

1 **SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Professional Standards Committee**
4 **April 6, 2015**
5 **First Reading**

AS 1561

6
7
8 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION:**
9 **APPOINTMENT, RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION**
10 **CRITERIA, STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES**
11 **FOR REGULAR FACULTY EMPLOYEES**
12 **Rescinds S98-8**

13
14 Resolved: That S98-8 be rescinded and replaced with the following policy according
15 to the following time schedule and conditions:

16
17 1. Implementation of Retention and Procedures:

18 The attached policy, sections 1 (Principles), 5 (Developmental Reviews and
19 Standards for Retention), 6 (Standards and Procedures for Appointment), 7
20 (Procedures for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion), and 8 (The Dossier) will
21 become effective for AY 2016/17 except as indicated below.
22

23
24 2. Implementation of Criteria and Standards

- 25 a) In this discussion the attached policy sections 2 (Categories of
26 Achievement), 3 (Evaluation of Achievements), and 4 (Standards for
27 Tenure and Promotion) will be referred to as the Criteria and
28 Standards of the new policy.
29
- 30 b) In this discussion sections of S98-8 II (Criteria) V.B (Standards for
31 Tenure), and VI.B (Standards for Promotion) will be referred to as the
32 Criteria and Standards of the old policy—excluding the sections on
33 retention.
34
- 35 c) The Criteria and Standards for the New Policy will be effective for all
36 tenure/tenure track faculty appointed for AY 2016/17 and subsequently.
37
- 38 d) The Criteria and Standards for the New Policy will be effective for all
39 tenure/tenure track faculty regardless of appointment date beginning in
40 AY 2020/21 (after five years).
41
- 42 e) During a transition, tenure/tenure track faculty appointed before AY
43 2016/17 shall have the choice to be evaluated using the criteria and
44 standards of the old policy or the new policy. Faculty who choose to
45 be evaluated under the new policy may not subsequently return to be
46 evaluated by the criteria and standards of the old. Their decision must
47 be made prior to the faculty member's next performance review and be
48 included as a statement in the beginning of the Working Personnel
49

50 Action File (i.e. the dossier) for all performance reviews during the
51 transition period.

52
53 f) The Office of Faculty Affairs will devise a method by which the
54 personnel committees and other reviewing bodies may readily
55 distinguish between candidates being evaluated under S98-8 and the
56 attached policy (e.g. different color binders).

57
58 g) Resolution of discrepancies during the transition. The choice between
59 the old and new criteria and standards applies to those sections of
60 policy explicitly identified above, but also to any other sections of policy
61 scattered elsewhere in the overall policy that clearly reference criteria
62 and standards. If there is ambiguity about whether the old or the new
63 sections apply, the AVP for Faculty Affairs shall define which applies.

64
65 3. Implementation of electronic dossiers. The AVP for Faculty Affairs, in
66 consultation with the Professional Standards Committee, shall determine a
67 timeline for the conversion to electronic dossiers as required in section 8.5, but
68 the conversion shall be completed no later (and preferably earlier) than the end
69 of the phase-in period noted above (AY 2020-21.)

70
71 Resolved: That for AY 2015/16 the Professional Standards Committee shall devote
72 itself exclusively to educating the campus in the use of the new policy; any
73 pressing policy items within its purview shall be temporarily diverted to the
74 Executive Committee; be it further

75
76 Resolved: That this policy shall be given a thorough review by the Professional
77 Standards Committee at least once during each six year cycle; meaning
78 no later than AY 2021-2022.

79
80 *Rationale: Prior to 1998, SJSU's ARTP policy was regularly revised every few years*
81 *in response to changes in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, to*
82 *problems encountered in implementation of the policy, and to changes in*
83 *expectations and working conditions over time. In 2006 a major redraft of*
84 *this policy was produced after 6 years of work, but it was never signed into*
85 *effect. The Senate temporarily lost interest after the failed effort, but it*
86 *became increasingly clear that the existing policy was accumulating*
87 *problems and inconsistencies with every passing year.*

88
89 *In AY 2012-13 the Professional Standards Committee decided to tackle*
90 *the problem. In 2012-13 the Committee gathered information about the*
91 *way the existing policy was working. We interviewed members of*
92 *numerous RTP committees, interviewed the Provost, and distributed a*
93 *campus-wide survey to t/tt faculty. What we discovered was troubling.*
94 *Hundreds of responses from faculty at different stages of their careers*
95 *reported concerns that the old policy lacked sufficient flexibility in choices*
96 *related to professional development, that the criteria for tenure and*
97 *promotion were often unclear, and that the procedures used in*
98 *implementing the process were sometimes unfair.*

99
100 *In AY 2013-14 the committee spent the first half of the year exploring*
101 *alternative policies, surveying both within and outside the CSU. Ultimately*
102 *we proposed that the new policy be designed around three criteria*
103 *corresponding to the most commonly accepted traditional divisions of*
104 *faculty development: Academic Assignment (teaching for most but not all*
105 *faculty), Scholarly/Artistic/Professional achievement, and Service.*
106 *Furthermore, we proposed that faculty should receive an evaluation of*

107 *their achievements in each of these three categories, with their tenure or*
108 *promotion dependent upon their overall level of achievement accumulated*
109 *across all three areas. This plan was endorsed by the Senate in SS-F13-*
110 *8, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Endorsing a Proposal to Reform the*
111 *SJSU Policy on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion by Adopting the*
112 *“Flexible Achievement” Plan.”*

113
114 *Armed with the Senate’s support for our general approach, the committee*
115 *began the long task of rewriting the policy. The debate over SS-F13-8,*
116 *however, did expose one significant concern. In dividing the evaluation of*
117 *faculty into three categories some feared that faculty who embraced*
118 *synergistic practices (that cut across the categories) might be placed at a*
119 *disadvantage. In response to this concern, the committee has redrafted*
120 *language that emphasizes the value of such synergies. For example, truly*
121 *synergistic practices should enhance the evaluation of all related*
122 *categories and not simply one or the other. We believe that this solution*
123 *will encourage faculty who use students to conduct research, or whose*
124 *scholarship informs their service, or whose service relates to teaching, etc.*

125
126 *In AY 2014-15 the committee has spent the year working on revised*
127 *language, section by section and at times word by word. Even a simple*
128 *paragraph may have received an hour or two of debate in committee, as*
129 *we examined conflicts with the current Collective Bargaining Agreement*
130 *and considered the numerous problems identified with the old policy in*
131 *recent years. The committee is not finished, and if truth be told—the*
132 *ARTP Policy needs far more regular oversight than it has received over*
133 *the past 17 years. The current draft is a major step forward to address*
134 *those original concerns expressed to us about transparency, fairness, and*
135 *flexibility while maintaining high standards for all phases of Appointment,*
136 *Retention, Tenure, and Promotion, but Professional Standards intends to*
137 *continue to monitor and update the policy regularly as was the practice*
138 *prior to 1998.*

139
140 *Approved: (March 16-28, email vote after March 16 discussion, 2015)*

141
142 *Vote: (9-1-0)*

143
144 *Present: (Peter, Green, Lee, Mathur, Fatoohi, Fujimoto, Riley, White, Dresser, Romero)*

145
146 *Absent: ()*

147
148 *Financial Impact: Few direct impacts beyond the existing ARTP processes.*

149
150 *Workload Impact: Considerable education will be required to train both faculty*
151 *committees and administrative evaluators in the application of the new policy.*

152 APPOINTMENT, RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION
153 CRITERIA, STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR
154 REGULAR FACULTY EMPLOYEES

155

156 1.0 Principles: The present document is the policy of San Jose State University
157 concerning the appointment, retention, tenure, and promotion for all regular or
158 tenure-track Unit 3 faculty in the university specified. When making
159 recommendations on faculty personnel matters, committees and administrators
160 should use common sense and flexibility in applying standards and criteria,
161 keeping this policy's principles firmly in mind.

162 1.1 Flexibility in Professional Development:

163 It is important to note that all faculty -- even all faculty in the same
164 department -- need not conform to the same model for professional
165 development. San Jose State University seeks diversity within its faculty
166 and in the ways individual faculty members seek to be effective in
167 furthering the mission of the university. It should be recognized that faculty
168 who are outstanding in one area but less active or successful in other
169 areas may well be contributing more to the university than someone who
170 is adequate in all areas but outstanding in none.

171 1.2 Fair Process of Evaluation by Peers:

172 The purpose of these procedures for recruitment, retention, tenure and
173 promotion is to provide just recognition and encouragement of genuine
174 achievement. The basic evaluation of faculty members' potential,
175 performance and achievement should be made by their peers both within
176 their departments and their disciplines at large. Candidates deserve to
177 know the standards by which they will be evaluated so that they may plan
178 their professional development accordingly. Therefore, committees and
179 administrators must take great care to apply the standards written in policy
180 rather than their own personal standards, which may differ.

181 1.3 Clear Standards for Advancement

182 1.3.1 Excellence in education is dependent above all upon the quality of
183 the faculty. San Jose State University seeks to retain, tenure, and
184 promote faculty who have achieved distinction in teaching, service,
185 and in their disciplines or professional communities. This process
186 of professional development requires thorough and candid
187 evaluation for the sake of encouraging and recognizing
188 achievement.

189 1.3.2 Positive faculty development depends upon a clear understanding

190 of the standards for advancement. Standards for retention, tenure
191 and promotion must be clear and available to faculty members
192 throughout their period of review.

193 1.4 Integration of Professional Development and Holistic Evaluation.

194 1.4.1 Categories of Achievement are devices that should prompt
195 evaluators to consider all dimensions of a candidate's professional
196 development. The categories should promote a holistic evaluation
197 of the effectiveness of a faculty member in serving the mission of
198 San Jose State University, and reviewers should apply this policy
199 with a holistic temperament.

200 1.4.2 San Jose State encourages faculty to integrate the various
201 components of their academic career when the outcome enhances
202 student success.^[Ken1]

203 1.5 Definitions

204 1.5.1 This document pertains to all regular tenure track/tenured faculty of
205 the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement. This includes
206 Professors, Librarians, and Counselors. When the document uses
207 the term Professor, or Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor it
208 applies to the equivalent titles in the other professions, such as
209 Counselor, Associate Counselor, Assistant Counselor or Librarian,
210 Associate Librarian, or Assistant Librarian.^[Ken2]

211 1.5.2 When this document refers to colleges it means those colleges that
212 administer departments which are home to Unit 3 tenure/tenure
213 track faculty. This excludes the College of International and
214 Extended Studies.^[Ken3]

215 2.0 Categories of Achievement:

216 2.1 Relationship of the Categories. There are three basic categories of
217 achievement, each of which warrants a careful evaluation. However,
218 these categories are not mutually exclusive. Achievements that address
219 criteria found in more than one category will be credited in more than one
220 category. For example, the use of students in faculty research should be
221 considered both an achievement under Academic Assignment when it
222 enhances student success, and it also should be considered an
223 achievement under Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement when it
224 reflects a contribution to the discipline—and could therefore enhance a
225 candidate's evaluation in two categories. ^[Ken4]

226 2.2 Effectiveness in Academic Assignment

227 2.2.1 Academic Assignment is the specific role given to a faculty member

228 to support the educational mission of San Jose State University.
229 Academic Assignment is the primary, but not the only,
230 consideration in evaluating a faculty member's performance and is
231 the essential condition for continuation and advancement within the
232 university. For most faculty, academic assignment consists
233 primarily of teaching. For some faculty, such as department
234 chairpersons, coordinators, counselors, librarians and field
235 supervisors, part or all of their academic assignment is of a non-
236 teaching nature, and they should be evaluated accordingly. [Ken5]

237 2.2.2 When evaluating effectiveness in teaching, chairs, committees, and
238 administrators are required to conduct a holistic evaluation. The
239 teaching must be considered in the context of its purpose, its
240 objectives, and the degree of difficulty of the assignment.
241 Evaluators must be well versed in the University policy F12-6
242 "Evaluation of Effectiveness in Teaching" and consider all available
243 sources of information. [Ken6]

244 2.2.3 A holistic and contextualized evaluation of teaching requires
245 attention to many factors, and must never rely solely on student
246 opinion surveys. Evidence of teaching effectiveness shall include
247 for the period under review, a list of courses taught, copies of
248 syllabi from all courses recently taught, peer evaluations and the
249 appropriate results of surveys of student opinion as required by the
250 current university policy on teaching evaluation (F12-6). [Ken7]

251 2.2.4 Evidence of teaching effectiveness may also include statements of
252 course objectives, selected course materials, signed letters from
253 colleagues and from present or former students, and evidence of
254 student learning. Faculty shall include in their opening narrative a
255 discussion of their teaching philosophy and their strategies for
256 achieving student learning that references specific examples and
257 evidence contained later in the dossier. [Ken8]

258 2.2.5 Evaluators should fully consider the contributions made by faculty
259 who create new curricula or extensive new course materials, who
260 engage in team-teaching, who use interdisciplinary approaches, or
261 who experiment with new pedagogical or technological approaches.
262 Contributions to general education and service learning should also
263 be considered. Candidates are encouraged to submit
264 documentation of the value of their contributions to the
265 advancement of teaching and learning. [Ken9]

266 2.2.6 Evaluators should fully consider the contributions made by faculty
267 who supervise graduate and undergraduate student research, who
268 professionally mentor students, or who train and supervise teaching
269 and graduate assistants. Faculty are encouraged to submit

270 evidence of student success in postgraduate activities (professional
271 schools, research, graduate programs, job performance.)^[Ken10]

272 2.2.7 For non-teaching Unit 3 faculty employees, effectiveness in
273 academic assignment will be evaluated in conformity with
274 guidelines developed by the unit of assignment, with appropriate
275 components of peer evaluation and evaluation of impact on
276 students.

277 2.3 Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement

278 2.3.1 The second basic category for evaluation is
279 scholarly/artistic/professional achievement. Such contributions to a
280 faculty member's discipline or professional community are expected
281 for continuation and advancement in the university.

282 2.3.1.1 The nature of the expected contributions will vary
283 according to the discipline, and may be more specifically
284 defined in each department's guidelines. These
285 expectations may also address the extent and nature of
286 the documentation that is appropriate.

287 2.3.1.2 The nature of contributions will also vary according to the
288 faculty member's professional interests.
289 Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievements may include
290 original research that advances knowledge; or the
291 synthesis of information across disciplines, topics, or
292 time; or the application of disciplinary expertise within or
293 without the University; or the systematic study of teaching
294 and learning within the discipline; or a combination of
295 these forms of achievement. ^[Ken11]

296 2.3.1.3 Regardless of the form an achievement takes, it must be
297 documented and evaluated and not merely enumerated
298 to be properly used in faculty personnel decisions.

299 2.3.1.4 Evaluation must be made by disciplinary peers.
300 Acceptance of scholarly or artistic work by an editorial or
301 review board (or jury) constitutes an evaluation of that
302 work. Departments that develop guidelines should
303 specify more precisely the types of evaluation
304 appropriate for their disciplines. ^[Ken12] When appropriate,
305 professional contributions should be evaluated by
306 professional persons in a position to assess the quality
307 and significance of the contributions. Candidates may
308 request that disciplinary experts provide evaluations of
309 any of their work to be included in the dossier. External

310 reviewers should not have personal or professional
311 relationships with the candidate that could compromise
312 their objectivity. [Ken13]

313 2.3.1.5 In cases where there is no external evaluation of an
314 achievement provided, the evaluation will be made by the
315 judgment of peers as constituted on the department
316 personnel committee. When operating as the primary
317 level of review of a work, the department personnel
318 committee will read/view/experience the work prior to
319 deliberating on the level of achievement which it
320 represents. [Ken14]

321 2.3.1.6 Work in progress and unpublished work should be
322 assessed whenever possible.

323 2.3.2 Scholarly achievement includes, but is not limited to, books,
324 articles, reviews, technical reports, computer software, application
325 for and/or awards of grants, or papers read to scholarly
326 associations -- in general, work based on research and entailing
327 theory, analysis, interpretation, explanation, or demonstration. |
328 [Ken15]

329 2.3.3 Artistic achievement includes, but is not limited to, the creation of
330 original work in poetry, fiction, drama, dance, the aural and visual
331 arts; or performances or direction in music, theatre and dance
332 requiring interpretation and the mastery of a skill in addition to
333 research. [Ken16]

334 2.3.4 Professional achievements involve the application of disciplinary
335 expertise whether within or without the University.

336 2.3.4.1 Professional achievement may include patented
337 inventions or discoveries; consulting; service on editorial
338 boards or as editor of a professional journal or
339 newsletter; adjudicator, translator or reviewer for
340 publishers or other agencies and associations; public
341 lectures; honors and awards. [Ken17]

342 2.3.4.2 Professional achievement may also include active
343 participation or leadership in disciplinary or professional
344 associations; organizing panels, activities or workshops;
345 serving in accreditation or other discipline-based review
346 capacities. [Ken18]

347 2.3.4.3 Forms of service that are related to the faculty member's
348 discipline and require the application of the faculty
349 member's professional knowledge or skills shall be

350 recognized as professional achievements. This may
351 include service to K-14 educational segments;
352 professional involvement with other groups and
353 institutions related to the institutional mission of a
354 "metropolitan" university; active participation or
355 leadership in the CSU; and in some cases service to
356 other associations and to the community, state, nation, or
357 international community in a capacity that requires
358 disciplinary expertise.^[Ken19]

359 2.3.5 Consideration in applying the criteria for
360 Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement

361 2.3.5.1 Quality of publications and not simply enumeration.
362 Normally, the number or length of publications per se
363 shall not be a criterion for tenure or promotion, but shall
364 be considered along with the quality and significance of
365 the work in determining the level of achievement.
366 Department guidelines may be more specific about the
367 nature, venue, prestige, number, or impact of
368 publications at levels higher than "baseline."^[Ken20]

369 2.3.5.2 Research Grants. In recognition of the comprehensive
370 mission of San Jose State University and the teaching
371 load of its faculty, these criteria exclude any requirement
372 that faculty members must obtain external support as a
373 condition for tenure or advancement except as provided
374 below. However, all faculty who do seek and/or obtain
375 external funding should be appropriately credited as per
376 2.3.2. Department guidelines may establish standards
377 for judging the level of achievement represented by the
378 efforts to seek and/or obtain external funding.

379 ^[Ken21]An explicit requirement that faculty must obtain
380 external support is permitted when the appointment letter
381 designates that grant writing and/or fundraising will
382 constitute the primary academic assignment of the
383 position rather than teaching (e.g. the director of a
384 research center, or gallery). Assistant Professors are
385 excluded from being appointed with this requirement.
386 Those so appointed must be provided the appropriate
387 assigned time and resources to support a focus on the
388 pursuit of external funding. Work done under such
389 circumstances must be evaluated.^[Ken22]

390 2.3.5.3 The Scholarship of Teaching. Noting the particular
391 requirements for curricular development in a period of
392 changing pedagogies, expanded scholarship about

393 effective teaching, and students from increasingly varied
394 and diverse backgrounds, scholarship that focuses on
395 teaching and learning within a candidate's discipline, and
396 which appears in peer reviewed publications, is explicitly
397 allowed and encouraged as an achievement in the
398 category of Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement.

399
400 2.3.5.4 Student participation in faculty research. Faculty who
401 supervise student research or who provide opportunities
402 for students to participate in faculty research may in
403 some circumstances use these activities to demonstrate
404 Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement. When
405 faculty guide students to produce significant
406 achievements linked to the faculty's own
407 scholarly/artistic/professional work, then evaluators
408 should consider the student achievements as
409 strengthening the faculty member's own level of
410 achievement. Evaluators must judge the significance of
411 the accomplishments and the level of support provided
412 by the faculty member before determining how to weigh
413 the significance of student research for the faculty
414 member's level of achievement.

415 2.4 Service

416 2.4.1 The third basic category for evaluation is service to the department
417 (or equivalent), college (or equivalent), university and community.
418 All faculty have an obligation to contribute to the governance of the
419 institution and to enhance the surrounding community. Not all
420 faculty, however, need contribute to the same degree, so it is the
421 responsibility of evaluators to determine the level of achievement
422 represented by a candidate's profile of service. [Ken23]

423 2.4.2 Types of Service

424 Service may include activities which support the mission of the
425 university and student success that are not defined in the primary
426 academic assignment. For example, service could be construed as
427 participation in the Academic Senate and its committees, search
428 and review committees, leadership in the California Faculty
429 Association, membership in the Academic Senate of the CSU, work
430 on system-wide committees and task forces, and administrative
431 activities (to the extent that such assignments are not the primary
432 academic assignment), participation in campus organizations of
433 benefit to faculty or students, and participation in public interest
434 groups sponsored by or affiliated with the University. [Ken24]

435 2.4.3 Significant service should be systematically evaluated and

436 documented. Election to a position is a form of evaluation. Faculty
437 should also request written evaluation of significant service from
438 persons in a position to know the extent and quality of their
439 contributions, such as the chair of a committee. [Ken25]

440 2.4.4 Considerations for Applying the Criteria for Service

441 2.4.4.1 Service expectations increase with rank. Service will
442 always include some activities to support the operations
443 of a department (or equivalent), such as department
444 committee work, academic advising, career counseling
445 and personal counseling of students, participating in
446 department meetings, the creation, revision, or
447 assessment of the curriculum; organizing and planning
448 department activities, and working on accreditation and
449 review of department programs. As faculty gain
450 experience at the university, they will normally assume
451 greater responsibility for similar service activities at the
452 college and university levels as well. Evidence of service
453 at the university level is a requirement for promotion to
454 Professor.

455 2.4.4.2 Higher levels of service require higher standards for
456 evaluation. While fairly routine levels of service will often
457 be listed rather than evaluated, service accomplishments
458 involving leadership, the production of documents, the
459 management of organizations, and other tangible results
460 should be independently evaluated in order to be eligible
461 to be designated at higher levels of achievement. [Ken26]

462 3.0 Evaluation of Achievements

463 3.1 At each level of review, committees and administrators will provide written
464 recommendations or decisions that evaluate levels of achievement in each
465 of the three categories. These evaluations shall classify the candidate's
466 level of achievement in each category by describing it in terms of one of
467 the five levels described below (3.3) and provide a detailed rationale for
468 the classification. [Ken27].

469 3.2 It is the role of evaluators to judge the level of achievement regardless of
470 the form it takes, while respecting the academic freedom and professional
471 choices made by each candidate. Evaluators should not substitute their
472 own preferences for policy and should recuse themselves if necessary to
473 avoid the possibility (or the appearance) of bias. Evaluators who recuse
474 themselves should abstain from voting and absent themselves from
475 discussion of a case as per section 7.152. Examples of attitudes that
476 would warrant recusal include (but are not limited to)

477 3.2.1 Hostility toward a candidate's ideology as expressed in a research

478 agenda.

479 3.2.2 Opposition to a candidate's choice of pedagogy when the
480 pedagogy is exercised appropriately under curricular policy.

481 3.2.3 Dislike of a candidate's emphasis in professional development
482 when the emphasis is permitted by policy.

483 3.2.4 Any personal or professional conflicts-of-interest such as those
484 delineated in the University's policy on Academic Freedom and
485 Professional Responsibility. [Ken28]

486 3.3 Criteria to be used when evaluating candidates for Promotion and
487 Tenure [Ken29]

488

489 3.3.1 Academic Assignment

490

491 3.3.1.1 Committees and administrators shall write an evaluation
492 of a candidate's achievements in academic assignment
493 and shall rate the overall performance in this category
494 according to the following descriptive scale. When a
495 candidate's achievements are significant but depart from
496 the general description below, evaluators should exercise
497 judgment and give credit for unusual, unique, or
498 unanticipated activities at the same level as better known
499 activities of comparable significance. Especially in
500 unusual cases, candidates should carefully document the
501 significance of their accomplishments in academic
502 assignment.

503

504 3.3.1.2 Criteria for non-teaching faculty.

505

506 Criteria for evaluating the Academic Assignment of non-
507 teaching faculty, such as Librarians and Counselors, will
508 be developed by the units as part of their department
509 guidelines and will parallel the categories identified
510 below, but will reference those specific responsibilities in
511 their academic assignment rather than teaching.
512 Department guidelines for academic assignment will be
513 mandatory and not optional for such units [Ken30]

514

515

516 3.3.1.3 Criteria for teaching faculty

517

518

519 3.3.1.3.1 Needs improvement. The candidate has not
520 documented teaching accomplishments that meet

521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566

the baseline level as described below.

3.3.1.3.2 **Baseline** [Ken31] The candidate has taught assigned courses that are well crafted and appropriate for the catalog description. The candidate has taken measures to correct any problems identified earlier in either direct observations or prior performance evaluations. Recent direct observations are supportive. Student evaluations, taking into account contextual factors such as the difficulty of the teaching assignment, the range of courses taught, the resources provided, and the workload expected--approach the norms appropriate for the classes reviewed. This should especially be true for those classes taught in the candidate's primary focus and any curriculum specifically identified in the appointment letter.

3.3.1.3.3 **Good.** In addition to the baseline as described above, the candidate has documented a degree of innovation within the teaching assignment. This could mean that the candidate has effectively taught an unusually wide range of courses, or that the candidate has created one or more new courses to fill important curricular needs, or that the candidate has consistently engaged students in research or service learning activities, or that the candidate has experimented with new pedagogies, or that the candidate has substantially reformed the content of courses. Allowing for contextual factors as described above, candidates meeting this level of achievement have at least some student evaluations above the norms and relatively few below.

3.3.1.3.4 **Excellent.** In addition to a good performance as described above, the candidate has either engaged in a high level of curricular innovation or achieved consistently high evaluations. For example, the candidate documents important experimentation in teaching and assessment of student learning and shows how the experiment informed curricular choices and reforms. Or a candidate consistently achieves evaluations well above the norms expected for the nature of the

567 classes taught.

568
569 3.3.1.3.5 Truly Outstanding^[Ken32]. In addition to an
570 excellent performance as described above, this
571 level of achievement is reserved for candidates
572 whose teaching impact goes beyond the students
573 they directly reach. Truly Outstanding teachers
574 have received recognition for their teaching. They
575 may have served as teaching mentors to other
576 faculty, they may have received teaching awards
577 from students, departments, or colleges, they may
578 have published on pedagogy or curriculum, they
579 may have created curriculum that is adopted at
580 other institutions, they may be deeply engaged
581 with alums and former students in enriching their
582 professional and community lives.

583
584
585 3.3.2 Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement

586
587 3.3.2.1 Committees and administrators shall write an evaluation
588 of a candidate's scholarly/artistic/professional
589 achievement and shall rate the overall performance in
590 this category according to the following descriptive scale.
591 When a candidate's achievements are significant but
592 depart from the general description below, evaluators
593 should exercise judgment and give credit for unusual,
594 unique, or unanticipated activities at the same level as
595 better known activities of comparable significance.
596 Especially in unusual cases, candidates should carefully
597 document the significance of their accomplishments.

598
599 3.3.2.2 Needs improvement. The candidate has not documented
600 scholarly/artistic/professional accomplishments that meet
601 the baseline level as described below.

602
603 3.3.2.3 Baseline. The candidate has documented
604 scholarly/artistic/professional achievements that show the
605 promise of continued grow and success within his/her
606 discipline.

607
608 3.3.2.4 Good. In addition to the baseline as described above,
609 the candidate has documented
610 scholarly/artistic/professional achievements that
611 constitute important contributions to the discipline and
612 that help to enhance the scholarly/artistic/professional

613 reputation of the candidate's department, school, college,
614 or SJSU more generally.

615
616 3.3.2.5 Excellent. In addition to a good performance as
617 described above, this level requires achievements of both
618 sufficient quality and quantity to establish a significant,
619 important, and growing reputation within the candidate's
620 field.

621
622 3.3.2.6 Truly Outstanding. In addition to an excellent
623 performance as described above, this level of
624 achievement is reserved for candidates whose
625 scholarly/artistic/professional impact is national or
626 international in scope. This level of achievement will only
627 be awarded when there has been external review by
628 leaders in the candidate's field testifying to the high
629 significance of the candidate's achievements.

630
631 3.3.3 Service

632
633 3.3.3.1 Committees and administrators shall write an evaluation
634 of a candidate's service achievements and shall rate the
635 overall performance in this category according to the
636 following descriptive scale. When a candidate's
637 achievements are significant but depart from the general
638 description below, evaluators should exercise judgment
639 and give credit for unusual, unique, or unanticipated
640 service activities at the same level as better known
641 activities of comparable significance. Especially in
642 unusual cases, candidates should carefully document the
643 significance of their service accomplishments.

644 3.3.3.2 Needs improvement. The candidate has not documented
645 service activities that meet the baseline level described
646 below.

647 3.3.3.3 Baseline. The candidate has undertaken a fair share of
648 the workload required to keep the Department functioning
649 well. This includes activities such as work on department
650 committees, the creation, revision, or assessment of
651 curricula, or participating in department planning,
652 accreditation, outreach, and advising.

653
654 3.3.3.4 Good. In addition to the baseline described above, the
655 candidate has also participated in significant service
656 activities beyond the department. This will usually
657 include college-level service and may include University

658 level service, service in the community, or significant
659 activities in a professional organization. In at least one
660 facet of service, the candidate will have demonstrated
661 some leadership, such as serving as an elected Chair of
662 a group or committee that produced something of
663 significance, such as a successful administrative or
664 faculty search, a policy reform, a curricular change, an
665 accreditation report, etc.

667 3.3.3.5 Excellent. In addition to a good performance as
668 described above, the candidate has documented
669 significant influence at the University, system, or national
670 level. Candidates who achieve an evaluation of
671 “excellent” in service will generally have occupied several
672 elected or appointed positions of leadership and will
673 document multiple specific accomplishments that have
674 significance for people beyond the candidate’s
675 department or college. This may include leading
676 University task forces and administrative searches,
677 positions of Senate leadership, leadership in CFA,
678 leadership in professional organizations, and similar
679 activities.

680 3.3.3.6 Truly Outstanding. A truly outstanding service profile
681 exemplifies all the qualities listed above, but is reserved
682 for those few candidates who achieve the highest level of
683 faculty leadership. Serving as the highest elected officer
684 in a faculty organization, such as Senate Chair, UCCD
685 Chair, CFA President, ASCSU Senator, President of a
686 significant professional organization, chairing a college or
687 university reaccreditation effort, etc. Occupying these
688 positions, however, is not considered “truly outstanding”
689 unless the candidate documents significant
690 achievements resulting from the time in office.

693 3.4 Department Guidelines for Achievement [Ken33]

694 3.4.1 Purpose of Guidelines

695 3.4.1.1 Individual departments may create guidelines that relate
696 this university-wide policy to the professional standards
697 and breadth of activities of particular disciplines. While
698 there is no specific provision for College guidelines, they
699 may be created simply by act of the constituent
700 departments developing and then approving common
701 guidelines. [Ken34]

702 3.4.1.1.1 In the case of Departments that do not have
703 approved guidelines, “levels of achievement” will
704 be judged exclusively by the policy language of
705 3.3.

706 3.4.1.1.2 In the case of Departments that do have approved
707 guidelines, the guidelines will serve as an aid for
708 evaluating -“levels of achievement” within the
709 broader policy language of 3.3.

710 3.4.1.2 Non-teaching units are required to develop such
711 guidelines for the category of “Academic Assignment.”
712 [Ken35]

713 3.4.1.3 Guidelines should assist committees and administrators
714 outside the department or college in understanding the
715 standards appropriate to the applicant's profession and to
716 ensure fair and equitable application of these standards
717 to the broader procedures, standards, and criteria of the
718 university policy. Such statements or guidelines may
719 specify the sorts of documentation that are normally
720 expected to be especially relevant to the evaluation of
721 professional effectiveness of faculty in the particular
722 academic area. [Ken36]

723 3.4.2 Content of Guidelines

724 3.4.2.1 Guidelines may offer specific profiles of accomplishments
725 that would warrant a given level of achievement within a
726 given category as viewed by that specific discipline.
727 When the accomplishments of candidates are similar to
728 the accomplishments included in the guidelines, then the
729 guidelines may serve as a fair scale to assist in
730 evaluating the level of achievement attained by the
731 candidate.

732 3.4.2.2 Departments are encouraged but not required to produce
733 guidelines for Scholarly/Artistic/Professional
734 Achievement. They may produce guidelines for two or all
735 three categories of achievement. They may also include
736 in their guidelines notes on synergistic practices and
737 accomplishments that span more than one category of
738 achievement. Any category without guidelines will be
739 evaluated with the policy language in 3.3.

740 3.4.2.3 For Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement each
741 department should provide examples of achievements
742 necessary to attain each of the performance levels, “Truly

743 Outstanding," "Excellent," "Good" and "Baseline," within
744 its discipline(s).^[Ken37]

745 3.4.2.4 For Academic Assignment and Service) each department
746 may describe what is expected to attain "Truly
747 Outstanding," "Excellent," and "Good" levels of
748 achievement within its discipline(s). "Baseline" levels for
749 Academic Assignment and for Service shall be judged
750 exclusively according to the policy language in 3.3.^[Ken38]

751 3.4.2.5 Departments which contain more than one discipline, or
752 which contain very different subdisciplines, may produce
753 more than one set of specialized guidelines. When this
754 occurs, particular care must be taken to specify to which
755 faculty each set of guidelines applies. The applicable
756 guidelines should be specified in appointment letters and
757 the Chair's description of assignment.^[Ken39]

758 3.4.3 Approval of Department Guidelines

759 3.4.3.1 Department Guidelines must be approved by a vote of
760 department probationary and tenured faculty, using
761 secret ballots. ^[Ken40]

762 3.4.3.2 Guidelines must be approved by the Associate Vice
763 President for Faculty Affairs in consultation with the
764 Professional Standards Committee of the San Jose State
765 University Academic Senate, which shall establish a
766 process to consult with department and colleges prior to
767 deliberating on the approval of guidelines.^[Ken41]

768 3.4.3.3 Guidelines must be kept current. They shall be reviewed
769 every five years and shall clearly display the date they
770 were last approved by the AVP for Faculty Affairs.
771 Guidelines that display a date more than five years old
772 calculated from the time of the submission of the dossier
773 shall be considered invalid, except as provided below in
774 "Continuity of guidelines throughout review period."

775 3.4.3.4 Department guidelines should meet these conditions:

776 3.4.3.4.1 They provide inclusive examples of
777 accomplishments within the discipline that
778 represents the given levels of achievement
779 described in 3.3 of this policy

780 3.4.3.4.2 They provide realistic estimates of the resources
781 required to meet each given level of achievement,

782 as per 3.5^[Ken42].

783 3.4.3.4.3 They comport entirely with the principles,
784 categories, and standards defined by this policy.

785 3.4.4 Publication, Distribution, and Use of Guidelines

786 3.4.4.1 All approved department guidelines shall be posted on
787 the Faculty Affairs website (or equivalent) and shall
788 display the date they were last approved..

789 3.4.4.2 Continuity of guidelines throughout review period.

790 Normally, any valid (current) guidelines must be included
791 in each candidate's dossier. If, however, guidelines have
792 changed during the candidate's period of review, the
793 candidate shall have the right to choose to include either
794 the old or the new guidelines. Similarly, if guidelines that
795 were valid during a part of the candidate's period of
796 review are no longer valid and have not been replaced,
797 the candidate may choose between including the old
798 guidelines or including no guidelines. Only one set of
799 guidelines may appear in the dossier, and reviewers are
800 restricted to only considering included guidelines. ^[Ken43]

801 3.4.4.3 Once approved and published, department guidelines
802 must be applied when judging the level of achievement of
803 all candidates to which they apply, bearing in mind the
804 limits of such guidelines.

805 3.4.4.4 Guidelines are inclusive and not exclusive in nature.
806 They shall not be used to exclude accomplishments from
807 consideration that were unanticipated when the
808 guidelines were created. When candidates submit
809 genuine accomplishments that were not anticipated in the
810 guidelines, the accomplishments will be assessed using
811 the policy language outlined in 3.3.^[Ken44]

812 3.5 Resources and scholarly, artistic or professional achievements

813 3.5.1 Scholarly, artistic, and professional achievements can depend to
814 some degree on the availability of resources, such as release time
815 from teaching, the provision of sabbaticals and leaves, and the
816 availability of funds for equipment and travel. The necessary
817 resources will vary according to the individual, the discipline and
818 the level of achievement sought.

819 3.5.2 If departmental or college guidelines exist, appropriate

820 departmental personnel (e.g. Chairs, Directors, RTP committee
821 members) should help candidates use the guidelines to plan an
822 appropriate but not binding strategy for professional growth. If
823 guidelines do not exist, appropriate departmental personnel and the
824 candidate shall jointly develop estimates of resources that are
825 required to achieve different levels of performance in their
826 discipline: baseline, good, excellent, and truly outstanding.

827 3.5.3 For each performance review, candidates shall provide lists of
828 resources they have received to support their scholarly, artistic, and
829 professional development.

830 3.5.4 During each performance review, evaluators should consider the
831 level of achievement of a candidate relative to the availability of
832 resources provided. [Ken45]

833 4.0 Standards required for Tenure, Promotion to Associate, and Promotion to
834 Professor

835 4.1 Tenure and promotion to Associate

836 4.1.1 Timing of performance review for tenure and promotion.

837 4.1.1.1 Under normal circumstances, probationary faculty are
838 considered for both tenure and promotion to Associate
839 during their sixth year, to be effective at the beginning of
840 the following academic year.

841 4.1.1.2 The probationary period may be extended for an
842 additional year (for a variety of medical, personal, and
843 professional leaves) as defined under the Collective
844 Bargaining Agreement Article 13.

845 4.1.1.3 When probationary faculty are initially appointed with one
846 or two years of service credit (as per the Collective
847 Bargaining Agreement Article 13), this credit is simply
848 counted toward the “normal” timeline for tenure and
849 promotion to Associate. All achievements (in all
850 categories) earned during the years for which service
851 credit was awarded must be fully documented and
852 considered. [Ken46]

853 4.1.2 Relationship of tenure to Associate status. When considered at the
854 normal time, promotion to Associate and tenure must be linked:
855 both must be awarded or neither. [Ken47]

856 4.1.3 Standard for tenure and promotion to Associate. When considered
857 at the normal time, faculty will be tenured and promoted if they

858 meet baseline standards in all three criteria and also meet
859 “Excellent” in one category or “Good” in two categories. [Ken48]

860 4.1.4 Early decisions. Favorable early decisions require a significantly
861 higher level of achievement than a favorable decision after the
862 normal period of review. Since tenure is the most important
863 decision the University makes with regard to faculty, the level of
864 achievement required for an early tenure decision is particularly
865 high. [Ken49]

866 4.1.4.1 Promotion to Associate effective after five years at rank
867 (one year early) without accompanying early tenure
868 requires candidates to meet the standards for “Good” in
869 all three categories and the standards for “Excellent” or
870 higher in at least one. .

871 4.1.4.2 Promotion to Associate effective after four years at rank
872 (two years “early”) without accompanying early tenure
873 requires candidates to achieve an evaluation of “Good” in
874 all three categories and either “Excellent” in two or “Truly
875 Outstanding” in one.

876 4.1.4.3 Tenure after five years at rank (one year “early”) requires
877 candidates of “Good” in all three categories and either
878 “Excellent” in two or “Truly Outstanding” in one. If early
879 tenure is granted to a candidate at the rank of Assistant
880 then early promotion to Associate will be simultaneously
881 granted. [Ken50]

882 4.2 Promotion to Professor

883 4.2.1 Timing of performance review for promotion to Professor. Under
884 normal circumstances, Associates may be considered for
885 promotion to Professor after completing four years in the rank of
886 Associate, to be effective at the beginning of the following
887 academic year. (Note that for faculty who earned promotion to
888 Associate prior to earning tenure, the review period for Professor
889 begins with the promotion to Associate and not with tenure.) [Ken51]

890 4.2.2 Standard for promotion to Professor. When considered at the
891 normal time, faculty must meet or exceed one of these profiles
892 across the three categories:

893 4.2.2.1 Baseline, Good, Truly Outstanding

894 4.2.2.2 Baseline, Excellent, Excellent

895 4.2.2.3 Good, Good, Excellent

896 4.2.3 Early decisions

897 4.2.3.1 Associates may be considered for Promotion to
898 Professor after completing three years in rank (one year
899 “early”) if they not only meet baseline standards in all
900 three criteria but, in addition meet the standards for “Truly
901 Outstanding” in two categories or “Excellent” in three
902 categories.

903 5.0 Developmental Reviews and Standards for Retention^[Ken52]

904 5.1 Purpose and Types of Reviews. Untenured (probationary) faculty will be
905 reviewed in the years leading up to the final performance review for tenure
906 and promotion. The primary purpose of these reviews is developmental--
907 to provide the candidate with a formative review of all categories of
908 achievement, so as to encourage professional growth that will merit the
909 award of tenure and at least the level of Associate by the end of the
910 review period. A secondary purpose of performance reviews is to
911 determine whether a probationary faculty member should be retained to
912 continue progress toward tenure and promotion.

913 5.1.1 Performance reviews. A performance review is a thorough review
914 carried out at multiple levels, with characteristics specified in this
915 policy and in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Faculty may
916 only be considered for tenure and promotion or retention through a
917 performance review. In specified years prior to the tenure and
918 promotion decision, faculty will undergo performance reviews to be
919 considered for retention. Faculty who wish to be considered for
920 early tenure or promotion must submit materials for a performance
921 review. SJSU also uses performance reviews to provide each
922 candidate with a thorough formative assessment of progress
923 toward tenure and promotion.

924 5.1.2 Periodic Review of the Annual Summary of Achievements. The
925 Periodic Review is a less thorough review carried out at fewer
926 levels, with characteristics specified in this policy and in the
927 Collective Bargaining Agreement. The periodic review may not
928 recommend promotion, tenure, or retention. These reviews will,
929 however, provide probationary candidates with an annual
930 assessment of the progress they have made toward tenure and
931 promotion. Under circumstances described below, periodic reviews
932 may also recommend that a candidate submit a full performance
933 review in the following year.^[Ken53]

934 5.2 Timing of developmental reviews

935 5.2.1 Normally, probationary faculty shall submit materials for

936 performance reviews in their third year. One outcome of this third
937 year review shall be the determination as to whether the candidate
938 shall be scheduled for a fourth year review, a fifth year review, or
939 no additional review beyond that which may be triggered by an
940 annual summary review as per 5.2.3. [Ken54]

941 5.2.2 Normally, probationary faculty shall submit annual summaries of
942 achievements for periodic evaluation every year in which they do
943 not submit a full performance review. Department committees,
944 department chairs, and college deans shall consider an annual
945 summary of achievements prepared by the faculty member,
946 evaluations of teaching, and the cumulative record of previous
947 evaluations and recommendations by committees and
948 administrators. Copies of their observations and suggestions shall
949 be given to the faculty member; the original evaluation shall be
950 placed in the official Personnel Action File, and copies included in
951 subsequent years' dossiers.

952 5.2.3 If committees or administrators believe that it is in the best interest
953 of the university or the candidate to require an additional
954 performance review in a year when such a review would not
955 normally be required, they may so recommend to the President. An
956 additional performance review is warranted when a prior review
957 raises concerns that a candidate is not making sufficient progress
958 toward tenure and promotion to Associate, or when a candidate
959 appears to be falling below baseline expectations in any of the
960 categories. The recommendation for an additional performance
961 review may be made either as a result of a periodic evaluation or a
962 prior performance review. Candidates may also request an
963 additional performance review. [Ken55]

964 5.2.4 When the probationary period is extended by leave or preceded by
965 service credit (as per 4.1.1.2 and 4.1.1.3) there will be a
966 corresponding adjustment to the schedule for all reviews.
967 Performance reviews shall not, however, be required for newly
968 appointed faculty in their first year at SJSU who have been given
969 service credit on appointment. [Ken56]

970 5.3 Standards for Retention. For Retention during the probationary period,
971 faculty must meet baseline standards in Academic Assignment to be
972 retained. It is expected that a candidate show increasing effectiveness in
973 teaching, or consistent effectiveness in the case of individuals whose
974 teaching is fully satisfactory from the start. Faculty members should not be
975 retained if their performance in teaching and in the other aspects of their
976 academic assignment falls below baseline standards, and is therefore not
977 sufficient to warrant a reasonable expectation that tenure will be granted
978 at the end of the probationary period. [Ken57]

979 6.0 Standards and Procedures for Appointment [Ken58]

980 6.1 Standards for Initial Appointment

981 6.1.1 Promise of excellence. Candidates for initial appointment to
982 probationary positions should be carefully reviewed so that new
983 faculty members will not merely fill positions but will bring to the
984 university intellectual distinction and the potential for tenure and
985 eventual promotion to advanced rank. Candidates for appointment
986 should come fully prepared and ready for a university career, with
987 the promise of excellence and a commitment both to teaching,
988 service to the University, and to contributing to their professional
989 communities. [Ken59]

990 6.1.2 Terminal degree. Initial appointment to a probationary position
991 normally requires possession of the doctorate or appropriate
992 terminal degree from an accredited institution. In unusual
993 circumstances, persons may be appointed who are close to
994 completing the required terminal degree. An exception to the
995 terminal degree requirement may also be made in the case of
996 distinguished individuals with significant
997 scholarly/artistic/professional accomplishments in their field, or
998 whose achievements make a unique ability available to the
999 campus. In such cases, the basis of the exception shall be made a
1000 permanent part of the faculty member's file, and the decision
1001 recorded whether or not possession of the terminal degree is to be
1002 expected for tenure or promotion to advanced rank. [Ken60]

1003 6.1.3 Standards for award of probationary credit. Probationary credit of
1004 up to two years may be awarded by the President at the time of
1005 appointment.

1006 6.1.3.1 Probationary credit will be awarded only upon the
1007 recommendation of the department and the dean.

1008 6.1.3.2 Probationary credit should only be granted in
1009 consideration for a candidate's previous service and
1010 achievement in teaching and in
1011 scholarly/artistic/professional activities at a post-
1012 secondary education institution, previous CSU
1013 employment, or comparable experience.

1014 6.1.3.3 Probationary credit may only be awarded upon the
1015 assurance that the candidate has been advised of
1016 possible hazards of receiving this award, which include
1017 the provision that only accomplishments during the one
1018 or two years preceding the appointment to regular faculty

1019 status may be listed and considered in tenure and
1020 promotion decisions. Because recipients of probationary
1021 credit will be subject to a four- or five-year tenure review
1022 period, they are advised that they will have less time to
1023 achieve the standards required for tenure, as outlined
1024 above.^[Ken61]

1025 6.1.3.4 Probationary credit may not be awarded for
1026 achievements earned prior to receipt of the candidate's
1027 terminal degree. ^[Ken62]

1028 6.1.4 Standards for appointment at the rank of Associate or of Professor;
1029 or appointment with tenure.

1030 6.1.4.1 Appointments at advanced rank or to a tenured position
1031 require that candidates show evidence of
1032 accomplishments normally expected for level of the
1033 appointment. Recruitment committees should require
1034 applicants to submit portfolios that go beyond a simple
1035 vita and cover accomplishments in all three categories of
1036 achievement.

1037 6.1.4.2 In addition to the normal appointment requirements,
1038 appointment at advanced rank requires that the
1039 Department Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)
1040 committee review the candidate's materials and approve
1041 the level of the appointment. ^[Ken63]

1042 6.2 Procedures for Initial Appointment

1043 6.2.1 All recruitment shall be carried out in accordance with the
1044 university's current policies on diversity and equal opportunity (S01-
1045 13 Commitment to a Campus Climate that Values Diversity and
1046 Equal Opportunity or its successor policy.) ^[Ken64]

1048 6.2.2 Composition of department recruitment committees

1049 6.2.2.1 Recruitment committees shall be elected by vote of the
1050 tenured and probationary faculty of the department by
1051 secret ballot. ^[Ken65]

1052 6.2.2.2 Recruitment committees should preferably contain a
1053 minimum of five members but never fewer than three
1054 members. If a department lacks three qualified
1055 members, it may elect a faculty member from a related
1056 discipline to serve, whose willingness should first be
1057 ascertained.

1058 6.2.2.3 The majority of faculty on any recruitment committee
1059 must be tenured and must not have entered an early
1060 retirement program. Probationary faculty and faculty in
1061 an early retirement program may serve if elected,
1062 provided they do not constitute a majority of the
1063 committee, and provided that they receive the permission
1064 of the President as per the Collective Bargaining
1065 Agreement^[Ken66]. That permission must be requested by
1066 the Department and is reviewed by the Dean and Faculty
1067 Affairs.

1068 6.2.2.4 If a search is authorized for a tenured position, then the
1069 recruitment committee may not include probationary
1070 faculty. ^[Ken67]

1071 6.2.2.5 The Chair of the Department shall normally be a voting
1072 *ex officio* member of the recruitment committee and shall
1073 Chair the committee. If the Chair elects not to serve,
1074 then the committee shall choose its own Chair from
1075 among its elected members.

1076 6.2.2.6 Departments may create independent recruitment
1077 committees for each search, or carry out all searches
1078 with a standing recruitment committee, provided all
1079 recruitment committees conform to the requirements of
1080 policy.

1081 6.2.2.7 Recruitments for department chairs should be conducted
1082 in accordance with the provisions of S14-8 (Sect VI.1.)

1083 6.2.3 Recruitment committee procedures.

1084 6.2.3.1 Recruitment committees shall be charged by the Dean or
1085 the Dean's designee and shall sign an appropriate
1086 agreement to protect the confidentiality of candidate
1087 applications.

1088 6.2.3.2 Faculty Affairs will provide all recruitment committees
1089 with comprehensive guidelines for organizing the
1090 recruiting process.

1091 6.2.3.3 Recruitment committees shall evaluate all candidates for
1092 appointments to regular positions and determine the
1093 order of desirability of finalists for the position.

1094 6.2.3.3.1 Committees shall provide a clear rationale for their
1095 recommendations to the Dean and to Faculty
1096 Affairs.

1097 6.2.3.3.2 Normally, offers shall be extended to candidates in
1098 the order recommended by the committee. If,
1099 however, information emerges after the committee
1100 makes its recommendation (e.g. a subsequent
1101 reference check) that calls the order of desirability
1102 into question, the committee shall be given the
1103 opportunity to change its recommendation. [Ken68]

1104 6.2.3.3.3 In the event that the President (and his designees)
1105 cannot (for any reason) accept the
1106 recommendation of the committee, the search will
1107 be cancelled. [Ken69]

1108 6.2.4 Retreat Rights.

1109 6.2.4.1 Persons to be employed initially in academic-
1110 administrative assignments with retreat rights to a
1111 department or program shall be reviewed and must
1112 receive a favorable recommendation from the appropriate
1113 personnel committee of the department in which tenure
1114 must be acquired before retreat rights are granted. [Ken70]

1115 6.2.4.2 Prior to making a recommendation on retreat rights,
1116 departments shall receive in writing, from an appropriate
1117 administrative level, an explanation of any possible
1118 budgetary consequences for their department should the
1119 retreat rights be exercised. [Ken71]

1120 6.2.5 No person shall be offered a probationary appointment unless such
1121 an appointment has been recommended by an appropriate faculty
1122 committee, generally the department's elected recruitment
1123 committee.

1124 6.2.6 Appointment letters

1125 6.2.6.1 Appointment letters shall be written by the college dean
1126 in consultation with the chair of the department.

1127 6.2.6.2 Appointment letters must be approved by the Office of
1128 the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs, who
1129 shall also provide suitable templates to the Colleges.

1130 6.2.6.3 The letter shall reference this policy and any associated
1131 documents such as department guidelines, to bring to the
1132 faculty member's attention the appropriate criteria,
1133 procedures, and standards for retention, tenure, and
1134 promotion.

1135 6.2.6.4 Appointment letters shall may summarize and clarify how
1136 the expectations contained in policy and guidelines will
1137 apply to a faculty member, but the letter may not change
1138 or contradict the standards. If there is a perceived
1139 conflict between an appointment letter and this policy, the
1140 language of the policy shall take precedence. [Ken72]

1141 6.2.6.5 Any subsequent change in the particular character of a
1142 faculty member's academic assignment shall be made in
1143 writing and signed by the faculty member, the department
1144 chair, the college dean, and the AVP for Faculty Affairs
1145 An addendum to the appointment letter must then be
1146 included the personnel action file and in in subsequent
1147 dossiers. [Ken73]

1148

1149 7.0 Procedures for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

1150 7.1 Procedures and principles for all personnel committees

1151 7.1.1 Training. All committee members must be thoroughly trained in the
1152 use of the present university policy on Appointment, Retention,
1153 Tenure, and Promotion Criteria, Standards, and Procedures for
1154 Regular Faculty Employees. Department chairs, college deans, and
1155 the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs shall arrange for
1156 appropriate training in the application of this policy. [Ken74]

1157 7.1.2 Charge. Prior to deliberations, all members of a personnel
1158 committee shall sign a statement prepared by the Office of Faculty
1159 Affairs indicating that they have been trained appropriately, that
1160 they have read and understood this policy, and will apply it fairly
1161 and accurately to the best of their ability. The statement shall also
1162 include their agreement to keep confidential all content of
1163 committee deliberations. The charge will be delivered by the AVP
1164 for Faculty Affairs, or the Dean, or the Chair, corresponding to the
1165 level of the committee. Committee members may not view dossiers
1166 or deliberate until after having signed the agreement. [Ken75].

1167 7.1.3 Election of RTP members

1168 7.1.3.1 Faculty elected to serve on RTP committees should
1169 consider that their participation affects the careers of
1170 colleagues as well as the well-being of students and the
1171 health of the University more generally. This service
1172 shall be their highest professional priority.
1173
1174
1175

1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222

7.1.3.2 Candidates should verify their ability to serve during the scheduled meeting times. If necessary and feasible, Deans and Chairs should adjust members' teaching schedules to accommodate their ability to attend the scheduled meetings. If an elected member has an unresolvable conflict with the meeting schedule, that member should promptly notify the Dean and Chair who should arrange to replace the member via a special election prior to the beginning of committee deliberations. [Ken76]

7.1.3.3 No one may serve during the same review cycle on more than one level of committee; membership on the University committee, a college committee, or a department committee precludes membership on the other two.

7.1.3.4 All departments with four or more active Professors are expected to provide members/nominees to higher level committees. Departments with three or fewer active Professors may provide members/nominees to higher level committees by supplementing their department level committee with external faculty (if needed) as per 7.2.7. A department with insufficient faculty to provide a representative to a College level committee may elect a representative from outside its department in a related discipline, or it may elect another department's elected representative as a designee to explain the department's criteria and context to the College committee.

7.1.4 Quorums

A simple majority of the full membership of the committee must be present to obtain a quorum necessary in order to conduct business. In all personnel recommendations, a simple majority of those voting prevails. [Ken77] A quorum is determined at the beginning of the meeting, prior to any members removing themselves for purposes of abstention. [Ken78]

7.1.5 Voting procedures for all decisions

7.1.5.1 Voting. College and University committees and any Department committees consisting solely of tenured Professors may devise their own voting procedures. [Ken79] Department Committees with members of less than full rank shall always vote by written secret ballot.

1223 [Ken80] Regardless of the voting method, the results shall
1224 be immediately announced in the committee and
1225 recorded. If written secret ballots are used, they shall be
1226 retained and sealed and stored in the Department /
1227 College / AVP's office until after the following stage of
1228 review has been completed, then they shall be
1229 destroyed. Electronic voting may not be used unless it is
1230 implemented in a manner that provides the same degree
1231 of secrecy and security as paper ballots. No member
1232 may vote (electronically or any other way) who has not
1233 participated in the full discussion of any case . [Ken81]
1234

1235 7.1.5.2 Abstentions

1236 7.1.5.2.1 Permitted reasons for abstention include if a
1237 member has a conflict of interest concerning the
1238 candidate, or if a member has failed to do due
1239 diligence in reviewing the dossier. Committee
1240 members shall not abstain simply because they
1241 find a case difficult to decide.

1242 7.1.5.2.2 Committee members who abstain must declare
1243 their intention in advance and must absent
1244 themselves from committee deliberations.
1245 Abstaining members may not contribute to the text
1246 of the committee's explanation (majority or
1247 minority) for its decision. [Ken82]
1248

1249 7.1.6 Voting for Tenure and Promotion

1250
1251 7.1.6.1 For tenure and promotion decisions, committees will
1252 conduct separate votes to determine the candidate's
1253 level of achievement in each of the three categories—
1254 bearing in mind synergistic and cross-category
1255 achievements as described earlier in this policy.
1256 Committees will deliberate until a majority agrees. In the
1257 event of a deadlocked committee, the committee should
1258 request mediation from the Office of Faculty Affairs.
1259

1260 7.1.6.2 The final committee recommendation for tenure and
1261 promotion will be determined by applying the evaluation
1262 of the three levels of achievement agreed to by
1263 committee majorities to the standards described in
1264 section 4. [Ken83]
1265

1266 7.1.7 Voting for Retention

1267
1268 For retention there will be one vote to "retain" or "do not retain."

1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301

1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310

1311
1312
1313

7.1.8 Recording Committee recommendations. Committees shall write reports for each case stating the reasons for all votes cast. (An abstention is not considered a "vote" for this purpose.) A statement of these reasons shall be included in a single report from the committee, with the possibility of a separate "minority" report. In either case, the confidentiality of voting shall be maintained, and signatures on the report(s) shall not indicate how individual members voted when recommendations are not unanimous.^[Ken84].

7.1.9 Confidentiality. All personnel materials, proceedings, and recommendations are confidential, except (a) that positive final decisions may be announced; (b) that each faculty member shall have access to materials in his/her personnel files as provided by law, the Agreement, and Trustee policy; and (c) that any individual may voluntarily disclose materials from his/her personnel file at an appropriate proceeding, such as a grievance or court hearing.^[Ken85]

7.1.10 Deadlines. Deadlines for the procedural steps provided herein shall be established at the start of the academic year by the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs. Deadlines shall include a specific closing date "at which time the Personnel Action File is declared complete with respect to documentation of performance for the purpose of evaluation," as required by the Agreement (Section 15.12.b). If any stage of the review has not been completed within the specified time, the performance review shall automatically be transferred to the next review level and the faculty member shall be so notified. The calendar with deadlines shall be communicated to all faculty subject in a given academic year to personnel actions governed by this policy.^[Ken86]

7.2 Department Committees.

7.2.1 Departments will establish one or more committees to recommend retention, tenure, and promotion decisions. (For example, a department could establish one committee of Professors for reviewing promotions to Professor, and a committee of Associates and Professors for reviewing tenure and promotion to Associate.) Members of department committees will be elected by the vote of probationary and tenured faculty. Department decisions about committee structure shall also be made by vote of the tenured and probationary faculty of the department.^[Ken87]

7.2.2 Membership on personnel committees for the purpose of deliberating or voting on personnel recommendations is limited to tenured full-time faculty members. Note that faculty who have been

- 1314 promoted but not tenured are not eligible to serve.
- 1315 7.2.3 No faculty member shall serve on the department committee who
1316 will serve that year on a higher level committee.
- 1317 7.2.4 Tenured faculty members, including department chairs, who are
1318 candidates for promotion may not serve on promotion committees.
- 1319 7.2.5 No faculty member, including department chairs, may participate in
1320 promotion, tenure, or retention deliberations about colleagues of
1321 equal or higher rank. [Ken88]
- 1322 7.2.6 Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program may not serve
1323 on retention, tenure, or promotion committees, and may serve on
1324 appointment/recruitment committees only by special permission as
1325 per section 6.2. [Ken89]
- 1326 7.2.7 In departments of sufficient size, personnel committees shall be
1327 composed of at least five (5) tenured full-time faculty members. In
1328 no case shall a personnel committee be composed of fewer than
1329 three (3) tenured full-time faculty members. In departments with
1330 fewer than three tenured full-time faculty members eligible to serve
1331 on the personnel committee, additional tenured full-time faculty
1332 members from related academic disciplines outside the department
1333 shall be selected to serve on departmental personnel committees
1334 as needed. A mutually acceptable list of nominees shall be selected
1335 by the college dean and the probationary and tenured faculty of the
1336 department; the probationary and tenured faculty shall elect the
1337 additional committee members from that list. [Ken90]
- 1338 7.2.8 Administrators holding full-time positions outside the department or
1339 involved in making personnel recommendations at the college or
1340 university levels shall not participate in departmental actions. [Ken91]
- 1341 7.2.9 The personnel recommendations of small colleges or units
1342 containing no departments shall be considered initial
1343 recommendations. For those small colleges or units which need to
1344 constitute a second level review committee, the first level
1345 committee and the Provost or his/her designee shall prepare a
1346 mutually acceptable list of nominees. The probationary and tenured
1347 faculty unit members shall elect the members of the second level
1348 review from that list. [Ken92]
- 1349 7.2.10 If the Chair has academic ranking that is higher than the candidate,
1350 the Chair shall write a separate recommendation, unless he/she
1351 has served as a duly elected member of the department committee.
1352 [Ken93] Such recommendations shall be forwarded to the college level
1353 along with the recommendations of the department committee and

1354 any responses to the departmental level recommendation(s)
1355 supplied by the faculty member.

1356 7.2.11 The department chair shall schedule any department personnel
1357 committee, which shall elect its own chair. If the Chair is not a duly
1358 elected member of the committee, then he/she may meet with the
1359 committee as a non-voting member only if invited to do so. The
1360 votes of the committee shall be recorded. A member of the
1361 committee shall be selected to write the evaluation of the faculty
1362 member for the committee, which shall be forwarded with the
1363 committee's recommendation to the college committee.^[Ken94]

1364 7.2.12 A faculty member shall have ten calendar days after notification of
1365 the department level recommendations in which to respond to or
1366 rebut those recommendations in writing. Responses or rebuttals
1367 should be addressed via the Chair to the next level of review (i.e.,
1368 either to the college Retention and Tenure Committee or the Dean)
1369 but should be delivered to the department office for placement in
1370 dossier. A faculty member may also request a meeting be held to
1371 discuss with the Chair the recommendations within ten days after
1372 notification. Dossiers shall be forwarded to the next level on the
1373 eleventh day after notification, accompanied by any response or
1374 rebuttal materials.^[Ken95]

1375 7.3 College Level Review

1376 7.3.1 The college retention, tenure, and promotion committee shall be
1377 composed of tenured full professors from departments within the
1378 college or, if augmentation is required, from related disciplines
1379 outside the college, and shall be elected by the probationary and
1380 tenured faculty unit employees of each department. Each college
1381 shall determine the number to be elected from each department
1382 and the minimum size required for department representation on
1383 the college committee. Department chairs and faculty serving on a
1384 college committee may not serve on a departmental committee in
1385 that college or on the university committee. The college committee
1386 shall elect its own chair and prepare its own report.^[Ken96]

1387 7.3.2 The college dean shall schedule the college retention, tenure, and
1388 promotion committee, but shall not attend committee deliberations
1389 nor communicate opinions about any individual candidate to the
1390 committee. Committees may request that the college dean or
1391 his/her designee meet with the committee outside of deliberations
1392 to explain procedural matters.

1393 7.3.3 The college dean shall write an independent evaluation of and
1394 recommendation for the faculty member under review. ^[Ken97]

1395 7.3.4 Department representatives on the college retention, tenure, and
1396 promotion committee may participate in the deliberations and vote
1397 on all faculty under review including those from their department.

1398 7.3.5 The recommendation of the college retention, tenure, and
1399 promotion committee, a statement of reasons for its
1400 recommendation and the recommendation and evaluation of the
1401 dean shall be included in the dossier, and a copy sent to the
1402 candidate and to the department chair and committee. The
1403 committee and/or the dean must thoroughly explain in writing any
1404 disagreement with the recommendation of the department
1405 committee.

1406 7.3.6 A faculty member shall have ten calendar days after notification of
1407 the college level recommendations in which to respond to or rebut
1408 those recommendations in writing. Responses or rebuttals should
1409 be addressed via the college dean to the next level of review (i.e.,
1410 either to the University Retention and Tenure Committee or the
1411 President) but should be delivered to the college office for
1412 placement in dossiers. A faculty member may also request a
1413 meeting be held to discuss with the college dean the
1414 recommendations within ten days after notification. Dossiers shall
1415 be forwarded to the next level on the eleventh day after notification,
1416 accompanied by any response or rebuttal materials.^[Ken98]

1417 7.4 University Level Review

1418 7.4.1 The University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee shall
1419 consist of one tenured full professor from each college and one
1420 from the General Unit as defined in Senate by-laws.^[Ken99] No
1421 member of a department or college retention, tenure, or promotion
1422 committee shall serve concurrently on the university committee.
1423 The members of the committee shall serve for two-year, staggered
1424 terms, and the committee shall elect its chair.

1425 7.4.2 The members of the university committee will be elected by the
1426 probationary and tenured faculty unit employees from each college
1427 and the General Unit. Only faculty who have previously served on
1428 their College level committee are eligible to be elected^[Ken100]. Each
1429 department in the college shall be informed of the pending selection
1430 and may nominate one person. Each college retention, tenure, and
1431 promotion committee will select at least two of those nominated to
1432 place before the electorate of its college. No one elected may serve
1433 as a member of a department or college retention, tenure, or
1434 promotion committee in the same Academic year.

1435 7.4.3 The Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs shall schedule the

1436 university committee. He/she may meet with the committee only if
1437 invited to do so.^[Ken101]

1438 7.4.4 The university committee shall review the following cases:

1439 7.4.4.1 All candidates for promotion to Professor, whether
1440 unanimous at lower levels or not.^[Ken102]

1441 7.4.4.2 Candidates for retention which have received any
1442 negative votes or recommendations at earlier levels of
1443 review.

1444 7.4.4.3 Candidates for tenure or for promotion to Associate who
1445 have received a negative recommendation at any earlier
1446 level of review, or whose evaluation (positive or negative)
1447 at an earlier level of review represents a borderline case
1448 by the standards described in 4.1, as determined by the
1449 committee.

1450 7.4.4.4 Any additional cases (e.g., cases that are unanimous at
1451 all levels for retention, tenure, or promotion to Associate)
1452 the university committee may choose to review or not to
1453 review based upon its workload and judgment. If it
1454 chooses not to review a (unanimous) case, it will append
1455 a statement explaining that it declines to review the case
1456 and recommends that the results of the earlier
1457 evaluations be implemented.

1458 7.4.5 ^[Ken103]The recommendation of the University Retention, and Tenure,
1459 and Promotion Committee, and a statement of reasons for its
1460 recommendation, shall be included in the dossier, and copies sent
1461 to the candidate, the college dean and committee, and the
1462 department chair and committee.^[Ken104]

1463 7.4.6 The Provost shall make a recommendation in any case reviewed by
1464 the university committee, and that recommendation shall be made
1465 in writing and included in the dossier, with a copy sent to the
1466 candidate, the college dean and committee, and the department
1467 chair and committee. When the recommendation is contrary to the
1468 recommendation of the university committee, a statement of
1469 reasons shall also be given in writing.^[Ken105]

1470 7.5 Periods of Review

1471 7.5.1 For retention and tenure candidates, the period of review shall
1472 begin with appointment to probationary service and continue to the
1473 time of the review.

1474 7.5.2 For promotion candidates, the period of review shall begin on the
1475 closing date specified for the last successful promotion, or, if there
1476 has been no prior promotion, on the date of the initial appointment
1477 to tenure-track service and continue to the time of the review.

1478 7.5.3 The period of review shall include the years for which any service
1479 credit was awarded.

1480 7.6 Decisions

1481 7.6.1 Announcement of final decisions. Second-year probationary faculty
1482 shall be notified of the President's decision regarding retention by
1483 February 15. Other probationary faculty shall be notified of the
1484 President's decision by June 1; if terminated, third-through-sixth-
1485 year probationary faculty shall receive a terminal year appointment.

1486 7.6.2 The President has the authority to make appointments, continue
1487 faculty members on probationary status, grant tenure, and grant
1488 promotions, though the President may choose to delegate this
1489 authority in whole or in part to the Provost.^[Ken106]

1490 7.6.3 The President shall notify the candidate in writing, giving the
1491 reasons for the decision. A copy of the decision shall be given to
1492 the faculty member and all review levels and shall be placed in the
1493 personnel file.

1494 7.6.4 When the presidential action is not consistent with the
1495 recommendation of the university committee, the President shall
1496 meet with the committee to discuss the reasons for the action.

1497 8.0 The Dossier

1498 8.1 Formal name. Personnel recommendations for retention, tenure or
1499 promotion of each faculty member shall be based upon written information
1500 and documentation contained in his/her personnel file or dossier. (In the
1501 Agreement, the dossier is known as the Working Personnel Action File.)

1502 8.2 Preparation of the Dossier

1503 8.2.1 Candidate's responsibilities. Candidates shall be responsible for
1504 preparing their dossiers. It shall be the primary responsibility of the
1505 faculty member under review to gather the necessary evidence and
1506 to prepare an index to the material contained in the dossier. That
1507 index shall be placed in the faculty member's permanent personnel
1508 file at the close of the year's deliberations, to provide an accurate
1509 record of all materials reviewed.

1510 8.2.2 Department Chair's responsibilities. The department chair or

1511 school or division director shall inform in writing faculty members
1512 who are to be reviewed of the nature of materials required by the
1513 retention and tenure committee and the date by which these
1514 materials must be received for the committee's consideration. It is
1515 the responsibility of the chair to ensure that a detailed description of
1516 the academic assignment of the faculty member for the period
1517 under review be placed in the dossier at least one week before the
1518 submission date of the dossier, in order to establish a frame of
1519 reference for evaluation of the candidate by persons from outside
1520 the department. The faculty member may attach a response to this
1521 statement, before the closing date; any such response shall also be
1522 included in the dossier. During the period that the dossier is open,
1523 it is the responsibility of the chair to ensure that the evidence
1524 necessary for a full and fair evaluation is contained in the
1525 dossier.^[Ken107]

1526 8.2.3 Mutual Responsibilities. The candidate should place in the dossier
1527 an accumulated record of all official evaluations undertaken during
1528 the period of review (e.g. the probationary period or the review
1529 period for promotion to Professor.) All recommendations and
1530 statements of reasons from previous years' committees and
1531 administrators shall be included in each subsequent dossier. This
1532 accumulated record of review from prior years of the review period
1533 shall be considered at all levels of review, beginning at the
1534 department level. All evaluators shall check to be sure that these
1535 documents are properly included.

1536 8.3 Documentation of the Period of Review

1537 8.3.1 The dossier shall contain material that documents achievements
1538 during the period of review and shall not document achievements
1539 that fall outside the period of review, with the exception that all
1540 important scholarly and professional accomplishments should be
1541 listed in a comprehensive vita.

1542 8.3.2 Materials that were previously submitted as "late additions" for
1543 consideration under a previously successful review are considered
1544 to be outside the current review period and are excluded from the
1545 dossier except on a comprehensive vita.

1546 8.4 Managing the Dossier^[Ken108]

1547 8.4.1 Closing Date. The accumulation and organization of materials
1548 within the dossier must be completed prior to a "closing date"
1549 established by the AVP for Faculty Affairs (see "Deadlines.")
1550 According to the Agreement, insertion of material after the date of
1551 this declaration other than by faculty and administrative evaluations

- 1552 generated during the evaluation cycle and responses or rebuttals
1553 by the faculty unit employee being evaluated is not normally
1554 permitted. (15.12b.)
- 1555 8.4.2 Missing materials. According to the Agreement (Section 15.12.b.),
1556 if, during the review process, the absence of materials required by
1557 this policy is discovered, the dossier shall be returned to the level at
1558 which the requisite documentation should have been provided and
1559 the materials provided in a timely manner.
- 1560 8.4.3 Late Add Materials. Insertion of material after the dossier has
1561 been officially closed (see “Deadlines”) must have the approval of a
1562 committee consisting of one member elected from and by each
1563 college committee and shall be limited to items that became
1564 accessible after the dossier is closed. Material inserted in this
1565 fashion shall be returned to the initial personnel committee for
1566 review, evaluation and comment before consideration at
1567 subsequent levels of review.
- 1568 8.4.4 Unsolicited materials. In addition to materials required by policy
1569 and/or provided by the candidate, the Agreement (Section 15.8)
1570 permits the inclusion of additional information provided by faculty
1571 unit employees, students, external reviewers, and academic
1572 administrators. For such materials to be inserted into the dossier
1573 without the consent of the candidate, they must be submitted to the
1574 Department Chair or Dean before the closing date, and they must
1575 subsequently be inspected by the AVP for Faculty Affairs to
1576 determine a) if the insertion is allowed under the Collective
1577 Bargaining Agreement, and b) that the insertion is both germane to
1578 the criteria of this policy and neither prejudicial nor defamatory. If
1579 the insertion is allowed, then the candidate must be afforded at
1580 least seven days to insert a response to the material.^[Ken109]
- 1581 8.5 Format and organization. The organizational structure of the dossier shall
1582 be determined by the AVP for Faculty Affairs in consultation with the
1583 Professional Standards Committee. Dossiers shall be provided in
1584 electronic form in a manner that secures their confidentiality and integrity,
1585 that facilitates a full and fair review, and that minimizes workload on the
1586 part of preparers and reviewers. .
- 1587 8.6 Narrative Statements
- 1588 8.6.1 The dossier shall be prefaced with a narrative statement by the
1589 candidate. Narrative statements should indicate familiarity with the
1590 criteria and standards of this policy.
- 1591 8.6.2 The candidate’s narrative statement shall be a single, substantiated

1592 argument for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. The narrative will
1593 explain the candidate's philosophy, agenda, and accomplishments
1594 in all three areas of review as well as any areas of synergy or
1595 overlap between the three areas. The narrative statement shall be
1596 limited to no more than 2000 words in length.

1597 8.6.3 The narrative statement shall cite evidence to support its argument
1598 by referring to specific documents included elsewhere in the
1599 dossier.

1600 8.6.3.1 Teaching faculty should construct statements explaining
1601 their teaching philosophies and their strategies for
1602 achieving student learning, citing appropriate course
1603 materials, evaluations, or assessment data to document
1604 increasing effectiveness as teachers. Similarly, non
1605 teaching faculty should take the opportunity to cite
1606 appropriate evidence to document their growing
1607 effectiveness in their academic assignment.

1608 8.6.3.2 Candidates should explain their scholarly or artistic or
1609 professional growth by showing how their work shows a
1610 continuity of development and progresses to culminating
1611 achievements. The narrative should aim to show a
1612 consistent pattern of achievement.

1613 8.6.3.3 Candidates should detail their service responsibilities and
1614 link the explanation to specific examples of successfully
1615 completed assignments.

1616 8.6.3.4 Candidates should, whenever possible, explain how
1617 accomplishments in each of the three categories may
1618 have supported their growth and development in the
1619 other two. For example, faculty who include students to
1620 assist with their research should indicate how their
1621 research agenda benefits student learning, or faculty who
1622 do extensive student service activities could indicate how
1623 this helps inform their teaching. [Ken110]

1624 8.7 Responses. Candidates shall indicate that they have read the
1625 recommendations of each committee and administrator.

1626 8.7.1 If candidates disagree with any recommendation, they have the
1627 right to respond in writing to those recommendations within ten
1628 calendar days after receiving the recommendations. Responses
1629 should be addressed to the next higher faculty committee but
1630 should be delivered to the administrative office currently holding the
1631 dossier for placement in the dossiers. [Ken111]

1632 8.7.2 Candidates may also request a meeting be held to discuss the
1633 recommendation within ten days after receipt of the
1634 recommendation (see the Collective Bargaining Agreement 15.5.)
1635 If requested, the meeting should be held with the author of the
1636 particular recommendation in question, such as the Chair, Dean, or
1637 Provost, or with the Chair of the particular committee responsible
1638 for the recommendation. [Ken112]

1639 8.7.3 Dossiers shall be forwarded to the next level no earlier than the
1640 tenth day after faculty unit members have been notified of the
1641 recommendations made. Responses or rebuttals received within
1642 the ten-day limit must accompany the dossiers. [Ken113]