CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SAN BERNARDINO

PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND PERIODIC EVALUATION

INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

August 17, 2026

Division of Academic Affairs
Faculty Senate

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA 92407
909.537.5028 | fax: 909.537.7008
https://www.csusb.edu/faculty-senate

FAM 652.1
EVALUATION OF TENURE-LINE FACULTY

Table of Contents

Purpose and Scope	1
Definition	2
Policy Statement	2
Overview of Evaluation	3
Performance Review	11
Periodic Evaluation	14
Evaluation Criteria and Their Application	15
Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty	24
Departmental Guidelines	26
Approvals	28
History	29

Purpose and Scope

The purpose of faculty evaluation is to develop and maintain high-quality faculty who are intellectually and professionally active in teaching; research, scholarly and creative contributions; and service to the university and community.

Peer judgment is vital to any evaluation process in academia. Peer evaluation occurs at all levels of faculty evaluation: Department, College, and University.

Evaluation also includes administrative review.

Procedures contained in this document are in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). If an inconsistency is found between this policy and the CBA that is in effect, the CBA shall prevail.

There are several policies in the FAM governing the evaluation of different categories of faculty as defined in the CBA: instructional faculty; student service professionals, academic related; library faculty; and coaching faculty. This policy focuses on the evaluation of tenure-line (defined below) instructional faculty. But some of the stipulations in this policy may apply to other types of faculty. The procedures on student evaluation and classroom visitation, for example, are applicable to the evaluation of lecturers as well.

Definition

1. Tenure-line Faculty: Those faculty who are either probationary or tenured.
2. Lecturer: Non-tenure-line instructional faculty.
3. Department: Department or school (e.g. School of Computer Science and Engineering, School of Social Work).
4. Department chair: Department chair or school director.
5. FAD Office: Office of Faculty Affairs and Development.
6. Service to university and/or community: To replace university and/or community service that has been used in previous versions of this and other evaluation policies.

Policy Statement

1. There are two types of evaluation of tenure-line faculty. First is performance review, applicable to all faculty for purposes of determining retention, tenure, and/or promotion. The second type of evaluation is periodic evaluation, applicable to faculty not subject to performance review.

2. Only tenured faculty and academic administrators may engage in the evaluation of tenure-line faculty. Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be available to faculty before the evaluation process begins. No changes in such criteria or procedures may be made during the evaluation process.

3. At all levels of evaluation, before recommendations are forwarded to the next level, faculty evaluated shall be given a copy of each recommendation stating in writing the reasons for the recommendation. Faculty have the right to respond or rebut within ten days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall be placed in the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) and be sent to previous evaluators. The faculty evaluated may request an opportunity to discuss the recommendation with the recommending party. This discussion shall not alter the evaluation timeline of evaluation.

4. Recommendations or decisions relating to retention, tenure, promotion, termination, or any other personnel action shall be based primarily on material contained in the WPAF. If a personnel recommendation or decision is based on reasons not contained in the WPAF, the party making the recommendation or decision shall commit those reasons to writing in a signed statement, to be placed in the WPAF and provided to the faculty. In

cases of promotion, evaluation committee members must have a higher rank than those being considered for promotion.

5. Recommendations shall be confidential.
6. Timetables for evaluation are prepared at the beginning of each academic year by the FAD Office and approved by the Faculty Senate.

Overview of Evaluation

1. Evaluation committees

    a. Department evaluation committees

        i. Composition: A Department Evaluation Committee shall normally be composed of three tenured faculty. In departments with many evaluations to conduct, the department may vote to increase the size of the DEC to as many as five members. One member may be an Associate Professor who is not undergoing performance review, and the remaining members must be Professors. Associate Professors must recuse themselves from cases involving promotion to Professor (see CBA Article 15.43). If a recusal results in a committee with fewer than three members, the department shall elect a Professor to serve as an alternate committee member. Eligible faculty who are undergoing periodic evaluation may serve on the committee but must recuse themselves from their own evaluation. The Department Chair may not serve on this committee. The committee shall elect its chair who must hold the rank of Professor. The committee serves a one-year term, elected annually from within the department or from related academic disciplines.

        Members of the Department Evaluation Committee cannot serve concurrently on the College Evaluation Committee or the University Evaluation Committee but may serve concurrently on other Department Evaluation Committees.

        Faculty in the Faculty Early Retirement Program are eligible to serve on the Departmental Evaluation Committee if (a) the period of active employment spans the period of the Committee's work, and (b) the appointment is approved by the College Dean. However, evaluation committees may not be comprised solely of faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program.

        The election of the committee must be conducted in accordance with the procedures stipulated in FAM 652.6: Election of the Department Evaluation Committee.

ii. Functions: This committee shall conduct both performance review and periodic evaluation of the department tenure-line faculty. It may also evaluate lecturers if the department so decides (FAM 652.2: Evaluation of Lecturers). It is highly recommended that committee members attend training provided by FAD prior to the review and discussion of files.

b. College evaluation committees

i. Composition: A College Evaluation Committee shall be composed of four tenured faculty. At least three of the four shall hold the rank of Professor; the fourth may be an Associate Professor who is not being evaluated for promotion. The committee shall elect its chair who must hold the rank of Professor. Department Chairs or Associate Deans may not serve on this committee. Members shall be elected to staggered two-year terms by the tenure-line faculty of the college. No more than one member may come from a single department, unless the college has fewer than four departments, in which case, no more than two members may come from a single department. A member of a College Evaluation Committee cannot serve concurrently as a member of a Department Evaluation Committee or the University Evaluation Committee.

Faculty in the Faculty Early Retirement Program are eligible to serve on the College Evaluation Committee if (a) the period of active employment spans the period of the Committee's work, and (b) the appointment is approved by the College Dean. However, evaluation committees may not be comprised solely of faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program.

Functions: This committee shall conduct college-level performance review of faculty in the college. It is highly recommended that committee members attend training provided by FAD prior to the review and discussion of files.

c. University evaluation committee

i. Composition: The University Evaluation Committee shall be composed of one tenured Professor elected from each College by the tenure-line faculty of the College, one tenured librarian elected by the tenure-line librarians, and one tenured SSPAR elected by the tenure-line SSPARs. Department Chairs or Associate/Assistant Deans may not serve on this committee. Library Evaluators may serve on this committee but must withdraw when a librarian they have evaluated is being evaluated. Members shall serve two-year staggered terms. The Committee shall elect its Chair. Members of this committee cannot serve concurrently on

any evaluation committee at a lower level.

Faculty in the Faculty Early Retirement Program are eligible to serve on the University Evaluation Committee if (a) the period of active employment spans the period of the Committee's work, and (b) the appointment is approved by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs. However, evaluation committees may not be comprised solely of faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program.

Functions: This committee shall conduct performance reviews of faculty at the University level in cases where recommendations from the Department Evaluation Committee, Department Chair, College Evaluation Committee, and Dean are not unanimous as well as in cases involving non-retention, denial of tenure, or denial of promotion. This committee shall also serve as the higher-level peer review committee for librarians and SSPARs. Its ratings shall be based primarily on previous recommendations and ratings. It is highly recommended that committee members attend training provided by FAD prior to the review and discussion of files.

2. Instruments of evaluation

   a. *Faculty Activities Reports (FARs)*: FARs shall be submitted by all evaluated faculty. FARs shall cover all three areas of evaluation: teaching; research, scholarly or creative contributions; and service to university and/or community. A FAR should cover the following periods of time:

      i. For all probationary faculty being considered for retention or tenure: cumulative since appointment.
      ii. For faculty applying for promotion: cumulative since the submission date of the FAR that led to the previous promotion or since initial appointment, whichever is more recent.
      iii. For all others (e.g., tenured faculty subject to periodic evaluation): cumulative since the submission of the most recent FAR.

   b. *Supporting Documentation:* The evaluated faculty will provide a brief narrative explaining the significance of his or her work and contributions in each area of the FAR: teaching; research, scholarly, and creative activities; and service. Supporting documentation for activities must be attached (for example, course descriptions, reprints of publications, appropriate evidence regarding speeches, consultations, performances, exhibitions, and work in progress, as exemplified below:

i. For probationary faculty being considered for retention: all supporting documentation since the last performance review.
ii. For probationary faculty being considered for tenure and/or promotion: all supporting documentation since appointment.
iii. For tenured faculty applying for promotion: all supporting documentation since the last promotion or since initial appointment, whichever is more recent.
iv. For all others (e.g., tenured faculty subject to periodic evaluation): all supporting documentation since the last FAR was submitted.
v. For probationary faculty with accomplishments achieved before joining CSUSB and granted service credit for these accomplishments, the documentation for these accomplishments shall be included. They will be given equal weight during evaluation as those achieved at CSUSB but, viewed as a whole, shall not be the majority of evidence for the granting of tenure or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.
vi. For probationary faculty with accomplishments achieved before joining CSUSB but not granted service credit for these accomplishments, they may opt to document these accomplishments. If documented, these accomplishments shall be considered. Evaluators shall decide how much weight—if any—these accomplishments should be given in their recommendations.

All FARs must be accompanied by an Index of Attachments.

In the case of collaborative research, scholarly or creative contributions, activities or accomplishments, a Joint Activities Report must be submitted.

c. Classroom visitation reports: Classroom visitations shall be conducted for all probationary faculty, tenured faculty requesting consideration for promotion, and lecturers. Classroom visitations may also be scheduled when requested by tenured faculty. The following guidelines must be met:

i. Classroom visitations shall be conducted at least once each academic year during the probationary period. Visitations should be scheduled in as many different courses and by as great a variety of visitors as possible. Additional visitations may also be scheduled at the request of a faculty member, the Department Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair jointly, or the College Evaluation Committee and the College Dean jointly.

ii. For tenure-line faculty, visitors and the course to be visited shall be selected jointly by the College Evaluation Committee and the College Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair, no later than the third

week of classes. The Department Chair shall, in turn, consult with the faculty member to be visited for concurrence before the formal assignment of visitors. For lecturers, visitors, and the course to be visited shall be selected jointly by the Department Evaluation committee or the Department Lecturer Evaluation Committee (See FAM 652.2: Evaluation of Lecturers) and the Department Chair.

All faculty members shall be informed in writing of planned visits. Notification shall take place no less than three days before the visitors have been notified of their assignments. All classroom visitation assignment notifications, for both visitors and visitees, should be completed by the end of the fifth week of the semester.

iii. Visitations for faculty in their first two probationary years shall be conducted by two tenured faculty of equal or higher rank and from disciplines as close as possible to that of the visited faculty. The two visitors are expected to visit the same course on the same date.

Visitations for all other tenure-line faculty shall be conducted by one tenured faculty of equal or higher rank and from a discipline as close as possible to that of the visitee. An additional visitor may be requested by the faculty member to be visited. Visitations for lecturers are conducted by one faculty of the same or higher rank. The date of the visitation shall be agreed upon by the visitor and the visitee.

iv. Classroom visitation forms will be sent by the College Dean's office to the visitor and the visitee prior to the pre-visitation conference. The pre-visitation conference shall concern matters such as the course objectives, content and organization, approaches and methods used, and the relevance of the class to the overall course plan. The visitor shall arrange all meetings.

The visitee shall furnish copies of syllabi, exams, and other materials to the visitor. Throughout the process, the visitee’s intellectual property rights shall always be respected and upheld by the visitor. For online or hybrid courses, the materials made available to the visitor for evaluation shall be comparable to what is provided for a visitation in a face-to-face class. In an online class that is delivered synchronously, the visitor shall have electronic access to one class session, the syllabus and exams, plus any other supporting material the visitee deems useful to provide a full picture of their methods of instruction. In an online class that is delivered asynchronously, the visitor shall have access to online materials that cover the equivalent of one day of class, plus the syllabus and exams and other supporting materials as described above. Student privacy must

be respected. Visitors should not have access to students' grades or graded work. The length of time that visitors have electronic access to discussion boards, chat room logs, etc. should be limited in scope, and students should be informed about the time frame during which the visitor will have that access.

For a hybrid course, the visitor and the visitee should determine the most appropriate venue (i.e., online or in class) for the visitation.

v. No later than two weeks after the visitation, the visitor shall present the Classroom Visitation Report to the visitee. A post-visitation conference shall take place about the report and suggestions for improvement.

vi. The visitor and the visitee sign the Classroom Visitation Report which, together with supporting materials, shall be transmitted by the Dean's office. to the FAD Office for inclusion in the PAF. The faculty visited shall be given a copy of the report by the visitor.

vii. For faculty undergoing a performance evaluation, the visitation reports must be completed by the eighth week. A missing visitation report will not negatively affect the evaluation of faculty undergoing performance evaluation.

viii. The faculty visited may submit to the College office a written response or rebuttal to be attached to the report, seven days following the post-visitation conference.

d. Student evaluation and alternative Evaluation Instruments

Student evaluations shall be required for all classes except for:

i. Classes with enrollments of fewer than five (5) students;
ii. Field experiences, thesis research, distance learning through interactive televised video, independent project/study, recitations, and internships; and
iii. Team-taught classes.

Faculty teaching classes in which student evaluations are not administered are encouraged to use alternative evaluation instruments.

e. The following guidelines should be met for all student evaluations.

i. Faculty Senate authorized forms shall be used.

ii. The faculty teaching the course shall not be present when the student evaluation is conducted.

iii. As soon as practicable after the end of the term, faculty shall receive a summary of results as well as the original paper forms. Probationary faculty should retain the original forms at least until the next performance review. Faculty at the rank of Professor should retain them until their next periodic evaluation. Lecturers should retain the original forms at least until their next periodic evaluation.

iv. All student evaluations will be stored in electronic format. The following provisions shall govern the inclusion of student evaluations in the PAF: Probationary Faculty: The student evaluations of classes taught by a probationary faculty in the first term of employment are automatically excluded from the PAF. However, he or she may choose to include them via a written request submitted to the FAD Office. The student evaluations of all other classes shall enter the PAF.

Tenured Faculty: Tenured Assistant and Associate Professors may exclude up to twenty percent (20%) of the student evaluations per academic year. Those excluded, however, cannot be from classes that have been visited. Tenured Professors may exclude up to thirty percent (30%) of the courses evaluated per academic year.

In cases in which student evaluation exclusion occurs, classes whose student evaluations are included shall be representative of the faculty's teaching assignment as jointly determined by the faculty concerned and his/her department chair. Should there be disagreement, each party shall select 50% of the courses to be included in the PAF. If this selection process results in student evaluations not being included in the PAF, the parties shall submit a signed statement, specifying those student evaluations which are excluded.

At the time of submitting the FAR, faculty evaluated shall provide the FAD Office a statement about student evaluation inclusion/exclusion. This statement shall not be included in the PAF.

Alternative Student Evaluation Instruments. Based on college or departmental guidelines, additional evaluation instruments such as Student Evaluations of Supervision Effectiveness (SESEs) may be used as supplements or alternatives to student evaluations.

3. **Files for evaluation**

a. The Personnel Action File (PAF)

   i. A PAF shall be maintained for each faculty member in the FAD Office except the PAFs for tenured professors, which are kept at the college office.

   ii. Faculty shall have the right to submit additional materials and written rebuttals to any material in the PAF. The sources of these documents must be identified. Identification shall indicate the author, the committee, the office, or the name of the officially-authorized body. The faculty concerned must be provided with a copy of such added document at least five days prior.

   iii. Faculty have the right of access to all materials in the PAF, exclusive of pre- employment materials, unless the pre-employment materials are used in personnel actions.

   iv. Faculty may request to inspect their PAFs. A copy of all materials requested shall be provided within fourteen days. If a faculty member finds an inaccuracy, he or she may request a correction or deletion. If the request is denied, the faculty shall have seven days to submit the request to the President or designee. Within twenty-one days of the request to the President or designee, the President or designee shall provide to the faculty member a written response. If the President or designee grants the request, the record shall be corrected or the deletions made, and the faculty member shall be sent a written statement to that effect. If the President or designee denies the request, the response shall include reasons for denial.

   v. PAFs shall be held in confidence, accessible only to persons with official business. Access to a PAF shall be logged, whose record shall be part of the PAF itself.

b. Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). The WPAF is a subset of PAF, including documents assembled for the purpose of a scheduled evaluation. The WPAF shall include the following:

   i. FAR (with an Index of Attachments)

   ii. Classroom Visitation Reports

   iii. Student evaluations or alternative student evaluation instruments (summary reports and completed forms)

iv. Responses and rebuttals

v. Faculty-authored reports from sabbatical leaves, difference-in-pay leaves, mini-grants, and other internal CSUSB grants

vi. All other evaluation materials in the PAF

vii. All current and previous summary statements and recommendations resulting from the evaluation process

Materials submitted to the WPAF shall be deemed incorporated by reference in the PAF but need not be physically placed in it. An index of such materials shall be prepared by faculty and submitted with the materials. Such an index shall be permanently placed in the PAF.

The original student evaluation forms will be stored in electronic format and incorporated into the PAF. The actual student evaluation forms will be returned to the faculty member. Probationary faculty should retain the original forms at least until the next performance review and tenured Professors, until their next periodic evaluation.

4. Recommendations: Recommendations shall be made following a thorough review of the WPAF. All recommenders shall ensure that criteria are applied consistently across faculty. If there are omissions of documentation, information, or recommendation in the materials, the materials may be returned for amplification. Amplification documents shall be provided in a timely manner.

5. Decision: The President or designee shall receive the WPAF, review its contents and recommendations, and reach a decision. The President's or designee's decision shall be communicated in writing to the faculty, with the reasons for decision clearly stated.

Performance Review

1. Definitions and general provisions

    a. *Performance review:* Performance review is the process whereby decisions concerning retention, promotion, and tenure are made. Performance reviews are based upon information obtained from students, peers, and administrators in the manner described in this document. Upon completion of deliberations at each level of performance review, a copy of the recommendation shall be provided to the evaluated faculty, who may respond in writing within ten days after receipt of the recommendation and/or request a meeting with the recommending party.

b. *Probation:* Probation refers to the period of time in which a faculty member demonstrates that he or she is worthy of tenure. The length of probation shall be six years of full-time service, which is normally the time of service at CSUSB since initial appointment but may include credited service for experience prior to appointment.

c. *Tenure:* Tenure is the faculty member's right of permanent employment in the university. Tenure is normally granted after the six-year probationary period (applying in the sixth year) as defined above and shall be effective at the beginning of the seventh year.

   A probationary faculty member may apply for tenure earlier but not until after four years of service, including service credit (if applicable), i.e., in the fifth year of the probationary period. The process and criteria for early tenure are the same as those for regular tenure.

   This time frame for early tenure does not apply to faculty hired before September 10, 2019.

d. *Promotion:* Promotion is the advancement to a higher rank: From the rank of Assistant Professor to the rank of Associate Professor and then to the rank of Professor. These two promotions are sequential: One cannot be promoted to Professor from Assistant Professor.

   i. Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor: Application for promotion to Associate normally coincides with the application for tenure, i.e., in the sixth year of the probationary period.

      A probationary faculty member may apply for promotion to Associate earlier but not until after four years of service, including service credit (if applicable), i.e., in the fifth year of the probationary period. The process and criteria for early tenure are the same as those for regular promotion to Associate.

      This time frame for early promotion to Associate does not apply to faculty hired before September 10, 2019.

   ii. Promotion to Professor: Promotion to the rank of Professor is normally granted after five years of service since promotion to Associate. As such, application and evaluation take place in the fifth year.

      An associate professor may apply for promotion to Professor earlier but not until after three years of service, i.e., in the fourth year since promotion to Associate. The process and criteria for early tenure are the

same as those for regular promotion to Professor. This time frame for early promotion to Professor does not apply to faculty hired before September 10, 2019.

2. Procedures

   a. Faculty being evaluated complete the FAR and submit it to the FAD Office. The faculty should identify and provide materials accessible to them. Evaluating committees and administrators shall be responsible for identifying and providing relevant materials not provided by the faculty concerned.

      A specific deadline shall be established for the completion of the WPAF. Insertion of material after the deadline must be approved by the Department Evaluation Committee and shall be limited to items that become accessible after the deadline. Material inserted shall be forwarded to earlier evaluators for evaluation before consideration by subsequent evaluators. If, during the review process, a required evaluation document is found missing, the WPAF shall be returned to the responsible evaluator, who will then provide the missing document. This step shall not lead to a delay in the evaluation process.

   b. The FAD Office assembles the WPAFs and submits them to the Department Evaluation Committees and Department Chairs for concurrent and independent evaluation. If a department chair is unavailable (e.g. being ineligible due to rank or withdrawing due to conflict of interest) the evaluated faculty may select three department chairs within the college and submit their names to the College Dean. The College Dean shall select one from the three to serve in the capacity of the department chair.

   c. College Evaluation Committees and College Deans concurrently and independently conduct evaluation. If a College Dean withdraws from the evaluation process due to conflict of interest, the faculty being evaluated may choose to select two College Deans and submit their names to the Provost. The Provost shall select one of the two to serve in the capacity of the Dean. When required by external accreditation standards, another appropriate administrator may conduct an evaluation as the Dean's designee.

   d. If recommendations from the Department Evaluation Committee, Department Chair, College Evaluation Committee, and the College Dean are unanimous and do not involve non-retention or denial of tenure or promotion, the WPAF of the evaluated faculty is submitted directly to the President or designee for a decision.

      If there is disagreement between any two recommending parties or if the decision of these parties, although unanimous, leads to non-retention or denial of tenure

or promotion, the WPAFs are submitted to the University Evaluation Committee for evaluation.

e. When making recommendations for retention, evaluators may recommend a performance review to take place in the third or fifth probationary year. Such recommendations shall be placed in the “Additional Comments” section of the performance review report.

The FAD Office submits the WPAFs to the President or designee for decision. In addition to decisions regarding retention, promotion, or tenure, the President or designee may require that a performance review be conducted in the third or fifth probationary year, following the timeline used for performance reviews for fourth-year probationary faculty. Similarly, the classroom visitation schedule for the requested performance review shall be the same as for fourth-year probationary faculty.

Periodic Evaluation

1. Definitions and general provisions

    a. Applicable faculty: Periodic evaluation applies to faculty who are not subject to performance review. They are first-, third-, and fifth-year probationary faculty who are not applying for early tenure or promotion, and tenured faculty.

    b. Purpose: The purpose of periodic evaluation is to assess progress towards next performance reviews. It is intended to be instructive, providing guidance for faculty’s success in their RPT process and beyond.

    c. Result: The result of periodic evaluation is a summary statement on the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated faculty in all three areas of evaluation: teaching, research, scholarly or creative contributions and service to university and/or community. This statement may include recommendations for improvement. The summary statement is placed in the PAF and a copy is provided to the faculty member.

2. Procedures

    a. Applicable faculty complete their FARs and submit them to the FAD Office.

    b. The FAD Office assembles the WPAF.

c. The Department Evaluation Committee and Department Chair jointly evaluate the faculty and submit their report to the FAD Office.

Evaluation Criteria and Their Application

1. Area of evaluation

   a. Teaching: Teaching effectiveness shall be evaluated by the quality of performance of the faculty member in varied aspects of instruction, such as classroom instruction, studio instruction, laboratory instruction, supervision of individual projects, and supervision of fieldwork. Evaluators must recognize the diversity in teaching approaches, pedagogies, and styles exhibited by the instructional faculty of the university.

      Primary sources of evidence for the quality of instruction shall be faculty activities reports, classroom visitation reports (with appended materials gathered during the pre- and post-visitation conferences), student evaluations, alternative teaching evaluation instruments, and syllabi and major assessment instruments for each new and revised course. The evaluated faculty may include a teaching portfolio to include items appended to classroom visitations, course syllabi, lab schedules, examinations and quizzes, hand-out materials, and others. Evaluators shall consider all materials in the WPAF.

   Quality of instruction shall be evaluated in the following areas:

      i. Command of Subject Matter: Credentials presented by the evaluated faculty upon appointment attest to their initial command of the subject matter. However, evidence beyond these credentials are also expected to demonstrate that the evaluated faculty's command of subject matter is current.

      ii. Course Design/Preparation, Instructional Material, and Organization: Courses are expected to (a) be aligned with course goals, description, and mode of instruction (e.g. lab, lecture, seminar); (b) be organized to include learning activities and strategies that will achieve course goals and enhance student learning; (c) reflect a reasonable allocation of time and resources; and (d) have the appropriate use of teaching modes, strategies, techniques, and instructional materials, including technology. A course syllabus is required for each course. At the beginning of each course, faculty should make clear to students the objectives, requirements, assessment standards and methods, and plan for that course.

iii. Effectiveness in Instruction: It is vital that faculty regularly review and modify course content to meet changing curricular needs. Instructional effectiveness requires that faculty modify course content to reflect relevance, timeliness, and comprehensive coverage of central issues and prevailing perspectives in the discipline. The course content should be delivered using instructional modes and teaching techniques/strategies suitable for the type and size of the class being taught.

Effective teaching also requires that content, organization, and delivery are suitable for both the overall course and the individual class sessions. Successful experimentation with, and/or teaching research on, innovative teaching strategies and methods shall also be viewed as evidence for effective teaching.

iv. Academic assessment of student learning: Fair and thorough assessment of student learning is an important aspect of effective instruction. Assessment methods need to be consistent with program goals and course objectives and capable of distinguishing among different levels of student learning.

Methods of assessment may include examinations, homework, term papers, laboratory reports, completed special assignments, seminar presentations, and other means appropriate to the type of class or instructional mode involved. Documentation of these methods and other pertinent materials in the WPAF—including examples of student work—constitute evidence for assessment of student learning.

Faculty should make clear to students what methods will be used to assess learning and should apply standards appropriate to the level of the course.

b. Research, scholarly or creative contributions: Evaluators must recognize that no single method exists for faculty to demonstrate performance in research, scholarly or creative contributions, particularly across disciplines.

i. It shall be the sole responsibility of the evaluated faculty to provide documented evidence of research, scholarly or creative contributions referenced in the FAR. Examples of items which may be used are books and articles (or evidence of their acceptance for publication), proposals, contracts, grants or programs; letters of invitation or appointment; reviews of creative activity written by professionally recognized persons; and other appropriate professionally generated materials.

ii. The faculty member may consult with the Department Chair to ascertain that the FAR contains a thorough description of his or her professional activities and reflects a true picture of accomplishments in research, scholarly or creative contributions.

iii. A request for an external review of materials may be initiated at any level of evaluation by any party. Such a request shall document the special circumstances which necessitate an outside reviewer. The request must be approved by the President or designee, with the concurrence of the faculty member.

When the request for an external review has been approved, the faculty member shall provide to the FAD Office a list of names from which one or more evaluators may be chosen. Department Chairs, Evaluation Committees, and/or College Deans shall consider this list and may opt to provide additional names to it. The FAD Office, with the consent of the faculty member, will coordinate the selection of one or more reviewers from this list.

The external viewers should be, as far as possible, senior and established scholars in the field. They cannot be the dissertation chair or the primary dissertation advisor, a personal friend, or a collaborator of any publication or research effort of the evaluated faculty. The external review report will e included in the WPAF as an integral part of the evaluation process.

iv. The Department Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair must evaluate each item in the area of research, service or creative contributions. They must address the significance and quality of the contribution in relation to the form in which the contribution is presented, e.g. publication, presentation, or work in progress. If the contribution consists of professional activity such as a consultantship, participation in a professional organization, or grant and award, the committee and chair must assess its significance and relevance. If the Department Evaluation Committee or the Department Chair finds any deficiencies in the faculty member's documentation or has difficulty evaluating on a particular item, they may request clarification, expansion, or additional information through the FAD Office. If the evaluated faculty fails to provide requested information, the Department Evaluation Committee or the DepartmentChair shall so indicate in their reports.

v. Evaluation Committees, Department Chairs, and the College Dean shall consider all materials to determine their appropriateness and quality and, in light of established criteria, evaluate the faculty member's research,

scholarly or creative contributions.

vi. The following list of research, scholarly or creative contributions is exemplary. It is not meant to be limiting, definitive, or rank-ordered for importance. Work professionally evaluated by peers in the field is generally considered to be more significant. Some items on the list may be more appropriate to some disciplines than others. The individual contribution to collaborative activities must be clearly stated in the Joint Activity Report.

• Receipt of a fellowship, grant, contract, award, prize, or other evidence of professional recognition.

• Active participation in seminars, conferences, meetings, or other activity leading to research, scholarly or creative contributions.

• Continuing education, retraining, and the development of new skills relevant to one's current or potential work assignment. Evidence of these activities may be the taking of courses, earning advanced degrees, or participating in professional conferences, seminars, workshops, institutes, or special programs which lead to systematic updating of knowledge.

• Presentations at professional meetings.

• Publications, such as books or texts (whole or part thereof), articles in journals or periodicals, or any other type of academically specialized form of output such as music, script, software. Professionally recognized or refereed publications are generally considered to be more significant.

• Creative activity culminating in a public display or performance such as might occur in music, art, drama, or poetry reading.

• Active leadership and/or service in recognized professional societies. (This activity may also be relevant to service to university/community.)

• Consultantships, whether paid or unpaid, of a professional nature.

• Editing, reviewing, indexing, abstracting, or performing other editorial work for professional or scholarly publications.

• Any other items of specific professional activity, such as work in progress, research related to instruction, or research on how students learn and apply knowledge over an extended period of time.

c. Service to university and/or community: In addition to demonstrated teaching effectiveness and continued research, scholarly or creative activity, faculty must also participate in professionally related service to the university and/or community.
   i. Scope of Service to university and/or community: Faculty are uniquely qualified to contribute to the mission of the University in a variety of ways, such as participating in institutional governance, evaluating the teaching of their colleagues, advising students, and sponsoring student organizations.

      Service to community related to the mission of the University brings recognition not only to the University but also the faculty. Service should be consistent with the teaching abilities, expertise, and leadership qualities of the evaluated faculty and should foster an intellectual relationship with the community. Community may be local, regional, state, national, as well as international. Service to the University and/or community shall be demonstrated by documented evidence submitted with the FAR. The following list—which is not meant to be exhaustive nor are the items ranked-ordered for preference—provides examples of items that may be included in the FAR.

      Service to University

      • Active participation in service to and/or governance of programs, departments, colleges, the campus, and/or the University System. Activities supported by reassigned time shall be considered in evaluating the quantity—but not quality—of such work.

      • Attendance and active participation at program, department, and college meetings.

      • Active participation on committees at all levels of CSUSB and the CSU, with emphasis on the departmental and the college levels while at the Assistant Professor rank.

      • Participation in educational equity programs and activities.

      • Authorship of documents, reports, or other materials pertinent to the University's mission or operation.
      • Advisor or sponsor to student organizations or clubs on campus.
      • Assisting with grants, documents, contracts, proposals, reports, or other materials pertinent to the University’s mission or operation.

      • Active participation in program, Department, College, Campus and/or

University-wide Advisory Groups.

• Completion of classroom visitation reports.

• Academic and/or career advisement of students.

Service to Community

• Service in government at all levels.

• Consultantships to community service groups.

• Media presentations such as interviews, articles, speeches, or other presentations in newspapers, magazines, radio, television, or film.

• Lectures, speeches, talks, presentations, and/or displays given to schools, community groups, or the University community.

• Judge at science fairs, art shows, or music contests.

• Active participation and/or office holding in civic, educational service or humanitarian groups.

• Participation in community partnership activities which enhance social, economic, and cultural conditions.

ii. Evaluation of Service to university and/or community

The faculty shall describe and provide documentation for service to university and/or community. Evidence may include—but not be limited to— letters of invitation, memoranda documenting service, programs, membership lists, and other appropriate items. Evaluators evaluate the nature of the service to university and/or community and its appropriateness to the evaluated faculty's rank.

2. Evaluation Rating System

a. *Evaluation scale:* All evaluators shall apply the established criteria to the performance of the evaluated faculty relative to his or her employment status at the time of the evaluation. A rating of Above Expectations for Retention at the Rank of Assistant Professor at the Second Year, for example, only means that the evaluated faculty is deemed Above Expectations as a second-year probationary faculty. It is not indicative of his or her chances of being promoted or tenured later.

Above Expectations: Above the established criteria.
Meets Expectations: Within the range of the established criteria.
Below Expectations: Below the established range of criteria.
Well Below Expectation: Well below the range of established criteria.

b. Outcomes of evaluation

i. *Second-year retention review:* If the faculty member is rated at least Meets Expectations in two areas and no lower than Below Expectations in the third, he or she will be recommended for Retention at the rank of Assistant Professor.

Ratings of Below Expectations for Retention at the rank of Assistant Professor in two areas and at least Meets Expectations in the third also results in retention. But the retention decision will include recommendations from the President or designee for successful future reviews. If the faculty member is rated Well Below Expectations in any of the three areas or Below Expectations or Well Below Expectation in all three, he or she will not be recommended for Retention.

ii. *Fourth-year retention review:* Ratings of Meets Expectations or Above Expectations in all three areas will result in recommendation for retention.If the evaluated faculty is rated Below Expectations in any of the three areas and Meets Expectations (or above) in the other two areas, he or she will be recommended for Retention; but the retention decision will include recommendations from the President or designee for successful future reviews.

If the faculty being evaluated receives Well Below Expectations in one area or Below Expectations in two or more areas, he or she will not be recommended for Retention.

iii. *Tenure:* To be recommended for tenure, the faculty member must receive a minimum of Meets Expectations in all three areas relevant to the rank held at the time of evaluation. Any lower rating shall result in not being Recommended for tenure.

iv. *Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor:* To be recommended for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the faculty member must be evaluated as Above Expectations for one of the categories and as Meets Expectations or Above Expectations for the other two categories at the rank of Assistant Professor.

If a faculty member is evaluated to be Below Expectations or Well Below Expectations for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in any of the three categories, the faculty member will not be recommended for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

v. *Promotion to the rank of Professor:* To be recommended for promotion to Professor, a faculty member must receive the ratings of Above Expectations in one area and Meets Expectation or Above Expectations in the other two areas at the rank of Associate Professor. Any lower rating shall result in not Being recommended for promotion to Professor.

3. Application of criteria and rating system

a. General provisions

Early-tenure applications are evaluated according to the same standards and criteria as those for regular tenure applications. Early applications for promotion are evaluated according to the same standards and criteria as those for regular promotion applications.

In progressing through the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor, the faculty being evaluated will be judged by an increasingly rigorous application of the criteria.

b. Meets Expectations and Above Expectations in the area of teaching

i. Meets Expectations in the area of teaching

At the rank of Assistant Professor: During years two and three of the probationary period, the Meets Expectations faculty member at the rank of Assistant Professor must demonstrate command of the subject matter and strong indications of developing abilities in the other aspects of teaching. During subsequent years, competence in all teaching criteria must be evident.

At the rank of Associate Professor: The Meets Expectations faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor must demonstrate proficiency in each of the four teaching criteria.

At the rank of Professor: The Meets Expectations faculty member at the rank of Professor must demonstrate proficiency in each of the four teaching criteria and a sustained record of involvement and achievement indicative of a commitment and ability to continue at that level.

ii. Above Expectations in the area of teaching.

To be considered Above Expectations in the area of teaching, the faculty member must meet the requirements set forth above for Meets Expectations. He or she must also provide a preponderance of evidence demonstrating excellence in teaching and/or a record of distinction for some aspect of teaching at or beyond the University.

c. Meets Expectations and Above Expectations in the area of research, scholarly or creative contributions Both qualitative and quantitative standards should be used to evaluate Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions.

i. Meets Expectations in the Area of Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions At the rank of Assistant Professor: During years two and three of the probationary period, the Meets Expectations faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor must demonstrate involvement in research, scholarly or creative activities. In subsequent years, continued active involvement in and successful completion of some professionally evaluated activities should be evident.

At the rank of Associate Professor: The Meets Expectations faculty at the rank of Associate Professor must demonstrate a record of active involvement in and successful accomplishment of research, scholarly or creative activities. Successful accomplishment at this level normally requires some continued completion of professionally evaluated activities. At the rank of Professor: The Meets Expectations faculty at the rank of Professor must demonstrate a record of successful accomplishment and recognition in research, scholarly or creative activities.

ii. Above Expectations in the area of research, scholarly or creative contributions

To receive Above Expectations, the evaluated faculty must, as a minimum, have met the requirement set forth above for meets expectations appropriate to rank. In addition, he or she must have attained recognition beyond the University in research, scholarly activity, and/or creative activity.

d. Meets Expectations and Above Expectations in the area of service to university and/or community

i. Meets Expectations in the area of service At the rank of Assistant Professor: The Meets Expectations faculty should demonstrate a developing level of participation in service, particularly at the departmental

and college levels. To receive tenure, the Meets Expectations faculty member must demonstrate significant participation in the area of service.

ii. At the rank of Associate Professor: The Meets Expectations faculty at this rank must demonstrate significant participation in the area of service. For a faculty member hired at this rank, a Meets Expectations rating may be assigned for demonstrating sufficient progress towards meeting this standard by the third probationary year.

At the rank of Professor: In addition to significant participation in service activities, the Meets Expectations faculty at this rank is expected to provide effective leadership in some of these activities and demonstrate a sustained commitment to these leadership roles. For a faculty member hired at this rank, a Meets Expectations rating may be assigned for demonstrating sufficient progress towards meeting this standard by the third probationary year.

iii. Above Expectations in the area of service

A rating of Above Expectations in this area is awarded for exceptional service that has been clearly documented, both quantitatively and qualitatively.

To be considered Above Expectations in the area of service, the faculty member must meet the qualifications set forth above for Meets Expectations appropriate to academic rank. In addition, he or she must demonstrate unusual effectiveness or performance as a contributor or leader in the University, the community, or both.

Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

1. *Purpose:* The purpose of periodic evaluation of tenured faculty is to assure continued excellence in teaching; research, scholarly or creative contributions; and service to the university and/or community. This process is intended to be both positive and supportive.

2. Procedure

   a. Tenured faculty members shall be subject to periodic evaluation at intervals of not more than five (5) years. Periodic evaluations shall be conducted jointly by the Department Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair.

   b. Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on the Department Evaluation Committee in the evaluation of tenured faculty. However,

they cannot be the sole members of the said committee.

c. Participants in the FERP shall not be required to undergo periodic evaluation unless requested by either the FERP participant or an appropriate administrator.
d. If more than 25% of tenured faculty in a department are scheduled for periodic evaluation, the Department Chair may determine by a random method a one-year postponement of some reviews to reduce the number to less than 25%. The random process thus used shall be supervised by the chair of the Department Evaluation Committee.

   Also subject to periodic evaluation are tenured faculty whose previous evaluations resulted in a decision to review in less than five (5) years.

e. During the evaluation year, those tenured faculty scheduled for periodic evaluation shall submit a FAR to their college office, in accordance with the RPT calendar. The FAR shall cover activities in the previous five (5) years or since the last evaluation.

f. The following materials shall be assembled into a WPAF.

   i. A FAR covering the previous five (5) years or since the last evaluation.
   ii. Student evaluations and alternative student evaluation instruments.
   iii. Other materials deemed relevant by the reviewed faculty.

   The Department Evaluation Committee and Department Chair shall jointly review the assembled file and prepare a summary report, using the format found in Appendix 7, commenting on the overall effectiveness of the faculty member's performance, outlining strengths and opportunities for improvement, specifying remedies, if any, and indicating when the next review shall take place.

g. A copy of this report shall be given to the faculty member who shall have the right to submit a written response, which may be a rebuttal.

h. The WPAF, summary report and response (if any) shall be forwarded to the appropriate College Dean for review. The Dean, the Department Chair, the Chair of the Departmental Evaluation Committee, and the faculty being reviewed shall meet to discuss the report and any recommendations made in the report. The report, along with a statement from the College Dean formalizing the time of the next scheduled evaluation, shall then become a part of the faculty's PAF.

i. The review process for the periodic evaluation of tenured faculty shall be completed in accordance with the timetable for periodic evaluation and Performance review prepared by the FAD Office and approved by the Senate

each year.

3. Criteria: Tenured faculty shall be evaluated in the areas of teaching; research, scholarly or creative contributions; and service to the University and community. The criteria are the same as those for faculty subject to performance review.
4. Exclusion: Members of the Department Evaluation Committee are required to recuse themselves from their own review.

5. Delays in Review: It is recognized that unforeseen situations may warrant a delay in periodic evaluation. Requests for a delay shall be made in writing, clearly stating reasons that must be serious and compelling. These requests must be submitted to the Department Chair. The normal term of delay is one year. Delays of more than one year may be granted in exceptional circumstances, such as a multi-year leave of absence. The more than one-year delay may be granted by the College Dean upon recommendation by the Department Chair in consultation with the Department Evaluation Committee.

Departmental Guidelines

1. *Overview:* Academic departments may opt to create discipline/program specific guidelines for the evaluation of its tenure-line faculty. These guidelines must be in line with the university-wide criteria as specified above and, at the same time, provide guidance to faculty on those items that tend to have greater applicability for their academic area. The departmental guidelines cannot supersede or exclude the criteria listed above, nor impose any pedagogical technique or approach on the department faculty.

2. General requirements

    a. Teaching: Departments may describe, in general terms, instructional techniques or pedagogical approaches which are perhaps better suited for their disciplines/programs.

    b. Research, scholarly or creative contributions: Departments may indicate which of the professional activities listed above in this policy are more appropriate for the discipline/program and may suggest how best to engage in those activities to achieve professional accomplishments. Guidelines must avoid setting specific quantitative goals, since each evaluation committee must evaluate both quantitative and qualitative aspects of professional activities and achievements. Additionally, strict rank ordering of items shall be avoided, but clear identification of the most appropriate professional growth activities is encouraged.

    c. Service: Departments may indicate which service activities listed above in this policy may be more appropriate for the discipline/program, a given rank

experience of the faculty member.

3. Procedure for approval: Department chairs are responsible for ensuring that the guidelines are developed (or amended) with the full participation of all tenure-line faculty in the department and in consultation with the appropriate College Dean. Guidelines and subsequent modifications must receive, by secret ballot, approval from a majority of the Department faculty and approval through the normal Faculty Senate process, which will include a two-reading vote on the floor of the Senate. Faculty Senate consideration shall be limited to determining whether the proposed guidelines are in line with the standards and Criteria established in this document, including academic freedom in the area of research, scholarly, and creative activities.

   Departmental guidelines are implemented in the following way.

   a. Faculty who were hired before the approval of the departmental guidelines may opt to adopt either the departmental guidelines or the university-wide criteria established in this document for their evaluation.

   b. Faculty who are hired after the approval of the departmental guidelines must be evaluated according to them.

4. Distribution of guidelines

   Department Chairs are responsible for distributing the applicable departmental guidelines by the Friday of the third week of the Fall Semester each year to faculty who may be undergoing evaluation in that year.

   For new faculty, department Chairs shall both provide a written copy of the guidelines and meet with them to discuss the content of guidelines.

Approvals

Approved by the Faculty Senate on 05-06-2025

Approved by the Provost on _____

Approved by the President on _____

History

Revised: 2016 [Date] by FAC

Revised: 2018 [Date] by FAC

Revised: 2020 [Date] by FAC

Revised: 2023 [Date] by FAC

Revised: 2025 [Date] by FAC

Renumbered 2013 from 300 to 652.4 by EC

Renumbered 2020 from 652.4 to 652.1 by FAC

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Approved by the CSUSB Faculty Senate on 05-06-2025

Signed and Dated By

Jordan Fullam (Senate Chair) — Date: 5-6-2025

Tomas Morales (President) — Date: 5/14/2025

[This is the last page of a FAM document and shall be kept in the senate office. The dates on this page must match dates on the corresponding lines of the previous page.]

Appendix 1

FACULTY ACTIVITIES REPORT

NAME: _____

FROM:_____ TO:_____

COLLEGE:_____ DEPARTMENT:_____

An Index of Attachments (Appendix 3), listing all supporting documentation, must also be submitted.

I. TEACHING

A. Teaching and Instructionally Related Assignments

1. Courses taught (indicate course number and title; for courses taught for first time or those that have changed significantly, submit copy of syllabi).
2. Other (direction of MA theses, independent studies, internships, special examinations, etc.).

B. Development of new courses and programs and/or innovative approaches to standard courses.

C. Participation in conferences and seminars on instruction; special preparation for courses and other activities.

D. Other information that will be of assistance in the evaluation of your teaching effectiveness, with specific regard to the areas of evaluation utilized (command of subject matter, organization of instructional materials, effectiveness in instruction, and academic assessment of students).

II. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, OR CREATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS (Attach supporting evidence.)

A. See Chapter 2, Section II.B.6 of the "Procedures and Criteria for Performance Review and Periodic Evaluation of Faculty" for examples of Research, Scholarly, or Creative Contributions and organize your description according to your sense of their relative importance. Be sure to include a Joint Activities Report for each joint project listed (Appendix 2).

B. Research, Scholarly, or Creative Contributions in progress. List and briefly describe Research, Scholarly, or Creative Contributions that you are currently working on, and indicate roughly how close they are to completion.

III. UNIVERSITY AND/OR COMMUNITY SERVICE (Attach supporting evidence.)

See Chapter 2, Section II.C.1 of the "Procedures and Criteria for Performance Review and Periodic Evaluation of Faculty" for examples of University and/or Community Service activities.

A. Community service.

B. Student advisement (including academic advisement and counseling).

C. Service to programs, departments, the college, the University, and the CSU system.

D. Other activities, such as performance of classroom visitations and sponsorship of student groups.

IV. OTHER INFORMATION APPROPRIATE TO THE EVALUATION CRITERIA

_____ _____

Signature Date

JOINT ACTIVITY REPORT

FACULTY MEMBER _____

ACADEMIC YEAR _____

To ensure fairness and equity in deliberations by RPT committees, a faculty member should supply a clarification of his individual contribution to each joint activity listed on his Faculty Activities Report.

Attach as many sheets as you need to your report of Faculty Activities.

A. Identify the activity by title, etc., as listed in your Faculty Activities Report.

B. Describe your activities in the preparation of this project (e.g., amount of research, degree of consultation, assembling of an exhibition, etc.).

C. Describe the amount and significance of your contribution to the product.

Appendix 3

INDEX OF ATTACHMENTS TO FACULTY ACTIVITIES REPORT

Faculty's Name: _____

Cumulative: From: _____ **To:** _____

College: _____ **Department:** _____

Attachment No.	Description

PERFORMANCE REVIEW RECOMMENDATION

DEPARTMENT CHAIR

(To be submitted on blue paper)

Faculty Name: **Date:**

Department: **College:**

Recommendations:

(Indicate rating of Above Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations, Well Below Expectations for each of the areas).

RETENTION at the rank of _____ Yes ____No____

Ratings: **Teaching _____**
Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions _____
Service _____

TENURE at the rank of_____ Yes____No____

Ratings: **Teaching _____**
Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions _____
Service _____

PROMOTION to the rank of _____ Yes____No_____

Ratings: **Teaching _____**
Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions _____
Service _____

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

State reasons for each of the above recommendation(s) under the appropriate areas of evaluation.

I. TEACHING:

A. Your evaluation of the faculty member's

1. **Command of subject matter**
2. **Effectiveness in instruction (e.g., meeting classes, providing appropriate course content, organizing instructional materials, evaluating student work).**
3. **Participation in instruction-related roles such as course development.**

B. Your evaluation of student responses to this faculty member's teaching.

C. SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR RETENTION:

SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR TENURE:

SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR PROMOTION:

In each summary, justify the rating given. Include a clear statement of that rating for this area (for example, I rate Professor xxxxx as Above Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations, Well Below Expectations in the area of Teaching for the purpose of retention/tenure/promotion for the following reasons:).

II. Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions:

A. If the terminal degree has not been granted, precisely summarize the progress made towards its completion since the last report, and what remains to be done. Identify the sources of your information.

B. Research, scholarly or creative contributions should be evaluated, not just listed. Comment on the quality and/or significance of work as much as you are able, and comment on the stature and prestige of the journal, publisher, performance, show, etc. If you are familiar with the rejection rate, mention it. Evaluate consultantships, attendance at meetings and workshops.

C. Evaluate research, scholarly or creative contributions in progress.

D. SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR RETENTION:

SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR TENURE:

SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR PROMOTION:

In each summary, justify the rating given. Include a clear statement of that rating for this area (for example, I rate Professor xxxxx as Above Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations, Well Below Expectations in the area of Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions the purpose of retention/tenure/promotion for the following reasons:).

III. UNIVERSITY AND/OR COMMUNITY SERVICE:

A. Evaluate service to the off-campus community. Keep in mind that community service "should be consistent with the teaching abilities, expertise and leadership qualities of the faculty member, and should foster an intellectual relationship with the off-campus community" (Procedures and Criteria, Chapter 2, II.C.1, page 26). Candidates should be advised to supply evidence of the quality of their service (e.g., letters). Mere membership on a committee does not indicate active participation; comment on what you know about significance of involvement.

B. Evaluate University service in advisement of students (this category includes academic advisement, and career and other forms of counseling).

C. Evaluate service to the governance of programs, departments, the college, the University, and the CSU system.

D. Evaluate other activities, such as sponsoring student groups.

E. SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR RETENTION:

SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR TENURE:

SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR PROMOTION:

In each summary, justify the rating given. Include a clear statement of that rating for this area for example, I rate Professor xxxxx as Above Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations, Well Below Expectations in the area of Service for the purpose of retention/tenure/promotion for the following reasons :).

Signature: _____

Name: _____

PERFORMANCE REVIEW RECOMMENDATION

DEPARTMENT EVALUATION COMMITTEE

(To be submitted on salmon paper)

Faculty Name: **Date:**

Department: **College:**

Recommendations:

(Indicate rating of Above Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations, Well Below Expectations the areas).

RETENTION at the rank of _____ Yes ____No____

Ratings: **Teaching _____**
Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions _____
Service _____

TENURE at the rank of_____ Yes____No____

Ratings: **Teaching _____**
Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions _____
Service _____

PROMOTION to the rank of _____ Yes____No_____

Ratings: **Teaching _____**
Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions _____
Service _____

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

State reasons for each of the above recommendation(s) under the appropriate areas of evaluation.

I. TEACHING:

A. Your evaluation of the faculty member's

1. **Command of subject matter**
2. **Effectiveness in instruction (e.g., meeting classes, providing appropriate course content, organizing instructional materials, evaluating student work).**
3. **Participation in instruction-related roles such as course development.**

B. Your evaluation of student responses to this faculty member's teaching.

C. SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR RETENTION:

SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR TENURE:

SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR PROMOTION:

In each summary, justify the rating given. Include a clear statement of that rating for this area (for example, I rate Professor xxxxx as Above Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations, Well Below Expectations, in the area of Teaching for the purpose of retention/tenure/promotion for the following reasons:).

II. Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions:

A. If the terminal degree has not been granted, precisely summarize the progress made towards its completion since the last report, and what remains to be done. Identify the sources of your information.

B. Research, scholarly or creative contributions should be evaluated, not just listed. Comment on the quality and/or significance of work as much as you are able, and comment on the stature and prestige of the journal, publisher, performance, show, etc. If you are familiar with the rejection rate, mention it. Evaluate consultantships, attendance at meetings and workshops.

C. Evaluate research, scholarly or creative contributions in progress.

D. SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR RETENTION:

SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR TENURE:

SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR PROMOTION:

In each summary, justify the rating given. Include a clear statement of that rating for this area (for example, I rate Professor xxxxx as Above Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations, Well Below Expectations, in the area of Research for the purpose of retention/tenure/promotion for the following reasons:).

III. UNIVERSITY AND/OR COMMUNITY SERVICE:

A. Evaluate service to the off-campus community. Keep in mind that community service "should be consistent with the teaching abilities, expertise and leadership qualities of the faculty member, and should foster an intellectual relationship with the off-campus community" (Procedures and Criteria, Chapter 2, II.C.1, page 26). Candidates should be advised to supply evidence of the quality of their service (e.g., letters). Mere membership on a committee does not indicate active participation; comment on what you know about significance of involvement.

B. Evaluate University service in advisement of students (this category includes academic advisement, and career and other forms of counseling).

C. Evaluate service to the governance of programs, departments, the college, the University, and the CSU system.

D. Evaluate other activities, such as sponsoring student groups.

E. SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR RETENTION:

SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR TENURE:

SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR PROMOTION:

In each summary, justify the rating given. Include a clear statement of that rating for this area (for example, I rate Professor xxxxx as Above Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations, Well Below Expectations, in the area of Service for the purpose of retention/tenure/promotion for the following reasons:).

Department Evaluation Committee

Signature:	**Name:**
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

PERFORMANCE REVIEW RECOMMENDATION

COLLEGE DEAN

(To be submitted on pink paper)

Faculty Name _____ **Date** _____

Department _____ **College** _____

Recommendations:

(Indicate rating of Above Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations, Well Below Expectations for each of the areas).

RETENTION at the rank of _____ **Yes** ____ **No** ____

Ratings: **Teaching** _____
Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions _____
Service _____

TENURE at the rank of _____ **Yes** ____ **No** ____

Ratings: **Teaching** _____
Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions _____
Service _____

PROMOTION to the rank of _____ **Yes** ____ **No** ____

Ratings: **Teaching** _____
Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions _____
Service _____

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

State reasons for each of the above recommendations under the appropriate areas of evaluation. Please include a clear statement of the rating given in each area. (For example, I rate Professor xxxxx as Above Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations, Well Below Expectations in the area of Teaching for the purpose of retention/tenure/promotion for the following reasons :).

RETENTION at the rank of _____

Teaching:

Research, Scholarly, or Creative Contributions:

Service:

TENURE at the rank of _____

Teaching:

Research, Scholarly, or Creative Contributions:

Service:

PROMOTION to the rank of _____

Teaching:

Research, Scholarly, or Creative Contributions:

Service:

Additional Comments:

Signature _____ Name _____

PERFORMANCE REVIEW RECOMMENDATION

COLLEGE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

(To be submitted on green paper)

Faculty Name _____ **Date** _____

Department _____ **College** _____

Recommendations:

(Indicate rating of Above Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations, Well Below Expectations for each of the areas).

RETENTION at the rank of _____ **Yes** ____ **No** ____

Ratings: **Teaching** _____
Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions _____
Service _____

TENURE at the rank of _____ **Yes** ____ **No** ____

Ratings: **Teaching** _____
Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions _____
Service _____

PROMOTION to the rank of _____ **Yes** ____ **No** ____

Ratings: **Teaching** _____
Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions _____
Service _____

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

State reasons for each of the above recommendations under the appropriate areas of evaluation. Please include a clear statement of the rating given in each area. (For example, I rate Professor xxxxx as Above Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations, Well Below Expectations in the area of Teaching for the purpose of retention/tenure/promotion for the following reasons :).

RETENTION at the rank of _____

Teaching:

Research, Scholarly, or Creative Contributions:

Service:

TENURE at the rank of _____

Teaching:

Research, Scholarly, or Creative Contributions:

Service:

PROMOTION to the rank of _____

Teaching:

Research, Scholarly, or Creative Contributions:

Service:

Additional Comments:

College Evaluation Committee

Signatures:	**Names:**
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

PERFORMANCE REVIEW RECOMMENDATION
UNIVERSITY EVALUATION COMMITTEE
(To be submitted on yellow paper)

Faculty Name: **Date:**

Department: **College:**

Recommendations:

(Indicate rating of Above Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations, Well Below Expectations for each of the areas).

RETENTION at the rank of _____ Yes ____No____

Ratings: **Teaching _____**
Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions _____
Service _____

TENURE at the rank of_____ Yes____No____

Ratings: **Teaching _____**
Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions _____
Service _____

PROMOTION to the rank of _____ Yes____No_____

Ratings: **Teaching _____**
Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions _____
Service _____

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

State reasons for each of the above recommendations under the appropriate areas of evaluation. Please include a clear statement of the rating given in each area. (For example, "We rate Professor xxxxx as Above Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations, Well Below Expectations in the area of Teaching for the purpose of retention/tenure/promotion for the following reasons:).

RETENTION at the rank of _____

Teaching:

Research, Scholarly, or Creative Contributions:

Service:

TENURE at the rank of _____

Teaching:

Research, Scholarly, or Creative Contributions:

Service:

PROMOTION to the rank of _____

Teaching:

Research, Scholarly, or Creative Contributions:

Service:

Additional Comments:

University Evaluation Committee

Signature:	**Name:**
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

PERIODIC EVALUATION

(Salmon for combined chair/committee recommendation)

[ ] Tenured Faculty
[ ] First, Third or Fifth Year Probationary Faculty

Faculty Name: **Date:**

Department: **College:**

Provide a summary evaluation of performance in the areas of *Teaching, Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions, and University and/or Community Service.*

Signature(s): Name(s):

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

Periodic Evaluation of Lecturers

(This is a joint report to be completed by the Chair/Director and DEC and submitted on salmon paper.)

PART 1: To be filled out by department/school office

Name: _____ **Date:** _____

Department: _____ **College:** _____

Type of Appointment: __ Term-by-term; __ Academic Year; __ Three-Year; __ Other

Time base: ____ Part-time; _____ Full-time

Period under Review: _____(Term) to _____ (Term)

PART 2: To be filled out by committee

Provide a summary evaluation of performance in the areas of

I. Teaching (Not all sections may be applicable. For example, Sections A through C may not be applicable to the evaluation of lecturers with entirely supervision assignments.)

A. Comment on Command of the Subject Matter; Course Design/Preparation, Instructional Material and Organization; Effectiveness in Instruction; and Academic Assessment of Students

B. Comment on SOTEs

C. Comment on Classroom Visitations

D. Comment on other instructional related activities

E. Other comments

II. Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions (if applicable)

III. University and/or Community Service (if applicable)

If the evaluated lecturer is eligible for either an initial or subsequent three-year appointment, the following recommendation of the performance of duties is required.

___ Satisfactory _____ Unsatisfactory

Reasons:

Signed by

_____	_____	_____
[Department Chair]	[Committee Chair]	[Committee member]
_____	_____	_____
[Committee Member]	[Committee Member]	[Committee member]

[Type here] [Type here]

CLASSROOM VISITATION REPORT

Faculty Visited: **Visitor:**

Course No. and Title:

Date of pre-visit: **Date of classroom visit:** **Date of post-visit:**

Scheduled class hours: **Duration of Visit:**

No. of students enrolled: **No. of students in class**

Depending upon the format of the class in regard to asynchronous and synchronous learning, this may not be applicable to the evaluation.

1. Using the information obtained at the pre-visit conference, describe and evaluate the instructor's plan for this course. Comment on the syllabus, handouts, assigned text(s) and readings as well as the instructor's statements about this course. Describe and evaluate the assessment procedures used by the instructor for this course. Attach sample examinations or other assessment procedures from this or similar courses taught by this instructor.

2. Using the information obtained at the pre-visit conference, describe and evaluate the plan for the class session to be visited including objectives, content and organization.

3. Describe the activities observed in the class visited and evaluate instructor's (1) command of the subject matter, (2) methods of communications used, (3) appropriateness of the level of class content, (4) organization of the material presented, (5) sequence of the class activities, (6) interactions between the instructor and the students, (7) evidence of learning taking place, and (8) innovation in teaching. Address elements one through seven, and eight as appropriate, in your evaluation, one by one or incorporated in paragraph form.

[If the course is taught via online technologies (including hybrid courses), all of the above activities can be accomplished by reviewing the course website, the course discussion boards and/or online chat logs.]

4. Other comments.

Visitor's signature Visitor's Department Date

_____ _____ _____

I have read this report and know that I may submit a response or rebuttal to the school office.

Visitee's Signature Date

_____ _____

SOTE Overview

1) SOTE is a process with three components:

   a) **Evaluation** (Form A): SOTE provides a means to obtain student opinions on faculty teaching. It is used as part of an evaluation of a faculty member's teaching during periodic and performance reviews.

   b) **Faculty Comment** (Form B): It allows for faculty to comment on aspect(s) of the class that might influence the student responses.

   c) **Teaching Improvement** (Form C): It provides a process by which faculty can ask students specific questions about aspects of their teaching. It is designed to be a supplement to the evaluative questions of Form A (Questions 4 and 5), and to help to improve teaching by obtaining more specific student information.

2) Faculty will be able to see the SOTE report the written student responses on their computers.

3) SOTE applies to both regular and online courses.

For a full description of the SOTE process, please see *FAM 320: POLICY ON THE ADMINISTRATION, PROCESSING, AND USE OF STUDENT OPINIONS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS (SOTE)*

Appendix 10B

Class Climate	STUDENT OPINION OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS	☐ v1v1d

California State University San Bernardino — Professor's Name

SOTE Evaluation Form (FORM A) — Course Information

Mark like shown: ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ "X" fully inside box.

Correction: ☐ ■ ☐ ☒ ☐ To correct, black out the wrong box and "X" fully inside the correct box.

Student's Opinion

1. Rate your interest in the subject matter of this course before you took the class.

☐ Very High ☐ High ☐ Moderately High
☐ Moderately Low ☐ Low ☐ Very Low

2. How many class sessions did you attend?

☐ All ☐ Almost all ☐ More than half
☐ Less than half

3. Why did you take this course? Choose all that apply.

☐ The course fulfills a general education requirement.
☐ The course fulfills a requirement in my major.
☐ I have enjoyed the professor's class(es) in the past.
☐ The course will improve job/ career opportuniites.
☐ The class sounded interesting to me.

Other (Please specify):

RATING SCALE: 6 = Excellent, 5 = Very Good, 4 = Good, 3 = Fair, 2 = Poor, 1 = Unsatisfactory

4. How would you rate the overall quality of instruction in this course? 6 ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 1

Please provide reasons why you gave the above rating for the overall quality of instruction in this course.

Turn Over ---------->>

Student's Opinion [Continue]

RATING SCALE: 6 = Excellent, 5 = Very Good, 4 = Good, 3 = Fair, 2 = Poor, 1 = Unsatisfactory

5. How would you rate your professor's specific contributions to your learning in this course? 6 ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 1

Please provide reasons why you gave the above rating for your professor's specific contributions to your learning in this course.

FORM B

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO

Faculty Supplemental Comment Form

5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA 92407-2397

Class Description

Call Number

Filling out this form is optional. This form should only be completed in the event of an unusual circumstance(s) that you believe may influence the Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) responses in this class. **The faculty member must submit the completed form to Academic Personnel no later than the last scheduled class session of the quarter being SOTE'd. No forms will be accepted after that date.**

To Faculty: Using the space below, please describe the unusual circumstance(s) that you believe may influence the SOTE responses in this class.

TIMETABLE FOR PERIODIC EVALUATION AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY - 2026-27 AY

APPENDIX 11

	Call for FAR	FAR Due	File Access*	Chair/Dept Comm. Eval Due	College Dean/College Eval Comm. Due	University Evaluation Committee Due	VP/Provost Decision Due
Tenured Faculty (Periodic Eval)	**Oct. 1**	**Jan. 25**	**Feb. 1**	**Mar. 15**	**Apr. 19**	N/A	N/A
2nd Yr. Probationary Faculty (Perf. Rev. - Ret. Only)	May 5	Sep. 8	Sept. 15	Oct. 19	Dec. 7	Feb. 1	Feb. 15 (CBA 13.12)
4th Year Probationary Faculty (Perf. Rev. - Ret. Only)	May 5	Sept. 15	Sept. 21	Nov. 9	Feb. 8	March 8	March 22
3rd, 4th & 5th Yr. Prob. Faculty Applying for Early Tenure/Promotion (Performance Review)	Sept. 9	Oct. 5	Oct. 12	Nov. 30	Feb. 22	April 5	**May 11 no later than June 1 for Tenure (CBA 13.18) ***May 18 no later than June 15 for Promotion (CBA 14.9)
6th Year Faculty Eligible for Tenure & Promotion (Performance Review)	Sept. 9	Oct. 5	Oct. 12	Nov. 30	Feb. 22	April 5	**May 11 no later than June 1 for Tenure (CBA 13.18) ***May 18 no later than June 15 for Promotion (CBA 14.9)
Tenured Faculty Applying for Promotion (Performance Review)	Sept. 9	Oct. 5	Oct. 12	Nov. 30	Feb. 22	April 5	**May 11 no later than June 1 for Tenure (CBA 13.18) ***May 18 no later than June 15 for Promotion (CBA 14.9)
1st, 3rd & 5th Year Prob. Faculty (Periodic Evaluation)	Dec. 1	Feb 22	Mar. 2	Apr 13	N/A	N/A	N/A

Faculty members who plan to apply for Promotion, Early Promotion or Early Tenure should notify Faculty Affairs by September 1st.

* This date shall serve as the specific deadline date at which time the Working Personnel Action File is declared complete per CBA 15.12b

** The President shall officially notify the probationary faculty unit employee of the final decision on the award or denial of tenure no later than June 1. per CBA 13.18

*** The President shall notify the faculty unit employee in writing of the final decision on the promotion no later than June 15. per CBA 14.9

Evaluation Rebuttal Timeline per CBA 15.5: A faculty member may submit a response/rebuttal in writing and/or request a meeting to discuss the recommendation within (10) days after receiving the recommendation.

Per CBA 15.46: Failure to meet deadlines will result in the file being moved to the next level without unsubmitted materials/recommendations. Such materials will not be part of the current evaluation cycle.

Revised: 3/6/2026 (rt)

APPENDIX 12

Timetable for Periodic Evaluation of Lecturers - 2026-27 AY

	Call for FAR (If applicable)	FAR Due (If applicable)	File Access**	Chair/Dept Comm. Eval Due	College Dean/College Eval Comm. Due
	Department/ college notifies faculty who are scheduled to be reviewed				
All Lecturers with a 1 yr. apt.	Jan. 19	Feb. 8	Feb. 10	Mar. 22	N/A
All Lecturers eligible for an initial 3 year apt OR a subsequent 3 year apt	Jan. 19	Feb. 8	Feb. 10	Mar. 22	Apr. 27
All other Lecturers If applicable*	**Department/ college notifies faculty who are scheduled to be reviewed**	**(If applicable)**			
All Lecturers	Jan. 19	Feb. 8	Feb. 10	Mar. 22	N/A

** This date shall serve as the specific deadline date at which time the Working Personnel Action File is declared complete per CBA 15.12b

* A lecturer with a one semester appointment will be evaluated at the discretion of the department chair, appropriate administrator or equivalent. (CBA 15.25)

* A lecturer with a one year appointment will be evaluated in accordance with the periodic evaluation process. (CBA 15.24)

* A lecturer with a three year appointment will be evaluated in the third year of the appointment (CBA 15.29)

* A lecturer eligible for a three year appointment will be evaluated in the academic year preceding the issuance of the three year appointment. (CBA 15.28)

Evaluation Rebuttal Timeline per CBA 15.5: A faculty member may submit a response/rebuttal in writing and/or request a meeting to discuss the recommendation within (10) days after receiving the recommendation.

Revised: 3/7/26 (rt)

Schedule of Classroom Visitations (CV) and Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE)

	Fall	Spring
Full – Time Lecturers	SOTE/ CV	SOTE
1st year probationary	SOTE (All classes-unofficial) CV (1,2)	SOTE (1,2) CV (3, 4)
2nd year probationary	SOTE (3)	SOTE (4,5) CV (5, 6)
3rd year probationary	SOTE (6,7) CV (7)	SOTE (8,9)
4th year probationary	SOTE (10) CV (8)	SOTE (11,12)
5th year probationary	SOTE (13,14)	SOTE (15) CV (9)
6th year probationary	SOTE (16) (CV 10)	SOTE (17)
Applying for Promotion to Professor	CV	
Applying for Early Tenure and/or Early Promotion	CV	
All other Tenured Faculty	Courses to be SOTE'D Annually	

For tenure-line faculty, visitors and the course to be visited shall be selected jointly by the College Evaluation Committee and the College Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair. (FAM 652.1)

Visitations for faculty in their first two probationary years shall be conducted by two tenured faculty of equal or higher rank and from disciplines as close as possible to that of the visited faculty. (FAM 652.1)

For lecturers, visitors and the course to be visited shall be selected jointly by the Department Evaluation committee or the Department Lecturer Evaluation Committee (See FAM 652.2) and the Department Chair.