

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA
ACADEMIC SENATE

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

REPORT TO

THE ACADEMIC SENATE

FA-002-189

Review of Frequency of All-Level Review of RTP Packets URTPC

Faculty Affairs Committee

Date: 10/17/18

Executive Committee
Received and Forwarded

Date: 03/04/20

Academic Senate

Date: 03/18/20
First Reading

Background

Currently at CPP, with the exception of pre-RTP, annual performance reviews of probationary faculty for re-appointment, as well as reviews for tenure and/or promotion, are conducted at all levels every year including DRTPC, Department Chair, Dean, URTPC, and Provost. Other universities, including various CSU campuses, have other models where, for example, re-appointment reviews stop at the College level in some years, with a provision that when there's a rebuttal and/or an appeal an all-level review would be always triggered to assure that a more comprehensive evaluation will be conducted. As the campus continues to hire more faculty to increase tenure density the number of reviews also will continue to increase and a revised practice would be helpful to maintain a manageable workload for the URTPC.

The purpose of this referral is to request an examination of policies at other campuses by the Faculty Affairs Committee and propose an alternative to the current campus practice for re-appointment reviews only. Tenure and/or promotion reviews should continue at all levels.

Resources

The following people were contacted and asked to provide input to the committee about the referral:

- A. University Retention and Tenure Committee (URTPC) including its chair, Dr. Aubrey Fine.
- B. George Tejadilla, Interim Executive Director for Academic Personnel
- C. Martin Sancho-Madriz, AVP Faculty Affairs
- D. Policies of CSU campuses
- E. Collective Bargaining Agreement

Discussion

As the number of tenure-line faculty continues to grow at CPP, the number of reviews that are needed to be completed by the URTPC will also increase. Thus, the URTPC had the Faculty Affairs committee look at some options to reduce the number of full performance reviews (i.e., full RTP reviews).

The following options were thoroughly considered:

1. A review is skipped by the URTPC during some reappointment years (such as reappointment to years 4 and 6) if the DRTPC and Dean's evaluations are positive and recommend reappointment. However, if either the DRTPC or the Dean recommend not to retain the faculty, OR if the candidate appeals, writes any

- comments about an evaluation, or provides a rebuttal, then the URTPC would do a full review. The URTPC would do a full review for tenure and promotion as well as reappointment to years 3 and 5.
2. Similar to option 1, the URTPC would perform a truncated review during some reappointment years (reappointment to years 4 and 6). That is, policy would be drafted, that allows for a review of only pages 4 and 5 (a, b, c etc.) of 1330 if the DRTPC and Dean's evaluations are positive and recommend reappointment. However, if either the DRTPC or the Dean recommend not to retain the faculty, OR if the candidate appeals, writes any comments about an evaluation, or provides a rebuttal, then the URTPC would do a full review. The URTPC would do a full review for tenure and promotion as well as reappointment to years 3 and 5.
 3. We move to two-year appointments for probationary faculty. During alternate years, candidates would undergo an abbreviated periodic evaluation that would be much shorter and would only be evaluated by the DRTPC (the chair if not part of the DRPTC) and Dean/Director.

Option 3 was the only option considered viable with our university policies and the CBA. Further, option 3 was also consistent with practices at other CSUs. That is, it was not possible to have a faculty member engage in a performance review for an action without having all levels of review provide a recommendation based on the RTP package. However, allowing faculty members to be granted two-year contracts through their probationary period is consistent with the CBA and is practiced by several other CSUs. Further, to make sure the candidate is still getting feedback every year, faculty will still complete a periodic evaluation during years that they are not completing a full performance review (RTP).

Recommendation

The FAC recommends that the revised policy 1328 (PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION AND PERIODIC EVALUATION OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY) be adopted.

The revised 1328 awards reappointments in 2-year increments after a successful performance review (RTP). A streamlined focused evaluation ("periodic evaluation") would occur in the first year of a 2-year reappointment. The "periodic evaluation" ends at the dean/director level and does not result in a personnel action. Rather, the expected outcome is to provide the candidate a brief written document with input and guidance in preparation for their performance review scheduled in the second year of the 2-year reappointment. The candidate should address such input and guidance in their RTP packet in the following period of review. However, the DRTPC and/or other evaluators (e.g. department chair, dean, URTPC) may instead recommend a 1-year appointment (and a performance review) if it assesses this option is in the best interest of the candidate. The Provost will consider such recommendation(s) at all levels of review before rendering a final decision.

Attachments:

1. Overview of Modifications to RTP Policy 1328
2. Policy 1328 Revisions – Track Changes
3. Policy 1328 Revised – Clean Copy