

"Mini Review" Instructions

Purpose of Review

The primary purpose of the periodic evaluation or "mini review" is to provide probationary faculty with an annual assessment of the progress they have made toward earning tenure and promotion. These reviews are formative, providing the probationary faculty with review of the 3 categories of achievement in University Policy [S15-8](#), so as to encourage professional growth that will merit the award of tenure, and advancement in rank if applicable, by the end of the probationary period.

Who Is Evaluated During Probationary Faculty Periodic Evaluations?

All probationary faculty who have not undergone a performance review (retention, tenure, promotion) during the fall semester of the current academic year, shall undergo mini review unless they are first year spring new hires, are on leave, or are in the extended year of a presidentially approved extension of the probationary period.

Required Documents Reviewed in eFaculty

While required documents will be submitted in the faculty dossier (in "Faculty 180") in eFaculty, they will be reviewed in "Review, Promotion and Tenure" section of eFaculty. Review levels include an elected (see [S15-7](#)) department personnel committee, department chair (if not on the committee), and college dean, or their equivalents. Reviewers submit their evaluation within eFaculty by completing the Mini Review Evaluation Form. The evaluations are placed in the Personnel Action File (PAF).

All materials voluntarily archived in eFaculty for the period of review will be available to reviewers. However, only the following items are required of the candidate [eFaculty Activities tab in brackets]:

- Annual Summary of Achievements - Probationary [Review: Periodic Evaluation of Probationary Faculty - Mini Review]
- All prior Periodic Evaluations and Performance Reviews* [Prior Evaluations and Reviews]
- Current CV [Curriculum Vitae (CV)]
- All SOTE/SOLATEs for the period of review [Automatically uploaded to Classes Taught at SJSU and/or Additional Student Evaluations]
- All Direct Observations of Teaching (or equivalent) for the period of review [Direct Observations of Teaching]

Here are some helpful guides to using eFaculty:

- [Logging into eFaculty](#)
- [Adding to the "Activities" page in Faculty180](#)
- [Finding, adding, and removing SOTES/SOLATEs](#)
- [What Goes Where? Preparing Materials in eFaculty](#)

Candidates in Mini Review are not required to upload supporting material to eFaculty. On the other hand, material outside the scope of the review period may appear among their dossier materials. University Policy allows reviewers to focus only on the ASA and the other four required items above, but it encourages comprehensive review and feedback. Supporting material may facilitate seeing the bigger picture in the pursuit of advancement. While the period of review is the time since your appointment, last mini review, or retention review, eFaculty will display to reviewers all items during the time since your appointment or probationary service start date (including service credit years).

Pursuant to Article 15.12 a. of the CSU/CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), faculty members subject to review "shall be responsible for the identification of materials [they] wish to be considered, as well as materials required by campus policy, and for the submission of such materials as may be accessible to [them]." ***The failure to submit required documentation or otherwise cooperate in the evaluation process may be taken into consideration in the faculty member's evaluation.*** Once submitted, items in eFaculty are designated as the **Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)**.

Formative Evaluation

Reviewers shall focus on supporting the candidate's overall goal of attaining tenure and/or promotion. Therefore, they shall be critical and identify specific strengths and weaknesses as appropriate to encourage progress.

Reviewers shall provide detailed feedback to the faculty member in each category of achievement, 1) academic assignment—teaching for most, 2) service, and 3) research, scholarship, and creative activities, for accomplishments during the period of review. Reviewers may also provide holistic, developmental, and other feedback (in section 4 of the evaluation form).

University Policy allows reviewers to focus only on the ASA and other required items (see above). However, it is in the best interest of the candidate for reviewers to explore other evidence of achievement provided in the tabs in eFaculty so as to provide higher quality feedback on achievements during the period of review and make recommendations for improvement. Documentation from outside the period of review may help inform recommendations, but they are not subject to evaluation.

Periodic evaluations do *not* include voting on or stating levels of achievement (i.e. unsatisfactory, baseline, good, or excellent), or result in recommendations for retention, tenure, or promotion. However, if evaluators are concerned about progress to date, they may recommend that a candidate undergo a performance review (retention review) the following year.

Evaluation Process

Reviewers shall provide their detailed feedback on the form titled, Mini Review Evaluation form, in eFaculty. They should complete and submit the form within eFaculty. At the department committee step, only the chair ("manager" in eFaculty) may submit the form on behalf of the committee.

Department Level

A Department **committee** of tenured faculty **elected** by the probationary and tenured faculty conducts a formative evaluation as described above. If the Department Chair is *not* part of the committee, the Chair may submit a separate formative evaluation.

Statements are written on the Mini Review Evaluation Form and uploaded within eFaculty. Feedback is given on the three areas of achievement. Holistic feedback is allowed in the final section (section 4) of the form. Recommendations for special performance review shall be made in the final section. In committee, such a recommendation requires that a vote be reported with the recommendation.

Upon submission, the form(s) is shared with the faculty member. Within ten calendar days of the department level evaluation, the faculty member may submit a response/rebuttal to the Department's evaluation(s). After ten days, the WPAF, Department level evaluation(s), and any response/rebuttal shall be forwarded to the Dean's office for review.

College Level

All "mini review" faculty are also evaluated by the appropriate administrator (the dean or designated administrator). The administrator reviews all materials in the WPAF as described above, department level evaluation(s), and any response/rebuttal to the department level evaluation(s)

In eFaculty, the college administrator also submits a Mini Review Evaluation Form. Upon submission, a copy is provided to the faculty member and the department. Within ten calendar days, the faculty member may then respond to and/or rebut the evaluation. The ASA, evaluations, and optional responses become part of the faculty member's PAF.

Where to Get Help

UP – FS will always be available to assist in any way we can to solve problems, or find workarounds for ensuring a complete, fair, and helpful evaluation of the probationary faculty.

If you have questions or concerns about the processes and procedures, please contact our RTP Analyst, Anthony Hilton, anthony.hilton@sjsu.edu or 4-3235. If you have questions about policies or regulations governing periodic evaluations, please contact Senior Director of Faculty Services, James Lee, james.lee@sjsu.edu or 4-5866.

***What Constitutes Prior Periodic Evaluations and Performance Reviews?**

Prior evaluations are a compilation of front matter from all prior evaluations and performance reviews organized in reverse chronological order.

Prior mini review, upload these 3 components from prior evaluations:

1. Academic Year Summary of Achievements - Probationary
2. Periodic evaluations (committee, chair, dean reviews)
3. Candidate optional responses or rebuttals (if any)

Prior retention review, upload these 8 components from the review(s):

1. President's (or Provost's) Decision letter
2. All evaluations/recommendations, both **administrative** (Provost, Dean, Chair, etc.) and **committee** (URTP, college, department, etc.)
3. Candidate Optional Responses or rebuttals (if any)
4. Chair's Description of Academic Assignment
5. Approved RTP guidelines in effect at the time (if any)
6. CV at the time of review
7. Dossier Index (with appended late add list, if any)
8. Candidate's Narrative Statement