

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Professional Standards Committee**
4 **October 12, 2020**
5 **First Reading**

AS 1784

6
7
8 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
9 **Amendment D to University Policy, S15-8**
10 **Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees:**
11 **Criteria and Standards**
12 **To Provide Guidance regarding External Reviews**

13
14 **Resolved:** That S15-8 be amended as shown in the ~~strikeout~~ and underline of the
15 excerpted policy, with the text renumbered and formatted as shown.

16
17 **Rationale:** This policy recommendation began with a suggestion from the Provost to
18 provide more procedural guidance for those faculty who choose to solicit
19 external reviews of their Scholarly, Artistic, or Professional Achievement.
20 The existing policy does make provision for external reviews but is mostly
21 silent on when such reviews would be appropriate or how they would be
22 carried out. This amendment provides guidance for when external reviews
23 are most appropriate and on how reviewers should be selected. It makes
24 clear that departments may adopt their own procedures—as appropriate—
25 for conducting such reviews by writing them into their guidelines. It also
26 offers a brief “generic” approach for when reviews when requested in
27 departments that lack guidelines.

28
29 **Approved:** October 5, 2020

30 **Vote:** (9-0-0)

31 **Present:** Peter, Wang, Raman, Smith, Cargill, Saldamli, Riley, Quock,
32 Mahendra

33 **Absent:** Barerra, Monday

34 **Financial Impact:** No direct impact

35 **Workload Impact:** No direct impact

36
37
38

39 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
40 **Amendment D to University Policy, S15-8**
41 **Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees:**
42 **Criteria and Standards**
43 **To Provide Guidance regarding External Reviews**
44

45 2.3.1.3 Evaluation must be made by disciplinary peers. Acceptance of scholarly or
46 artistic work by an editorial or review board (or jury) constitutes an evaluation of
47 that work. Professional contributions should be evaluated by persons in a
48 position to assess the quality and significance of the contributions.
49

50 2.3.1.4 Candidates may request that disciplinary experts provide evaluations of any of
51 their work to be included in the dossier, but external reviews shall not otherwise
52 be required. External reviews are normally limited to the evaluation of
53 accomplishments that have not been formally peer reviewed (such as occurs with
54 public scholarship or as-yet unpublished works), and may be especially
55 appropriate when a department committee lacks appropriate expertise in the
56 candidate's scholarly, artistic, or professional specialization. Department
57 guidelines may describe timelines for requesting external reviews and
58 procedures for selecting reviewers. All external reviewers must be objective, and
59 any relationships that could compromise objectivity should be disclosed in the
60 evaluation. Reviewers should normally come from an institution similar to San
61 José State University. In the absence of department guidelines, a candidate
62 desiring external review of an achievement will nominate at least three reviewers
63 and the Department Chair shall select from among the nominees.
64

65 2.3.1.45 Published or otherwise completed works that are peer-reviewed or juried will
66 normally receive the greatest weight. Work in progress and unpublished work
67 should be assessed whenever possible. In cases where there is no external
68 evaluation of an achievement the department committee will review the work and
69 indicate the extent of its quality and significance.