculty, the period in which a tenured faculty member is on leave is included as part of the five year interval.

At the beginning of each five-year cycle, departments shall establish a schedule for the evaluations which ensures that all eligible tenured faculty are evaluated once every five years. The names of faculty to be evaluated each year will be sent to the Faculty Affairs Office each fall semester.

Criteria:

All tenured faculty must be evaluated by a Peer Review Committee and the dean/director or designee for teaching effectiveness or for effectiveness in primary assignment. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness must include written student evaluations in a minimum of two classes annually during the five-year period of review.
Beyond the requirement of student evaluation of teaching performance, departments may establish their own criteria for the evaluation of tenured faculty. Optional criteria may include, but are not limited to: curriculum development or revision; advising; contributions to the department, school, and/or university; currency in the field; professional achievement and growth; community service; and participation in professional associations. *(See Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Cover Sheet)*

**Procedures:**

Evaluation of tenured faculty shall be conducted by a properly constituted Peer Review Committee of the department or equivalent unit. Departments shall specify on the *Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Cover Sheet* whether an HRTP Committee was used or whether a specially constituted committee was established for this purpose.

At the beginning of each five-year evaluation cycle, it is the responsibility of the Peer Review Committee to inform tenured faculty eligible for evaluation about the procedures, the departmental criteria, and any supporting materials they are to submit to the committee. Department Peer Review Committees shall notify all tenured faculty to be reviewed about the time frames for the evaluation and deadlines for submission of materials. Some departments may choose to evaluate tenured faculty during the fall semester when the workload of an HRTP committee is lighter. In any case, tenured faculty should be notified the preceding semester of the pending evaluation.

At the conclusion of its deliberations, the Peer Review Committee shall prepare a written Peer Review Committee report, herein after referred to as the summary report. The Peer Review Committee summary report shall be forwarded to the dean/director or designee and to the tenured faculty member. Indexed materials submitted by the faculty member shall be returned to the faculty member. The Peer Review Committee Chair and the dean/director or designee shall meet with the tenured faculty member being evaluated to discuss his/her strengths and weaknesses along with suggestions, if any, for improvement.

The *Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Cover Sheet*, the Peer Review Committee's summary report, the results of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness in two classes annually, and a written statement by the dean/director or designee (if not part of the *Cover Sheet*) shall be placed in the official Personnel Action File at the conclusion of the evaluation.

Any rebuttal or statement the tenured faculty member wishes to make at any stage in the evaluation shall also be placed in the official Personnel Action File at the conclusion of the evaluation.

**EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY**

**COVER SHEET**

Department: Date of Evaluation: 

Date Tenure Awarded:_______
SECTION I: *(To be completed by the Chair of the Peer Review Committee)*

A. Membership of Department Review Committee: *Check appropriate box (members of the Committee must be tenured, full-time faculty).*

- HRT Committee
- Promotion Committee
- Specially Constituted Committee

B. Required Criteria used by Peer Review Committee: *Check appropriate box.*

- Written Student evaluations of teaching performance in a minimum of two classes annually during the five-year review period.
- Effectiveness in primary assignment for librarians

Optional Criteria:

Departments vary greatly in their criteria for performance. Any of the following criteria may be selected by the department and included in the evaluation: peer review of teaching effectiveness; curriculum development or revision; advising; contributions to the department, school, and/or university; currency in the field; professional achievement and growth; community service; participation in professional associations; or other selected criteria.

C. Procedures Followed:

- The faculty member chose to submit an updated vita or self-assessment as part of the evaluation.
- The peer Review Committee examined materials supplied by the faculty member and materials gathered by the committee, and prepared its written report.
- An index of materials submitted by the faculty member is attached. (The actual manuscripts, creative works and other materials provided by the faculty member have been returned to her/him.)
- The Chair of the Peer Review Committee has discussed the results of the evaluation with the faculty member.
- The Peer Review Committee summary report has been given to the dean/director or designee. A copy has been given to the faculty member.

Signature of Committee Chair:

Date
Signatures of Committee Members:

Date

Date

SECTION II: To be completed by Dean/Director or Designee.

- I have discussed the results of the evaluation with the faculty members.
- Commendations for strengths and suggestions for improvement, if any, have been made; and avenues of assistance have been identified.
- The procedures followed have been in conformity with San Francisco State University’s Policy for the Evaluation of Tenured Faculty.
- The summary report has been sent to the official Personnel Action File along with evaluations of teaching effectiveness.
- I concur with the summary report of the Peer Review Committee and have no further comment.
- I do not concur with the summary report of the Peer Review Committee and/or wish to comment further. My separate statement is attachment.

Signature of Dean/Director or Designee Date

Signature of Faculty Member Reviewed* Date

*This signature indicates receipt of a copy only; it does not indicate agreement or disagreement with the evaluation.

Summary Report and Student Teaching Evaluations have been filed in the faculty member’s Personnel Action File.

Signature of Dean of Faculty Affairs Date

*** APPROVED BY PRESIDENT WOO ON OCTOBER 23, 1984 ***