

**SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**Academic Senate**  
**Professional Standards Committee**

**April 6, 2015**

**AS 1561**

**First Reading**

**POLICY RECOMMENDATION:**  
**APPOINTMENT, RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION**  
**CRITERIA, STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES**  
**FOR REGULAR FACULTY EMPLOYEES**  
**Rescinds S98-8**

Resolved: That S98-8 be rescinded and replaced with the following policy according to the following time schedule and conditions:

1. Implementation of Retention and Procedures:

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

2. Implementation of Criteria and Standards

- a) In this discussion the attached policy sections 2 (Categories of Achievement), 3 (Evaluation of Achievements), and 4 (Standards for Tenure and Promotion) will be referred to as the Criteria and Standards of the new policy.
- b) In this discussion sections of S98-8 II (Criteria) V.B (Standards for Tenure), and VI.B (Standards for Promotion) will be referred to as the Criteria and Standards of the old policy—excluding the sections on retention.
- c) The Criteria and Standards for the New Policy will be effective for all tenure/tenure track faculty appointed for AY 2016/17 and subsequently.
- d) The Criteria and Standards for the New Policy will be effective for all tenure/tenure track faculty regardless of appointment date beginning in AY 2020/21 (after five years).
- e) 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 the new policy. Faculty who choose to be evaluated under the new 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.

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

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; be it further

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

*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*

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.<sup>[Ken1]</sup>

#### 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.<sup>[Ken2]</sup>

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.<sup>[Ken3]</sup>

#### 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. <sup>[Ken4]</sup>

#### 226 2.2 Effectiveness in Academic Assignment

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

to support the educational mission of San Jose 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. [Ken5]

2.2.2 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 consider all available sources of information. [Ken6]

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

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

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

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

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

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. <sup>[Ken11]</sup>

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.<sup>[Ken12]</sup> 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

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

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

## 2.4 Service

2.4.1 The third basic category for evaluation is service to the department (or equivalent), college (or equivalent), university and community. 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. [Ken23]

### 2.4.2 Types of Service

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

2.4.3 Significant service should be systematically evaluated and

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

#### 2.4.4 Considerations for Applying the Criteria for Service

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

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

### 3.0 Evaluation of Achievements

3.1 At each level of review, committees and administrators will provide written 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 five levels described below (3.3) and provide a detailed rationale for the classification. [Ken27].

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 as per section 7.152. 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. [Ken28]

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

#### 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 and not optional for such units [Ken30]

#### 3.3.1.3 Criteria for teaching faculty

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

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

classes taught.

3.3.1.3.5 Truly Outstanding<sup>[Ken32]</sup>. In addition to an excellent performance as described above, this level of achievement is reserved for candidates whose teaching impact goes beyond the students they directly reach. Truly Outstanding teachers have received recognition for their teaching. They may have served as teaching mentors to other faculty, they may have received teaching awards from students, departments, or colleges, they may have published on pedagogy or curriculum, they may have created curriculum that is adopted at other institutions, they may be deeply engaged with alums and former students in enriching their professional and community lives.

### 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 Needs improvement. The candidate has not documented scholarly/artistic/professional accomplishments that meet the baseline level as described below.

3.3.2.3 Baseline. The candidate has documented scholarly/artistic/professional achievements that show 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 documented 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, or SJSU 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.

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

### 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 Needs improvement. 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.

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 some leadership, such as serving as an elected Chair of a group or committee that produced something of significance, such as a successful administrative or faculty search, a policy reform, a curricular change, an accreditation report, etc.

3.3.3.5 Excellent. In addition to a good performance as described above, the candidate has documented significant influence at the University, system, or national level. 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. This may include leading University task forces and administrative searches, positions of Senate leadership, leadership in CFA, leadership in professional organizations, and similar activities.

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

### 3.4 Department Guidelines for Achievement [Ken33]

#### 3.4.1 Purpose of Guidelines

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

Outstanding,” “Excellent,” “Good” and “Baseline,” within its discipline(s).<sup>[Ken37]</sup>

3.4.2.4 For Academic Assignment and Service) each department may describe what is expected to attain “Truly Outstanding,” “Excellent,” and “Good” levels of achievement within its discipline(s). “Baseline” levels for Academic Assignment and for Service shall be judged exclusively according to the policy language in 3.3.<sup>[Ken38]</sup>

3.4.2.5 Departments which contain more than one discipline, or which contain very different subdisciplines, may produce more than one set of specialized guidelines. When this occurs, particular care must be taken to specify to which faculty each set of guidelines applies. The applicable guidelines should be specified in appointment letters and the Chair’s description of assignment.<sup>[Ken39]</sup>

### 3.4.3 Approval of Department Guidelines

3.4.3.1 Department Guidelines must be approved by a vote of department probationary and tenured faculty, using secret ballots. <sup>[Ken40]</sup>

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

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

3.4.3.4 Department guidelines should meet these conditions:

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

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

as per 3.5<sup>[Ken42]</sup>.

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

#### 3.4.4 Publication, Distribution, and Use of Guidelines

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

3.4.4.2 Continuity of guidelines throughout review period.

Normally, any valid (current) guidelines must be included in each candidate's dossier. If, however, guidelines have changed during the candidate's period of review, the candidate shall have the right to choose to include either the old or the new guidelines. Similarly, if guidelines that were valid during a part of the candidate's period of review are no longer valid and have not been replaced, the candidate may choose between including the old guidelines or including no guidelines. Only one set of guidelines may appear in the dossier, and reviewers are restricted to only considering included guidelines. <sup>[Ken43]</sup>

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

3.4.4.4 Guidelines are inclusive and not exclusive in nature. They shall not be used to exclude accomplishments from consideration that were unanticipated when the guidelines were created. When candidates submit genuine accomplishments that were not anticipated in the guidelines, the accomplishments will be assessed using the policy language outlined in 3.3.<sup>[Ken44]</sup>

#### 3.5 Resources and scholarly, artistic or professional achievements

3.5.1 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 equipment and travel. The necessary resources will vary according to the individual, the discipline and the level of achievement sought.

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

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

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. Since tenure is the most important decision the University makes with regard to faculty, the level of achievement required for an early tenure decision is particularly high. [Ken49]

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

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

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

## 4.2 Promotion to Professor

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

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

4.2.2.1 Baseline, Good, Truly Outstanding

4.2.2.2 Baseline, Excellent, Excellent

4.2.2.3 Good, Good, Excellent



#### 4.2.3 Early decisions

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

### 5.0 Developmental Reviews and Standards for Retention<sup>[Ken52]</sup>

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

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

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

### 5.2 Timing of developmental reviews

- 5.2.1 Normally, probationary faculty shall submit materials for



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

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

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

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

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

1047 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<sup>[Ken66]</sup>. 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. <sup>[Ken67]</sup>

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 7.1.3.2 Candidates should verify their ability to serve during the  
1178 scheduled meeting times. If necessary and feasible,  
1179 Deans and Chairs should adjust members' teaching  
1180 schedules to accommodate their ability to attend the  
1181 scheduled meetings. If an elected member has an  
1182 unresolvable conflict with the meeting schedule, that  
1183 member should promptly notify the Dean and Chair who  
1184 should arrange to replace the member via a special  
1185 election prior to the beginning of committee deliberations.  
1186

[Ken76]

1187  
1188 7.1.3.3 No one may serve during the same review cycle on more  
1189 than one level of committee; membership on the  
1190 University committee, a college committee, or a  
1191 department committee precludes membership on the  
1192 other two.  
1193

1194 7.1.3.4 All departments with four or more active Professors are  
1195 expected to provide members/nominees to higher level  
1196 committees. Departments with three or fewer active  
1197 Professors may provide members/nominees to higher  
1198 level committees by supplementing their department level  
1199 committee with external faculty (if needed) as per 7.2.7.  
1200 A department with insufficient faculty to provide a  
1201 representative to a College level committee may elect a  
1202 representative from outside its department in a related  
1203 discipline, or it may elect another department's elected  
1204 representative as a designee to explain the department's  
1205 criteria and context to the College committee.  
1206

#### 1207 7.1.4 Quorums

1208

1209 A simple majority of the full membership of the committee must be  
1210 present to obtain a quorum necessary in order to conduct business.  
1211 In all personnel recommendations, a simple majority of those voting  
1212 prevails. [Ken77] A quorum is determined at the beginning of the  
1213 meeting, prior to any members removing themselves for purposes  
1214 of abstention. [Ken78]  
1215

#### 1216 7.1.5 Voting procedures for all decisions

1217

1218 7.1.5.1 Voting. College and University committees and any  
1219 Department committees consisting solely of tenured  
1220 Professors may devise their own voting procedures. [Ken79]  
1221 Department Committees with members of less than full  
1222 rank shall always vote by written secret ballot. |



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

#### 7.1.5.2 Abstentions

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

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

#### 7.1.6 Voting for Tenure and Promotion

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

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

#### 7.1.7 Voting for Retention

For retention there will be one vote to “retain” or “do not retain.”

1269  
1270 7.1.8 Recording Committee recommendations. Committees shall write  
1271 reports for each case stating the reasons for all votes cast. (An  
1272 abstention is not considered a "vote" for this purpose.) A statement  
1273 of these reasons shall be included in a single report from the  
1274 committee, with the possibility of a separate "minority" report. In  
1275 either case, the confidentiality of voting shall be maintained, and  
1276 signatures on the report(s) shall not indicate how individual  
1277 members voted when recommendations are not unanimous.[Ken84].  
1278

1279 7.1.9 Confidentiality. All personnel materials, proceedings, and  
1280 recommendations are confidential, except (a) that positive final  
1281 decisions may be announced; (b) that each faculty member shall  
1282 have access to materials in his/her personnel files as provided by  
1283 law, the Agreement, and Trustee policy; and (c) that any individual  
1284 may voluntarily disclose materials from his/her personnel file at an  
1285 appropriate proceeding, such as a grievance or court hearing.[Ken85]  
1286

1287 7.1.10 Deadlines. Deadlines for the procedural steps provided herein  
1288 shall be established at the start of the academic year by the  
1289 Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs. Deadlines shall  
1290 include a specific closing date "at which time the Personnel Action  
1291 File is declared complete with respect to documentation of  
1292 performance for the purpose of evaluation," as required by the  
1293 Agreement (Section 15.12.b). If any stage of the review has not  
1294 been completed within the specified time, the performance review  
1295 shall automatically be transferred to the next review level and the  
1296 faculty member shall be so notified. The calendar with deadlines  
1297 shall be communicated to all faculty subject in a given academic  
1298 year to personnel actions governed by this policy.[Ken86]  
1299  
1300

## 1301 7.2 Department Committees.

1302 7.2.1 Departments will establish one or more committees to recommend  
1303 retention, tenure, and promotion decisions. (For example, a  
1304 department could establish one committee of Professors for  
1305 reviewing promotions to Professor, and a committee of Associates  
1306 and Professors for reviewing tenure and promotion to Associate.)  
1307 Members of department committees will be elected by the vote of  
1308 probationary and tenured faculty. Department decisions about  
1309 committee structure shall also be made by vote of the tenured and  
1310 probationary faculty of the department. [Ken87]

1311 7.2.2 Membership on personnel committees for the purpose of  
1312 deliberating or voting on personnel recommendations is limited to  
1313 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.<sup>[Ken98]</sup>

#### 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.<sup>[Ken99]</sup> 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<sup>[Ken100]</sup>. 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.<sup>[Ken101]</sup>

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.<sup>[Ken102]</sup>

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 <sup>[Ken103]</sup>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.<sup>[Ken104]</sup>

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.<sup>[Ken105]</sup>

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.<sup>[Ken106]</sup>

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.<sup>[Ken107]</sup>

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<sup>[Ken108]</sup>

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.<sup>[Ken109]</sup>

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]