



**ACADEMIC SENATE  
Executive Committee  
REFERRAL FORM  
CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA**

Date:	3/6/2024
To:	Faculty Affairs Committee
From:	Academic Senate Executive Committee
Subject:	Academic Senate Referral
Classification	FA-009-234
Title of Referral:	<b>Revisions to Policy 1328, Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion and Periodic Evaluation of Probationary Faculty</b>
Background:	See attached referral request form. Additional background provided by the Executive Committee:
Recommended resources:	See attached referral request form and supporting documentation. Additional resources recommended by the Executive Committee:  None.  For the Committee’s Report on this referral, please list in separate sections, the resources recommended, and resources actually consulted. If a resource was not consulted, briefly state why.
Review and recommend:	Review and recommend as appropriate.
Date required for presenting committee report to the Executive Committee:	12/4/2024

1.Name

Katherine Gasdaglis and Greg Barding

2.Email

kigasdaglis@cpp.edu

3.Title of Referral

Revisions to Policy 1328, Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion and Periodic Evaluation of Probationary Faculty

4.Names and Titles of proponents

Katherine Gasdaglis Associate Professor, Faculty Affairs Committee  
Greg Barding, Dept. Chair and Associate Professor, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair

5.Keywords

1328, rtp, criteria, mission, core, values, policy, reappointment, tenure, promotion

6.Is there a deadline by when this referral needs to be considered by the Academic Senate?

No

7.Deadline Date

N/A

8.Justification for deadline

N/A.

9.Background

Policy 1328 (Section 2) empowers departments to select and elaborate criteria for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP), because departments are in the best position to determine what excellence in Research, Teaching, and Service amounts to in their

fields. RTP documents that enumerate RTP criteria must be approved by the College, but departments determine and elaborate the criteria. So says the current policy 1328, as did past iterations of the policy.

In 2020 major revisions were made to Policy 1328. These revisions include a new biennial performance review process, according to which probationary faculty typically undergo a full Performance Review, including a long self-assessment narrative of indefinite length, every two years; are officially reappointed every two years (at the department's recommendation); and complete a shorter "Periodic Evaluation," involving a 4-page self-assessment narrative. The goal was to make the RTP process less onerous for everyone involved. Prior to the 2020 revision, probationary faculty underwent a full performance review every year.

At the same time this major structural effect was introduced, new language surrounding the requirements for the RTP package was also introduced. 1328 (section 7.4) now stipulates that the RTP packet (for both types of evaluation) requires a self-assessment narrative that speaks to the university's "core values." Since the implementation of 1328, faculty have reported that, in some colleges and not others, RTP packages have been returned to probationary faculty by the Dean's office for failure to discuss these core values. So, this suggests that the new core-values language is being treated as introducing additional criteria for successful RTP review by some of those entrusted with overseeing the RTP process.

The requirement that probationary faculty explain how their work speaks to the University's core values introduces new top-down criteria into the RTP process. The spirit of the policy, as well as long-standing practice at CPP, empowers departments to decide RTP criteria, and the new language contradicts this.

The new language also sends contradictory messages to probationary faculty and departments. Since departments are empowered to decide RTP criteria, some departments have simply ignored the new language. Others have not been permitted to. The inconsistency in the way the policy is now worded has led to the uneven enforcement of the policy across colleges.

**First Recommendation:** We recommend that reference to the University's core values be removed from the requirements for the RTP package (revision to 7.4). Departments decide the RTP criteria based on their disciplinary expertise and in alignment with the perennial mission of the CSU, namely the pursuit of excellence in Research, Teaching, and Education.

The transition from an annual Performance Review process to a biennial process was a major structural change. Anecdotally, some probational faculty have lamented the change, suggesting that alternating between the longer self-evaluation narrative for the Performance Review and the shorter self-evaluation narrative for the Periodic Evaluation is in fact more work than the former system. RTP was already an onerous process for probationary faculty, so this seems like a failure of the new policy 1328.

Moreover, in the self-assessment narrative of the biennial full Performance Review, faculty are required to summarize their RTP progress and accomplishments for the full 2-year period of review. So, it is simply redundant to require them discuss their accomplishments for the one-year period covered by the interim Periodic Evaluation.

**Second Recommendation:** We suggest keeping the biennial Performance Review structure, but further streamlining the process of Periodic Evaluation. We suggest that, in the interim years when a probationary faculty member undergoes a Periodic evaluation, they submit a packet that includes the following:

1. A list of accomplishments in the areas of Research, Teaching, and Service, for the year in question.
2. Two peer evaluations from the period of review (or more if required by the department);
3. Statistical summaries of student survey scores and reviews from the current review period; and
4. Any responses to written student input, as defined by Policy No. 1329, received by the department during the evaluation period.

No self-assessment narrative would be required in the years of periodic evaluation (revision to 7.4).

**Third Recommendation:** The new language of 1328 also requires probationary faculty to submit a CV with their RTP packet. Faculty have noted that the CV is redundant, given the forms probationary faculty must complete for RTP. We suggest removing this requirement (revision to 7.4) from 1328 and instead simply recommending to departments that they revise their RTP documents to reflect whether they prefer to review a CV or not.

**Fourth Recommendation:** 1328 should encourage departments to revise their RTP documents to reflect the new structure of 1328, including some guidance on the biennial full performance review structure and the differences between the full performance review and the shorter periodic evaluation.

#### 10. Recommended Resources

Jill Hargis, Interim AVP for Faculty Affairs

Deans

Department Chairs

DRTPC Chairs

Tenure Track Faculty

URTPC

CFA

#### 11. Attachments

[Policy 1328, PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION AND PERIODIC EVALUATION OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY](#)