

- c. Personnel recommendations or decisions relating to retention, tenure, or promotion or any other personnel action shall be based on the Personnel Action File. Should the President make a personnel decision on any basis not directly related to the professional qualifications, work performance, or personal attributes of the individual faculty member in question, those reasons shall be reduced to writing and entered into the Personnel Action File and shall be immediately provided to the faculty member. For the purposes of this section, course assignments shall not be considered personnel actions. However, course assignments shall not be punitive in nature.
- d. A request for an external review of materials submitted by a faculty unit employee may be initiated at any level of review by any party to the review. Such a request shall document (1) the special circumstances which necessitate an external reviewer, and (2) the nature of the materials needing the evaluation of an external reviewer. The request must be approved by the President with the concurrence of the faculty unit employee.

15.13 The periodic or performance review for individuals holding a joint appointment in more than one (1) academic department or equivalent unit shall be conducted by each department in which the individual holds an appointment or, in accordance with campus procedures, may be conducted by a committee with representation from each department in which the individual holds an appointment.

15.14 When classroom visits are utilized as part of the evaluation of a faculty unit employee under this Article, the individual faculty unit employee being evaluated shall be provided a notice of at least five (5) days that a classroom visit, online observation, and/or review of online content is to take place. There shall be consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits his/her class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits.

Process for Student Evaluations of Teaching

15.15 Written or electronic student questionnaire evaluations shall be required for all faculty unit employees who teach. All classes taught by each faculty unit

employee shall have such student evaluations unless the President has approved a requirement to evaluate fewer classes after consideration of the recommendations of appropriate faculty committee(s). In cases where student evaluations are not required for all classes, classes chosen for evaluation shall be representative of the faculty unit employee's teaching assignment, and shall be jointly determined in consultation between the faculty unit employee being evaluated and his/her department chair. In the event of disagreement, each party shall select 50% of the courses to be evaluated. The results of these evaluations shall be placed in the faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File. Results of evaluations may be stored in electronic format and incorporated by extension into the Personnel Action File provided that individuals involved in evaluations and personnel recommendations or decisions are provided secure access for these purposes.

- 15.16 Students may, with the concurrence of the department and administrator, be provided an opportunity to consult with the department peer review committee.
- 15.17 a. Student evaluations collected as part of the regular student evaluation process shall be anonymous and identified only by course and/or section. The format of student evaluations shall be quantitative (e.g., "Scantron" form, etc.) or a combination of quantitative and qualitative (e.g., space provided on the quantitative form for student comments).
- b. Any student communications or evaluations provided outside of the regular evaluation process must be identified by name to be included in a Personnel or Working Personnel Action File.
- 15.18 Student evaluation programs for librarian faculty unit employees, counselor faculty unit employees, and coaching faculty unit employees may be developed at the campus level. If such programs are established, the evaluation process shall be developed by a committee comprised of faculty unit employees and appropriate administrators.
- 15.19 [Intentionally left blank to preserve later provision references in this Article.]

Periodic Evaluation

university - level

State of California
Memorandum

DOC 2.1
CAL POLY
SAN LUIS OBISPO

To: Philip Bailey, Dave Christy, Douglas Epperson, Debra Larson, Christine Theodoropoulos, David Wehner

Date: February 22, 2013

From: Kathleen Enz Finken
Provost



Copies: Jeffrey Armstrong
Department Heads/Chairs
All Faculty Employees
College Analysts
Al Liddicoat
Glen Thorncroft
Steve Rein
Dustin Stegner
Kenneth Brown
Academic Personnel Staff

Subject: New Student Evaluation Requirement Effective Winter Quarter 2013

Provision 15.15 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement states that student evaluations shall be required for all classes taught by each faculty unit employee, unless the President has approved a requirement to evaluate fewer classes after considerations of the recommendations of appropriate faculty committee(s). The new requirement for faculty to evaluate all classes taught will take effect Winter Quarter 2013, as communicated in the memo dated 10/19/12 from Al Liddicoat, AVP Academic Personnel (available at <http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/policies/procedures>).

After consulting with the Academic Senate Instructional Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee, President Armstrong and I have reviewed and endorse the following exceptions for conducting student evaluations in low enrollment courses (individual senior project, independent study), capstone, and cooperative education courses:

1. Courses with low enrollment (less than five students) shall not be evaluated. Typical of these courses would be:
Individual senior projects
Independent study
2. Cooperative Education courses that do not include direct instruction shall not be evaluated using the student evaluation process. Academic Departments or the Career Services Office may use a survey to evaluate the students' co-op experience, but this is not part of the student evaluation process.
3. Capstone senior project courses, which usually have larger enrollment, shall be evaluated if there are more than 5 students enrolled.
4. Team-taught classes: In situations when classes are team-taught, the instructor of record shall conduct student evaluations. If there is more than one instructor of record, then copies of the evaluation results shall be placed in each of the instructor's personnel files with a memo indicating that the course was team-taught. Any faculty member team teaching the course will have the opportunity to write a narrative description to accompany the student evaluation results for the team-taught course if they desire to add context to the results. A faculty member who team-teaches a course and believes that the results are not representative of their contributions to the course, may request that the dean not include the results associated with this team-taught course in his/her PAF. After reviewing this request, the dean has the discretion to determine if the student evaluation results of the team-taught course should be placed in the instructor's file.

As a reminder, all student evaluations are to be conducted utilizing the questions and format that have been vetted and approved by your college. All other requirements and processes outlined in the Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty (available at <http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/policies/rpt>) remain applicable.

University-level

DOC 3,1

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

ADMINISTRATIVE
BULLETIN 91-3

GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

This Administrative Bulletin is being promulgated as the result of a recommendation of the Academic Senate to update and revise University guidelines for the student evaluation of faculty. During the ongoing discussions and deliberations of the Academic Senate, continuing concerns were expressed regarding a need to strengthen the student evaluation process for probationary faculty. While approving the Academic Senate resolution, it was also noted in the approval memo that I have asked the Vice President for Academic Affairs to work with each school to assure that their individual RPT policy and procedure documents reflect an appropriate commitment to student evaluation of faculty.

This Administrative Bulletin supercedes Administrative Bulletin 74-1.

APPROVED:

Warren J. Baker, President

DATE:

NOTE: This Administrative Bulletin should be filed in the Appendix of the Campus Administrative Manual and appropriate entries made in the CAM index and Administrative Bulletins list.

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

ADMINISTRATIVE
BULLETIN 91-3
(Supersedes AB 74-1)

GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

1. Student evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between The California State University (CSU) and the Unit 3-Faculty.
2. The primary purpose of this student evaluation program is to assist in improving the quality and effectiveness of the instructional program at Cal Poly.
3. The results of this student evaluation program will be used for both the improvement of instruction and in partial substantiation of recommendations in appointment, retention, tenure and promotion decisions. They will also be considered during the periodic evaluation process.
4. All faculty members who teach shall participate in this student evaluation program for a minimum of two classes per year, preferably two different courses:

Whenever possible, evaluation results of faculty members should be compared with those of other faculty members of their own rank and tenure status.

5. The student evaluation form and additional procedures used by any school/department shall be in accordance with these guidelines and shall be endorsed by the school/department faculty, department head/chair, and approved by the dean. Deans shall send a copy of approved forms and procedures, or revisions thereof, to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Student opinion regarding the form and additional procedures of any department shall be considered prior to the dean's approval through consultation with the student council of the school.
6. The following procedures shall be used in the administration of student evaluations:
 - a. each department is responsible for providing its faculty with copies of these guidelines and other procedures covering student evaluation of faculty in order to ensure that proper procedures are followed,
 - b. 10-20 minutes of class time will be provided by the faculty member for the student evaluation process in each class in which s/he is being evaluated. During this time, the faculty member shall be absent from the classroom,

- c. only students officially enrolled in the class will be permitted to participate.
7. Subsequent to the issuance of the grades for the quarter in which a faculty member has been evaluated using this process, the results (as defined in school/department procedures) of this program shall be made available to the faculty member, his/her department head/chair, and the custodian of the faculty member's personnel action file. The results shall be included in the faculty member's personnel action file.
8. If written comments from student evaluation forms are included in the personnel file, they may be either in summary form or by inclusion of all the written comments. If a summary is used, it must be approved by the faculty member being evaluated.

APPROVED:

Warren J. Baker, President

DATE:

Adopted: April 16 2013

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-759-13

RESOLUTION ON STUDENT EVALUATIONS

1 WHEREAS, The 2012-2014 CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement states that “[w]ritten
2 or electronic student questionnaire evaluations shall be required for all faculty unit
3 employees who teach” (15.15); and
4

5 WHEREAS, The Collective Bargaining Agreement states that periodic evaluation review of
6 tenured, tenure-line, and temporary faculty unit employees will include student
7 evaluations (15.23, 15.28-29, 15.32, and 15.34); and
8

9 WHEREAS, The CSU, CSU Academic Senate, and CFA Joint Committee “Report on Student
10 Evaluations” (March 12 2008) recommended that “[c]ampuses should use a well-
11 designed student evaluation instrument (with demonstrable validity and
12 reliability) in providing diagnostic information and feedback, and those involved
13 in evaluations should have an understanding of their formative as well as
14 summative uses” (p. 9); and
15

16 WHEREAS, The “Report on Student Evaluations” stated that “[t]he faculty on each individual
17 campus have the right, through their governance process, to develop the campus-
18 based program of student evaluations of teaching” (p. 7); and
19

20 WHEREAS, The objectives of student evaluations are to contribute to the continuous
21 improvement of instruction and students’ learning; therefore, be it
22

23 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate requires that student evaluations include university-
24 wide questions and the opportunity for students to provide written comments on
25 teaching and course effectiveness; and that they may also include (1) college-
26 and/or department-level questions and (2) faculty generated questions; and be it
27 further
28

29 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve the Instruction Committee’s report that
30 establishes university-wide student evaluation questions, scale, and metric used
31 for summarization of these questions; and be it further
32

33 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate designate the Instruction and Faculty Affairs
34 Committees as the appropriate committees for making potential revisions to

35 university-wide student evaluation questions in the future, and these revisions are
36 subject to approval by the Academic Senate; and be it further
37

38 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve that colleges, departments, and/or programs
39 may require the inclusion of additional student evaluation questions, based on
40 their respective faculty-based governance procedures; and be it further
41

42 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve that faculty members may include student
43 evaluation questions for their own classes; and be it further
44

45 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve that all student responses (numeric and/or
46 written) to faculty generated questions may be excluded from inclusion in the
47 faculty member's personnel action file (PAF) at the discretion of the faculty
48 member; and that any summary measures that may be calculated are not required
49 for inclusion in the faculty member's PAF; and be it further
50

51 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve that colleges, departments, and/or programs
52 may require the inclusion of students' written comments, excluding written
53 responses to faculty-generated questions, in a faculty member's personnel action
54 file (PAF), based on their respective faculty-based governance procedures.

(*) this was found
to be
inconsistent
with the calstate
level rules

Proposed by: Academic Senate Instruction Committee
Date: February 12 2013
Revised: February 19 2013
Revised: March 17 2013
Revised: April 16 2013

UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL ACTIONS – CAL POLY, SLO

substantiating reasons and must be signed by those supporting it.

11. Department chairs shall use Form AP 109 (Faculty Evaluation Form) to evaluate faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure. Department chairs are expected to conduct a separate level of review. Comments regarding student evaluations must be included in Section 1 of Form AP 109.

College deans should use the final page of Form AP 109 or similar format appended to Form AP 109 to record their evaluation and recommendation.

Section II. Criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure

A. Standards

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.

B. University criteria

Recommendations for retention, promotion, and tenure are based on the exhibition of merit and ability in each of the following University criteria as well as those approved for the college/department (See CAP 523.1.A.2):

1. Teaching performance or effectiveness as a librarian and/or other professional performance

Consideration is to be given to 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.

In formulating recommendations for the promotion of teaching faculty, evaluators will place primary emphasis on success in instruction. The results of the formal student evaluation are to be considered in formulating recommendations based on teaching performance.

4. Reappointment(s) is not a guarantee of subsequent reappointment or the granting of tenure; the granting of tenure does not guarantee future promotion. Evaluation in consideration of reappointment becomes more critical each subsequent year of the probationary period.
5. Each faculty member eligible for reappointment must submit documentation concerning teaching, professional growth, service, and other factors to aid evaluation.
6. Reappointment, evaluations, and recommendations shall be based on performance and progress of the individual. The faculty member will be evaluated in accordance with the established criteria for professional performance and comparatively against the performance of colleagues under consideration for the same personnel action.
7. Evaluation for tenure is a comprehensive assessment of the individual. Recommendation for, or against, tenure should come as no surprise to the individual if the continuing supportive process has been effective. These statements emphasize the importance of careful and conscientious effort by all concerned in making personnel evaluations and recommendations.

Criteria for Faculty Evaluations

Evaluations of faculty eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be in compliance with the timetable announced by the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs each Fall quarter.

The University's Faculty Evaluation Form (Form AP 109) must be utilized by the evaluating faculty for reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions. In each category of Form AP 109, the evaluator(s) must indicate the candidate's performance level according to the following (see Section V of Form AP 109):

1. **Performance Level 1:** Candidate has reached a high level of professional development and is making an outstanding contribution to the university which is readily recognizable.
2. **Performance Level 2:** Candidate fully meets the requirements of the present assignment and is making a valuable contribution to the university.
3. **Performance Level 3:** Candidate meets the requirements of the present assignment adequately and by following the preceding suggestions for improvement may make a greater contribution to the university.
4. **Performance Level 4:** Candidate does not meet satisfactorily the requirements of the present assignment.

The criteria for evaluating faculty for appointment, reappointment, tenure, or promotion shall focus on four basic factors:

1. **Quality of Teaching:** In accordance with the Orfalea College mission and character statements, excellence in teaching is the primary purpose of the faculty. In evaluating the "quality of teaching," the following factors shall be considered:

Qualitative Factors:

- a. Peer evaluation of classroom performance, and the fulfillment of instructional responsibilities; and
- b. The rigor and currency of courses as demonstrated by course syllabi, examinations, and assignments; and

Quantitative Factors:

- c. Grade distribution, as measured by the mean and standard deviation, compared with the Area and Orfalea College distribution; and
- d. Students' course evaluations, as measured by the mean and standard deviation; and
- e. Comparison of (c) and (d).

An evaluation of the quality of teaching will also consider the number of course preparations and new courses that are developed or significantly updated, since extraordinary efforts to accomplish these tasks may affect an instructor's performance on the above factors in teaching.

When candidates apply for tenure or promotion, at least three members of the Peer Review Committee must conduct peer evaluations of classroom performance. Each peer evaluator should use the guideline in Appendix C. To support its conclusions regarding peer evaluations of classroom performance in Form AP 109, the peer review committee must specifically address each of the factors listed in Appendix C.

2. **Quality of Professional Growth and Achievement:** Faculty members are expected to engage in activities that enhance their knowledge and skills in their professions. In addition, they have a responsibility to contribute to their professions through the publication and dissemination of ideas and technical skills. To this end, faculty members must engage in research that results in publication, according to the standards set forth in this document. However, the Orfalea College of Business recognizes the wide diversity of other activities that may bear on the quality of professional growth and achievement, such as, but not limited to: actively participating in professional conferences, serving as reviewers or editors for academic journals, participating in professional training courses, acting as a professional consultant, serving as an officer in professional organizations, providing service on advisory boards and committees, and receiving grants and/or patents. The faculty member's entire portfolio of professional growth and achievement activities will serve as the basis for the performance evaluation.

The Orfalea College expects all faculty members to disseminate ideas in published formats. In this regard, the college values all three types of intellectual contributions defined by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB):

- a. ***Contributions to practice*** – contributions that influence professional practice in the faculty member's field or a related field in a cross-disciplinary manner.
- b. ***Discipline-based scholarship*** – contributions that add to the theory or knowledge base of the faculty member's field or a related field in a cross-disciplinary manner.
- c. ***Learning and pedagogical research*** – contributions regarding pedagogy or teaching effectiveness in the faculty member's field or a related field in a cross-disciplinary manner.

The College recognizes that research may be published in various ways, including, but not limited to: peer reviewed journal articles, research monographs, scholarly books, textbooks, proceedings from scholarly meetings, cases and technical reports related to funded research projects, and instructional software. However, the Orfalea College of Business requires each faculty member to publish a minimum number of articles in accepted refereed journals or high quality law journals to be considered for tenure or promotion. The minimum thresholds are provided under the respective sections for tenure