

7
8 **Policy Recommendation**
9 **Amendment I to University Policy S15-8**
10 **Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty**
11 **Employees: Criteria and Standards**

12 Legislative History: This is the second of two policy proposals intended to add
13 information about administrative recusal of RTP committee members to S15-7 and S15-
14 8.

15
16 Rationale: S15-8 includes a recommendation on self-recusal in the case of bias (or
17 appearance of bias), but the availability of administrative recusal is not
18 described in policy (nor widely known among faculty). This proposal would
19 amend S15-8 to include information that such a procedure exists and how
20 to report a suspected conflict of interest or bias.

21
22 Resolved That section 3.2 of S15-8 (Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular
23 Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standardssjsu s) be modified as follows:
24

25 **3.0 Evaluation of Achievements**

26 3.1 At each level of review, committees and administrators will provide written
27 recommendations or decisions that evaluate levels of achievement in each of
28 the three categories. These evaluations shall classify the candidate's level of
29 achievement in each category by describing it in terms of one of the four
30 levels described below (3.3) and provide a detailed rationale for the
31 classification.

32 3.1.1 In extraordinary times when the campus community is impacted by an
33 emergency that would hinder the typical career (e.g., natural disaster,
34 campus closure, and similar events), the President may declare that a
35 serious campus-wide disruption to normal faculty activities has
36 occurred. If so, committees and evaluators shall adjust their analysis of
37 the levels of achievement of candidates in the following way: in addition
38 to evaluating all documented achievements of candidates as per
39 normal, they shall also consider the trajectory of each candidate's
40 professional development prior to the disruption and determine whether
41 that trajectory would normally have allowed the faculty member to meet
42 the policy standards.

43 3.2 It is the role of evaluators to judge the level of achievement regardless of
44 the form it takes, while respecting the academic freedom and professional
45 choices made by each candidate. Evaluators should not substitute their own
46 preferences for policy and should recuse themselves if necessary to avoid
47 the possibility (or the appearance) of bias. **If any faculty member, including a**
48 **candidate, believes a committee member may have a bias or conflict of**
49 **interest that could affect their impartiality, that person should report their**
50 **concerns to their college Dean and/or Faculty Services before deliberations**
51 **begin. Faculty Services will determine whether recusal is necessary**
52 **following administrative recusal guidelines.**

53 Evaluators who ~~recuse themselves~~ **are recused** ~~should~~ **shall** abstain from
54 voting and absent themselves from discussion of a case. Examples of
55 attitudes that would warrant recusal include (but are not limited to)

56 3.2.1 Hostility toward a candidate's ideology as expressed in a research
57 agenda.

58 3.2.2 Opposition to a candidate's choice of pedagogy when the pedagogy is
59 exercised appropriately under curricular policy.

60 3.2.3 Dislike of a candidate's emphasis in professional development when
61 the emphasis is permitted by policy.

62 3.2.4 Any personal or professional conflicts-of-interest such as those
63 delineated in the University's policy on Academic Freedom and
64 Professional Responsibility.

65

66 Approved: February 13, 2023

67 Vote: 9-0-1

68 Present: Barrera, French, Gómez, Kazemifar, Maldonado, Monday, Pruthi, Riley,
69 Smith, Wang

70 Absent: None

71

72 Financial Impact: None

73 Workload Impact: None anticipated

74