

(TABLED)
First Reading Item
California State University Dominguez Hills
Academic Senate
Revision of Retention, Tenure and Promotion Procedures
FPC 11-01

Whereas tenure track faculty are initially appointed for one (or two) year terms of employment; and

Whereas such faculty members are presently required immediately upon employment to begin the performance review process requiring substantial time and effort in gathering and preparation of supporting documentation, and

Whereas considerable time and effort is required of RTP Committee members and Administrators who participate in the reviewing process, and

Whereas a fair and evidence-based recommendation for retention and promotion would be enhanced by a more efficient and flexible process for the performance review of tenure track faculty, and

Whereas the Faculty Handbook establishes the process for the review of tenure track faculty, and

Whereas modifying the performance review process may ease the workload of certain of the RTP Committee members and Administrators,

It is therefore recommended that the Vice President of Academic Affairs/Provost implement the following process and policy changes pertaining to the performance review process for tenure-track faculty:

Introduction:

A revision of the CSUDH performance review process for faculty seeking retention, tenure and promotion (RTP) is desirable to provide a process that is more efficient and flexible and, if possible, less time-consuming. The goal of the review process, consisting generally of an evaluation of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) and Supplemental Information Form (SIF) for tenure track probationary faculty, is to provide timely, accurate, and adequate feedback for faculty under review and to assess their progress toward tenure and promotion. Unless otherwise provided herein, all reviews shall adhere to the following:

- a. The WPAF and SIF are to be reviewed and evaluated pursuant to guidelines determined by the department or program to which the faculty member is assigned and in place at the time the faculty member is initially employed; and

b. A review shall evaluate strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member, focusing on teaching, scholarship and service, with specific recommendations, including recommendations for improvement, if necessary.

First Probationary Appointment:

The initial probationary appointment of a full-time tenure-track faculty member shall be for a period of three years. In the first year, the faculty member shall develop a written Professional Plan that includes teaching, scholarship or creative activity, and service which will serve as the first year WPAF. The Professional Plan and any subsequent revisions shall be reviewed and evaluated by the Department Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Committee and the Department Chair or its equivalent¹. The evaluation document(s) with commentary regarding the sufficiency of the Plan shall be submitted to the College Dean to determine whether the Plan provides a likelihood of appropriate advancement toward a positive tenure decision. The evaluations shall be forwarded to Academic Affairs Personnel Services to be placed in the WPAF of the faculty member.

Second Probationary Year:

The faculty member shall prepare a brief written report (approximately 5 to 10 pages) for the second year performance review, summarizing progress in his or her activities since the first year review and if necessary any modification of the Professional Plan. (Such report does not require the extensive supporting documentation as would be contained in an SIF.) A review of the report shall be conducted by the Department RTP Committee and Department Chair or equivalent, and the College Dean and shall be forwarded to Academic Affairs Personnel Services to be placed in the WPAF of the faculty member.

Third Probationary Year:

The faculty member shall prepare a complete SIF and WPAF for the third year performance review; such files shall provide complete supporting evidence of the first two years of the member's activities. A full review of the file shall be conducted by the Department RTP Committee and Department Chair or equivalent, College RTP Committee, College Dean, Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost), and (in cases of disagreement between levels of review) the University RTP Committee. Thereafter, the file shall be forwarded to the President for action. The President or designee may decline to award a further probationary appointment, award a subsequent three-year appointment, or may (when deemed appropriate) award a one-year appointment.

Fourth Probationary Year:

For a faculty member awarded a three-year appointment during the previous year's review, the faculty member shall prepare a brief written report (approximately 5 to 10 pages) summarizing progress in their activities since the third year review and if necessary any modification of the Professional Plan. (Such report does not require the

¹ The phrase "Department Chair or equivalent" shall include a department chair, program director, coordinator or other similarly designated person in those cases in which the reviewer is not a department chair *per se*. The review of the Department Chair or equivalent will be made separate from the RTP Committee unless such person is also a member of the RTP Committee.

extensive supporting documentation as would be contained in an SIF.) A review of the file shall be conducted by the Department RTP Committee and Department Chair or equivalent and the college Dean, and shall be forwarded to Academic Affairs Personnel Services to be placed in the WPAF of the faculty member.

If a faculty member was awarded a one-year appointment during the third year review, the member shall prepare a complete SIF and WPAF for a fourth year performance review. A full review shall be conducted by the Department RTP Committee and Department Chair or equivalent, College RTP Committee, College Dean, Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost), and (in cases of disagreement between levels of review) the University RTP Committee. Thereafter, the file shall be forwarded to the President for action. The President or designee may decline to award a further probationary appointment, award a subsequent two-year appointment, or may (when deemed appropriate) award a one-year appointment.

Fifth Probationary Year:

If a faculty member was previously awarded an appointment through the sixth probationary year, the faculty member shall prepare a brief written report (approximately 5 to 10 pages) summarizing progress in their activities since the fourth year review and if necessary any modification of the Professional Plan. (Such report does not require the extensive supporting documentation as would be contained in an SIF.) A review of the file shall be conducted by the Department RTP Committee and Department Chair or equivalent and the college Dean, and shall be forwarded to Academic Affairs Personnel Services to be placed in the WPAF of the faculty member.

If a faculty member was awarded a one-year appointment during the previous year's review, the probationary faculty member shall prepare a complete SIF and WPAF for the fifth year performance review. A full review of the faculty member's performance shall be conducted by the Department RTP Committee and Department Chair or equivalent, College Dean, College RTP Committee, Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost), and (in cases of disagreement between levels of review) University RTP Committee. Thereafter the file shall be forwarded to the President for action. The President or designee may decline to award a further probationary appointment or award a further one-year probationary appointment.

Sixth Probationary Year:

The faculty member shall prepare a complete SIF and WPAF for the sixth year performance review; such files shall provide complete supporting evidence of the member's activities covering the prior year and any prior years in which an abbreviated review was conducted. A full review of the file shall be conducted by the Department RTP committee and Department Chair or equivalent, College RTP Committee, College Dean, Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost), and (in cases of disagreement between levels of review or upon timely written request of the faculty member) the University RTP Committee. Thereafter the file shall be forwarded to the President for the final action or decision. The recommendations shall be reviewed by the President or designee, who shall make the final decision on retention, tenure, and promotion.

This resolution is directed to the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost, and if approved, such changes in process and policy will be effective and implemented for those tenure track faculty employed as of the beginning of the semester following the semester in which such approval occurs. Nothing in this resolution is intended to revise, contravene or violate any provision of the Faculty Contract; however, implementation may require revision of the Faculty Handbook in certain respects. Nor is anything contained in this proposal intended to inhibit in any manner the ability of an administrator to address or deal with a faculty member who in any manner fails to properly perform the usual and customary duties imposed on faculty members pursuant to the employment agreement by which such person is appointed, the Faculty Contract, applicable ethical and professional standards.

Summary and effect of the proposal:

When implemented:

- (1) Initial appointment of tenure track faculty will be for three years.
- (2) In years one and two of their appointment, the faculty member will be subject to an abbreviated performance review by the appropriate RTP Committee, Department Chair, or the equivalent, and College Dean. Any abbreviated review does not require the full documentation contained in the Supplementary Information File but does require the submission of a Professional Plan and any changes to such Plan.
- (3) In the third year, the faculty member will have a full performance review as is presently the practice, except however, the College RTP Committee review will precede the College Dean review, as will be the case whenever such a Committee review is necessary. A faculty member who is progressing satisfactorily will generally be awarded a second three year appointment. However, in connection with the third year review, the recommendation, if not for three years may recommend a one year appointment, or none at all.
- (4) For a faculty member awarded a second three year appointment, the performance review for the fourth and fifth years will be abbreviated, and limited to the Department RTP Committee, the Department Chair or its equivalent and College Dean. However, for those awarded a one year contract for the fourth year, a complete review will be required. In connection with a fourth year review, the faculty member may be awarded a one or two year appointment, or none at all.
- (5) If awarded a two year appointment, the fifth year review of the faculty member will be abbreviated. A faculty member who was appointed for one year in the fourth year review will have a full performance review.
- (6) In the sixth year, tenure track faculty members will be subject to a full review.

The involvement of a College RTP Committee and a University RTP Committee is eliminated from the process in the first and second year reviews, and in those cases in which there is a second three year appointment, they are not involved in the fourth and fifth year reviews.