March 10, 1981

MEMO TO: All Department Chairs

FROM: Gail Fullerton
President

SUBJECT: IMPLEMENTATION OF TRUSTEE RESOLUTIONS ON POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY

The Board of Trustees of The California State University and Colleges adopted a policy on May 28, 1980, which reads as follows:

Policy. It is the policy of The California State University and Colleges to provide for periodic performance appraisals for each permanent or probationary employee.

Procedures. Procedures shall be established for periodic performance appraisals of permanent or probationary employees consonant with the policies of the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor.

On July 9, 1980, the Board of Trustees adopted the following resolution:

RESOLVED. That the Trustees adopt as policy the following minimum standards for the evaluation of tenured faculty:

1. The President shall be responsible for assuring that each department, or the first level of review, with student participation, shall develop procedures for peer evaluation of faculty instructional performance including currency in the field, appropriate to university education.

   a. These procedures shall apply to all tenured faculty except those scheduled for promotion review.

   b. These procedures shall include, but not be limited to, consideration of student evaluations of instructional performance currently required of all faculty in at least two courses annually. Courses selected for evaluation shall be representative of the faculty member's teaching responsibilities during the evaluation cycle.

   c. These procedures shall provide that tenured faculty be evaluated at intervals of no greater than 5 years.

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
2. Following the evaluation, a written summary of the evaluation shall be given to the faculty member. Normally the department chair, or the appropriate administrator at the first level of review, shall meet with each faculty member evaluated to discuss the results of the evaluation.

If areas for improvement are identified the aforementioned administrator shall advise the faculty member of avenues for assistance available within the department or campus.

3. The written summary of the evaluation shall be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

Response was requested by the Chancellor by February, 1981, from each campus president. This due date has been extended to April 1, by which time I must submit to the Chancellor a copy of the procedures adopted by each department on this campus pursuant to Trustee policy.

The Academic Senate of San Jose State University has been considering a policy recommendation and guidelines for such reviews. This policy is still under debate in the Academic Senate at this time, and the deadline is fast approaching. In accordance with the Trustees' directives, I am asking each department chair, or equivalent first level of review, to send to me by MARCH 30 interim procedures for that department or equivalent unit. These procedures should be developed in consultation with department faculty, and students should have an opportunity to participate in the development of these interim procedures. The procedures should be such that the academic freedom of the professor and the confidentiality of information is protected.

Attached as a possible guideline is the policy proposed by the Professional Standards Committee of the San Jose State University Academic Senate which is presently being debated by the Academic Senate.
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cc: Acting Academic Vice President
Associate Academic Vice President
Executive Vice President
School Deans
Dean, Student Services
Director, Information Systems & Computing
GUIDELINES FOR PEER EVALUATION OF FACULTY INSTRUCTIONAL PERFORMANCE

These guidelines are intended to implement Trustee policy (Title 5, Section 43351) for the periodic evaluation of tenured faculty, in accordance with the minimum standards for that review passed by the Board on July 9, 1980 and contained in FSA 80-44.

A. DEPARTMENT PROCEDURES

Each department shall develop procedures for evaluating tenured faculty in accordance with the guidelines stated below. Opportunity shall be given for students to participate in the development of these procedures. A copy of the department procedures should be sent to the Associate Academic Vice President and the School Dean no later than March 1, 1981.

The department procedures shall provide for "peer evaluations of faculty instructional performance including currency in the field, appropriate to university education." They "shall include, but not be limited to, consideration of student evaluations of instructional performance currently required of all faculty members in at least two courses annually." The courses evaluated should be "representative of the faculty member's teaching responsibilities during the evaluation cycle" (FSA 80-44).

B. SCHEDULE

Each tenured faculty member of the department shall be scheduled for peer evaluation at least once every five years. Faculty members who have been reviewed for promotion within the five-year period need not be scheduled for an additional evaluation. The department chair shall be responsible for scheduling the evaluation of the department tenured faculty, and each Fall shall inform the School Dean of the faculty members to be evaluated that year.

C. DEPARTMENT EVALUATION COMMITTEE

A department shall establish one or more committees to conduct the required peer evaluation. A department evaluation committee may be composed of all its tenured faculty, but no committee may be composed of fewer than three (3) tenured faculty members of the appropriate rank, including the department chair.
Only tenured faculty may serve on an evaluation committee and, except for full professors, no member of the committee may participate in the evaluation of persons of equal or higher rank.

The department chair shall serve as ex officio member and chair of the evaluation committee(s), but shall be excused when his or her instructional performance is under review. Except for the department chair, faculty members scheduled for evaluation in a particular year shall be ineligible to serve on a department evaluation committee during that year.

In departments of insufficient size, the necessary additional members of the evaluation committee shall be selected from other departments.

D. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

A written summary of the evaluation shall be given to the faculty member, and a copy placed in the personnel file. The chair should discuss the evaluation with the faculty members reviewed and, if areas for improvement were identified in the evaluation, advise them of avenues for assistance available within the department or the campus. The department chair should inform the dean if the evaluation committee has determined that serious problems exist in any particular case, and review with the dean the steps which have been or may be taken to resolve them. When the chair's instructional performance is reviewed, the committee, or its designee, should discuss the evaluation results with the chair and, if necessary, with the School Dean.

APPROVED: Professional Standards Committee, November 3, 1980
PRESENT: Buerger, El-Shaieb, Gustafson, Lima, Scofield, Sasseen, and Tidwell
VOTE: 6-1-0