

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate
Professional Standards Committee
April 27, 2015
Final Reading

AS 1568

POLICY RECOMMENDATION
RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION
FOR REGULAR FACULTY EMPLOYEES:
CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

Rescinds S98-8

Resolved: That S98-8 be rescinded and replaced with the following policy according to the following time schedule and conditions:

- 1) This policy will be effective for all tenure/tenure track faculty appointed for AY 2016/17 and subsequently.
- 2) This policy will be effective for all tenure/tenure track faculty regardless of appointment date beginning in AY 2020/21 (after five years).
- 3) During a transition, tenure/tenure track faculty appointed before AY 2016/17 shall have the choice to be evaluated using the criteria and standards of the old policy or according to this policy. (The criteria and standards of the old policy means these sections of S98-8: II (Criteria) V.B (Standards for Tenure), and VI.B (Standards for Promotion) excluding the procedural sections on retention.)
- 4) Faculty who choose to be evaluated under this policy may not subsequently return to be evaluated by the criteria and standards of the old. Their decision must be made prior to the faculty member's next performance review and be included as a statement in the beginning of the Working Personnel Action File (i.e. the dossier) for all performance reviews during the transition period.
- 5) The Office of Faculty Affairs will devise a method by which the personnel committees and other reviewing bodies may readily distinguish between candidates being evaluated under S98-8 and the attached policy (e.g., different color binders).
- 6) Resolution of discrepancies during the transition. The choice between the old and new criteria and standards applies to those sections of policy explicitly identified above, but also to any other sections of policy scattered elsewhere in the overall policy that clearly reference criteria

and standards. If there is ambiguity about whether the old or the new sections apply, the AVP for Faculty Affairs shall define which applies.

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

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

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

In AY 2013-14 the committee spent the first half of the year exploring alternative policies, surveying both within and outside the CSU. Ultimately we proposed that the new policy be designed around three criteria corresponding to the most commonly accepted traditional divisions of faculty development: Academic Assignment (teaching for most but not all faculty), Scholarly/Artistic/Professional achievement, and Service. Furthermore, we proposed that faculty should receive an evaluation of their achievements in each of these three categories, with their tenure or promotion dependent upon their overall level of achievement accumulated across all three areas. This plan was endorsed by the Senate in SS-F13-8, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Endorsing a Proposal to Reform the SJSU Policy on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion by Adopting the "Flexible Achievement" Plan."

Armed with the Senate's support for our general approach, the committee began the long task of rewriting the policy. The debate over SS-F13-8, however, did expose one significant concern. In dividing the evaluation of faculty into three categories some feared that faculty who embraced synergistic practices (that cut across the categories) might be placed at a disadvantage. In response to this concern, the committee drafted language that emphasizes the value of such synergies. .

In AY 2014-15 the committee has spent the year working on revised language, section by section and at times word by word. Even a simple paragraph may have received an hour or two of debate in committee, as we examined conflicts with the current Collective Bargaining Agreement and considered the numerous problems identified with the old policy in recent years. The committee is not finished, and if truth be told—the ARTP Policy needs far more regular oversight than it has received over

104 *the past 17 years. The current draft is a major step forward to address*
105 *those original concerns expressed to us about transparency, fairness, and*
106 *flexibility while maintaining high standards for all phases of Appointment,*
107 *Retention, Tenure, and Promotion, but Professional Standards intends to*
108 *continue to monitor and update the policy regularly as was the practice*
109 *prior to 1998.*

110 *Approved: (April 20, 2015)*

111 *Vote: (7-1-0)*

112 *Present: (Peter, Green, Lee, Mathur, Fatoohi, Fujimoto, Riley, Dresser)*

113 *Absent: (Romero, White)*

114 *Financial Impact: Few direct impacts beyond the existing ARTP processes*

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

RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION

FOR REGULAR FACULTY EMPLOYEES:

CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

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

1.1 Flexibility in Professional Development:

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

1.2 Fair Process of Evaluation by Peers:

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

1.3 Clear Standards for Advancement

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

1.3.2 Positive faculty development depends upon a clear understanding of the standards for advancement. Standards for retention, tenure and promotion must be clear and available to faculty members throughout their period of review.

158 1.4 Integration of Professional Development and Holistic Evaluation.

159 1.4.1 Categories of Achievement are devices that should prompt
160 evaluators to consider all dimensions of a candidate's professional
161 development. The categories should promote a holistic evaluation
162 of the effectiveness of a faculty member in serving the mission of
163 San José State University, and reviewers should apply this policy
164 with a holistic temperament.

165 1.4.2 San José State encourages faculty to integrate the various
166 components of their academic career whenever the outcome
167 enhances student success, faculty achievement, and the university
168 mission.

169 1.5 Definitions

170 1.5.1 This document pertains to all regular tenure track/tenured faculty of
171 the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement. This includes
172 Professors, Librarians, and Counselors. When the document uses
173 the term Professor, or Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor it
174 applies to the equivalent titles in the other professions, such as for
175 Counselors (Student Services Professional - Academic Related I,
176 II, and III), or Librarian, Associate Librarian, or Assistant Librarian.

177 1.5.2 When this document refers to colleges it means those colleges that
178 administer departments which are home to Unit 3 tenure/tenure
179 track faculty. This excludes the College of International and
180 Extended Studies.

181 1.6 Maintenance of the Policy

182 1.6.1 Interpretation and Implementation. The AVP for Faculty Affairs is
183 responsible for interpreting this policy and supervising its
184 implementation. When significant issues of interpretation arise, the
185 AVP for Faculty Affairs will consult with the Professional Standards
186 Committee.

187 1.6.2 This policy shall be reviewed by the Professional Standards
188 Committee at least once during each six year cycle; the first review
189 shall occur no later than AY 2021-2022.

190 2.0 Categories of Achievement:

191 2.1 Synergism amongst Categories of Evaluation. There are three basic
192 categories of achievement, each of which warrants careful and individual
193 evaluation. However, at a comprehensive university with a broad mission,
194 there is extensive overlap that could occur amongst these categories. In
195 such cases, evaluators should be careful to ascertain the extent of which
196 the categories overlap to enhance the mission of the university. Levels of
197 achievement should be awarded appropriately not only in the individual
198 categories but also for the level of synergism that could not have been
199 achieved without the overlap.

2.2 Effectiveness in Academic Assignment

2.2.1 Academic Assignment is the specific role given to a faculty member to support the educational mission of San José State University. Academic Assignment is the primary, but not the only, consideration in evaluating a faculty member's performance and is the essential condition for continuation and advancement within the university. For most faculty, academic assignment consists primarily of teaching. For some faculty, such as department chairpersons, coordinators, counselors, librarians and field supervisors, part or all of their academic assignment is of a non-teaching nature, and they should be evaluated accordingly.

2.2.2 Considerations in applying the criteria for Academic Assignment to teaching.

2.2.2.1 When evaluating effectiveness in teaching, chairs, committees, and administrators are required to conduct a holistic evaluation. The teaching must be considered in the context of its purpose, its objectives, and the degree of difficulty of the assignment. Evaluators must be well versed in the University policy F12-6 "Evaluation of Effectiveness in Teaching" and especially the most recent "SOTE/SOLATE Interpretation Guide.

2.2.2.2 Examples of contextual factors include whether the teaching resulted from newly created or substantially modified curricula; participation in team or interdisciplinary teaching; the adoption of new pedagogical or technological approaches; whether the level or kind of teaching or number of students created special demands or challenges; and the extent to which student learning occurs outside formal instruction through mentoring, advising, or the integration of students into a research program.

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

2.3 Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement

2.3.1 The second basic category for evaluation is scholarly/artistic/professional achievement. Such contributions to a faculty member's discipline or professional community are expected for continuation and advancement in the university. This category is subdivided into three areas: scholarly, artistic, and professional; this division is for ease of reference only. These three areas are

not perfectly distinct and some candidates will demonstrate their disciplinary expertise within two or all three of the areas.

2.3.1.1 The nature of the expected contributions will vary according to the discipline, and may be more specifically defined in each department's guidelines.

2.3.1.2 The nature of contributions will also vary according to the faculty member's professional interests. Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievements may include original research that advances knowledge; or the synthesis of information across disciplines, topics, or time; or the application of disciplinary expertise within or outside the University; or the systematic study of teaching and learning within the discipline; or a combination of these forms of achievement.

2.3.1.3 Evaluation must be made by disciplinary peers. Acceptance of scholarly or artistic work by an editorial or review board (or jury) constitutes an evaluation of that work. Professional contributions should be evaluated by persons in a position to assess the quality and significance of the contributions. Candidates may request that disciplinary experts provide evaluations of any of their work to be included in the dossier. External reviewers must be objective, and any relationships that could compromise objectivity should be disclosed in the evaluation.

2.3.1.4 Completed works assessed by external disciplinary experts will normally receive the greatest weight. Work in progress and unpublished work should be assessed whenever possible. In cases where there is no external evaluation of an achievement the department committee will review the work and indicate the extent of its quality and significance.

2.3.2 Scholarly achievement includes work based on research and entailing theory, analysis, discovery, interpretation, explanation, or demonstration. Examples: books, articles, reviews, technical reports, computer software and hardware development, application for and/or awards of grants, papers read to scholarly associations, documentaries, works of journalism, patents, translations, etc.

2.3.3 Artistic achievement includes original work in poetry, fiction, drama, dance, the aural and visual arts; or performances or direction in music, theatre and dance often requiring interpretation, mastery of a skill, formal experimentation, etc.

2.3.4 Professional achievements involve the application of disciplinary

286 expertise whether within or outside the University. Professional
287 achievements will usually be evaluated within the category of
288 service, except in fields that demonstrate disciplinary credentials
289 through practical application of skills rather than through
290 scholarship. Such disciplines shall adopt department guidelines
291 that explain appropriate standards for evaluating these activities
292 and distinguishing them from the service category of achievement.
293 Examples of achievements that could qualify when explicated by
294 guidelines are listed under “Service to the Profession/Discipline”
295 below.

296 2.3.5 Consideration in applying the criteria for
297 Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement

298 2.3.5.1 Quality of publications and not simply enumeration.
299 Normally, the number or length of publications per se
300 shall not be a criterion for tenure or promotion, but shall
301 be considered along with the quality and significance of
302 the work in determining the level of achievement.
303 Department guidelines may be more specific about the
304 nature, venue, prestige, or impact of publications.

305 2.3.5.2 Research Grants. In recognition of the comprehensive
306 mission of San José State University and the teaching
307 load of its faculty, these criteria exclude any requirement
308 that faculty members must obtain external support as a
309 condition for tenure or advancement except as provided
310 below. However, all faculty who do seek and/or obtain
311 external funding should be appropriately credited.
312 Department guidelines may establish standards for
313 judging the level of achievement represented by the
314 efforts to seek and/or obtain external funding.

315 An explicit requirement that faculty must obtain external
316 support is permitted when the appointment letter
317 designates that grant writing and/or fundraising will
318 constitute the primary academic assignment of the
319 position rather than teaching (e.g. the director of a
320 research center, or gallery). Those so appointed must be
321 provided the appropriate assigned time and resources to
322 support a focus on the pursuit of external funding. Work
323 done under such circumstances must be evaluated.

324 2.3.5.3 The Scholarship of Teaching. Noting the particular
325 requirements for curricular development in a period of
326 changing pedagogies, expanded scholarship about
327 effective teaching, and students from increasingly varied
328 and diverse backgrounds, scholarship that focuses on
329 teaching and learning within a candidate’s discipline, and
330 which appears in peer reviewed publications, is explicitly

allowed and encouraged.

2.3.6 Resources and scholarly, artistic or professional achievements.

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

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

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

2.3.6.4 During each performance review, evaluators should consider the level of achievement of a candidate relative to the availability of resources provided.

2.4 Service

2.4.1 The third basic category for evaluation is service. Contributions in service are expected for continuation and advancement in the University. All faculty have an obligation to contribute to the governance of the institution and to enhance the surrounding community. Not all faculty, however, need contribute to the same degree, so it is the responsibility of evaluators to determine the level of achievement represented by a candidate's profile of service.

2.4.2 Types of Service. For ease of reference only, service may be divided into several areas. Examples:

2.4.2.1 Service to students. Advising, mentoring, and participating in activities to enhance student success that are not subsumed in teaching or the primary academic assignment.

2.4.2.2 Service to the University. Participation in the Academic Senate and its committees, search and review

373 committees, program coordinators and part-time
374 department chairs, leadership in the California Faculty
375 Association, membership in the Academic Senate of the
376 CSU, work on system-wide committees and task forces,
377 and administrative activities (to the extent that such
378 assignments are not the primary academic assignment),
379 and participation in campus organizations of benefit to
380 faculty or students.

381 2.4.2.3 Service to the Community. Participation in public interest
382 groups sponsored by or affiliated with the University;
383 Service in the local, state, national, or global communities
384 as a representative of SJSU.

385 2.4.2.4 Service to the Profession/Discipline (see also
386 Professional Achievement.) Consulting, service on
387 editorial boards or as editor of a professional journal or
388 newsletter; adjudicator, reviewer for publishers or other
389 agencies and associations. Public lectures, newspaper
390 editorials, television or radio analysis, honors and
391 awards. Active participation or leadership in disciplinary
392 or professional associations; organizing panels, activities
393 or workshops. Serving in accreditation or other
394 discipline-based review capacities, Service to K-14
395 educational segments.

396 2.4.3 Significant service should be systematically evaluated and
397 documented. Election to a position in a contested election is a form
398 of peer evaluation of service. Faculty should also request written
399 evaluation of significant service from persons in a position to know
400 the extent and quality of their contributions, such as the chair of a
401 committee.

402 2.4.4 Considerations for Applying the Criteria for Service

403 2.4.4.1 Service expectations increase with rank. As faculty gain
404 experience at the university, they will normally assume
405 greater responsibility for service activities at all levels.

406 2.4.4.2 Higher levels of service require higher standards for
407 evaluation. While fairly routine levels of service will often
408 be listed rather than evaluated, service accomplishments
409 involving leadership, the production of documents, the
410 management of organizations, and other tangible results
411 should be independently evaluated in order to be eligible
412 to be designated at higher levels of achievement.

413 3.0 Evaluation of Achievements

414 3.1 At each level of review, committees and administrators will provide written
415 recommendations or decisions that evaluate levels of achievement in each

of the three categories. These evaluations shall classify the candidate's level of achievement in each category by describing it in terms of one of the four levels described below (3.3) and provide a detailed rationale for the classification.

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

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

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

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

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

- 3.3 Criteria to be used when evaluating candidates for Promotion and Tenure

Following are the criteria that evaluators are to use in determining the level of achievement attained by faculty. These criteria may be supplemented, but not replaced, by department guidelines. Any valid department guidelines shall be placed in the dossier for review.

3.3.1 Academic Assignment

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

3.3.1.2 Criteria for non-teaching faculty.

Criteria for evaluating the Academic Assignment of non-teaching faculty, such as Librarians and Counselors, will be developed by the units as part of their department guidelines and will parallel the categories identified below, but will reference those specific responsibilities in their academic assignment rather than teaching. Department guidelines for academic assignment will be mandatory for such units.

3.3.1.3 Criteria for teaching faculty.

3.3.1.3.1 Unsatisfactory. The candidate has not documented teaching accomplishments that meet the baseline level as described below.

3.3.1.3.2 Baseline. 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 the nature, subject, and level of classes taught, are generally within the norms by the end of the review period, particularly for classes within 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 documented the use of high-impact practices in teaching. Candidates meeting this level of achievement have at least some student evaluations above the norms and relatively few below, when taken in context of the nature, subject, and level of classes taught.

3.3.1.3.4 Excellent. In addition to a good performance as described above, the candidate has either engaged in a higher level of curricular innovation

than described above, or documented widespread positive impacts for student success, or achieved both student and peer evaluations that are consistently within and above the norms when taken in context of the nature, subject, and level of classes taught. Excellent teachers may have received recognition or awards for their teaching, they may have mentored other teachers, or they may have created curriculum that is adopted at other institutions.

3.3.2 Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement

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

3.3.2.2 Unsatisfactory. The candidate has not created scholarly/artistic/professional accomplishments that meet the baseline level as described below.

3.3.2.3 Baseline. The candidate has, over the course of the period of review, created a body of scholarly/artistic/professional achievements that shows the promise of continued growth and success within his/her discipline.

3.3.2.4 Good. In addition to the baseline as described above, the candidate has created scholarly/artistic/professional achievements that constitute important contributions to the discipline and that help to enhance the scholarly/artistic/professional reputation of the candidate's department, school, college, SJSU, or the CSU more generally.

3.3.2.5 Excellent. In addition to a good performance as

described above, this level requires achievements of both sufficient quality and quantity to establish a significant, important, and growing reputation within the candidate's field. Excellence in scholarly/artistic/professional achievement requires a body of work that is widely recognized as significant within the discipline.

3.3.3 Service

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

3.3.3.2 Unsatisfactory. The candidate has not documented service activities that meet the baseline level described below.

3.3.3.3 Baseline. The candidate has undertaken a fair share of the workload required to keep the Department functioning well. This includes activities such as work on department committees, the creation, revision, or assessment of curricula, or participating in department planning, accreditation, outreach, and advising. While not required for tenure and promotion to Associate, a baseline level of achievement for promotion to Professor will also include at least some service at the University level.

3.3.3.4 Good. In addition to the baseline described above, the candidate has also participated in significant service activities beyond the department. This will usually include college-level service and may include University level service, service in the community, or significant activities in a professional organization. In at least one facet of service, the candidate will have demonstrated leadership resulting in tangible, documented achievements.

3.3.3.5 Excellent. In addition to a good performance as described above, the candidate has documented significant influence at a high level, whether it be service to students, the University, the community, or the

profession. Candidates who achieve an evaluation of “excellent” in service will generally have occupied several elected or appointed positions of leadership and will document multiple specific accomplishments that have significance for people beyond the candidate’s department or college.

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

4.1 Tenure and promotion to Associate

4.1.1 Timing of performance review for tenure and promotion.

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

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

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

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

4.1.3 Standard for tenure and promotion to Associate. When considered at the normal time, faculty must meet or exceed one of these profiles across the three categories:

4.1.3.1 Excellent in either Academic Assignment or in Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement and at least Baseline in the other two categories:

4.1.3.2 Good in any two categories and at least baseline in the remaining category.

4.1.4 Early decisions. Favorable early decisions require a significantly higher level of achievement than a favorable decision after the normal period of review. Candidates may be tenured and promoted

638 to Associate prior to the end of their probationary period if they
639 attain evaluations of Excellent in two categories and Baseline or
640 better in the remaining category.

641 4.2 Promotion to Professor

642 4.2.1 Timing of performance review for promotion to Professor. Under
643 normal circumstances, Associates may be considered for
644 promotion to Professor during their fifth year at the rank of
645 Associate, to be effective at the beginning of their sixth year at
646 rank. (Note that for faculty who earned promotion to Associate
647 prior to earning tenure, the review period for Professor begins with
648 the promotion to Associate and not with tenure.)

649 4.2.2 Standard for promotion to Professor. When considered at the
650 normal time, faculty must meet or exceed one of these profiles
651 across the three categories:

652 4.2.2.1 At least Excellent in two categories and at least Baseline
653 in the remaining category.

654 4.2.2.2 At least Excellent in one category and at least Good in
655 the remaining two categories.

656 4.2.3 Early decisions. Associates may be promoted to Professor prior to
657 serving five years in rank if they meet the standards for Excellent in
658 two categories and Good in one.

659 5.0 Standards for Retention

660 Probationary faculty must meet baseline standards in Academic Assignment to
661 be retained. It is expected that a candidate show increasing effectiveness in
662 teaching, or consistent effectiveness in the case of individuals whose teaching is
663 fully satisfactory from the start. Faculty members should not be retained if their
664 performance in teaching and in the other aspects of their academic assignment
665 falls below baseline standards, and is therefore not sufficient to warrant a
666 reasonable expectation that tenure will be granted at the end of the probationary
667 period.