

**SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
ONE WASHINGTON SQUARE
SAN JOSE, CA 95192**

S15-7, Amendment A [Note: University Policy F15-1, Adjusting the Timing of Performance Reviews during the Transition to the New System for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)] renamed S15-7, Amendment A on March 21, 2016

Legislative History: Amends S15-7 (RTP Procedures)

At its meeting of September 14, 2015, the Academic Senate approved the following policy recommendation presented by Senator Peter for the Professional Standards Committee.

Action by University President: Approved and signed by Interim President Susan W. Martin on September 18, 2015

**University Policy:
Adjusting the Timing of Performance Reviews During the
Transition to the New System for Retention, Tenure, and
Promotion (RTP) Amends S15-7 (RTP Procedures)**

Resolved: That the following be inserted as a sixth and final resolved clause to S15-7, and be edited into the public copies of S15-7:

Resolved: Any probationary faculty member who has completed a performance review under S98-8 prior to Fall 2016 (e.g., received a second year review during AY 2015-16 or earlier) shall continue to be reviewed under the timeline (2-4-6) begun under the old policy until the tenure decision is completed. The AVP for Faculty Affairs, in consultation with the Professional Standards Committee, shall be further empowered to adjust the

implementation of this policy to accommodate other issues that may arise as a result of the transition from S98-8 to S15-7. This clause will expire at the end of AY 2019-20.

Rationale: One of the reasons PS recommended that our RTP policies be adopted a year in advance of their implementation was to give the campus sufficient time and notice to anticipate implementation issues and head off problems. One such issue has been detected and this amendment will correct the problem.

Under our old policy, probationary faculty were reviewed in their 2nd and 4th probationary years prior to the final tenure decision being made in their 6th year. Under the new policy they will be reviewed in their 3rd year, with the possibility of an additional review in their 4th or 5th year, prior to the final and decisive review in their 6th year. The problem concerns the transition to the new system for people who have already started their review cycle under the old system.

Under S98-8 (the old policy) faculty who are in their 2nd year this year are being reviewed. Next year S15-7 goes into effect and all 3rd year faculty are to be reviewed. This would mean that this cohort of faculty would be reviewed two years in a row.

A worse problem is that faculty who are currently in their 3rd year will miss both the 3rd year review of the new policy and the 4th year review of the old policy, and progress to the final tenure decision without having had any full review.

What this simple amendment does is to keep all faculty who have started their review cycle on the old timeline on the same 2-4-6 timeline. This eliminates both of the problems just mentioned. Faculty who are currently in their 1st year, however, will be the first cohort to fully utilize the new 3+ 6 review cycle.

One very important note: the timing of reviews is completely unrelated to a faculty member's privilege to choose between the old and new Criteria and Standards during the transitional period. Staying with the old timing cycle does not necessarily mean staying with the old Criteria and Standards—this remains a faculty member's choice.

The second sentence in this amendment adds a temporary "elastic clause" to the policy to allow the AVP for Faculty Affairs to make additional adjustments that may be required during implementation. We hope that this may prevent the need to come to the Senate with additional amendments for temporary issues during the transition.

Approved: (August 31, 2015)
Vote: (7-0-0)
Present: (Peter, Green, White, Lee, Cuellar, Virick, Kauppila)
Absent: (Riley)
Financial Impact: No changes over the previous policy.
Workload Impact: No changes over the previous policy. The transition to a system which might involve fewer reviews would be delayed, but it is hard to estimate any impacts.