

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

**S15-8, University Policy, Retention, Tenure and Promotion  
for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards**

**Rescinds S98-8**

**Effective: AY 2016-2017**

**Legislative History:**

At its meeting of April 27, 2015, the Academic Senate approved the following policy recommendation presented by Senator Peter for the Professional Standards Committee. This policy rescinds University Policy S98-8, the Appointment, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Criteria, Standards and Procedures for Regular Faculty Employees. On June 12, 2015, President Mohammad Qayoumi signed and approved University Policy S15-8.

On September 18, 2015, Interim President Susan W. Martin approved Amendment A to University Policy S15-8.

On May 4, 2020, President Mary A. Papazian signed and approved Amendment B to University Policy S15-8. The revised language in Amendment B seeks to correct a problem with the way the current language discusses the “norms” of our SOTES. Amendment B also inserts a reference to “course syllabi and other teaching materials.” Amendment A and B are incorporated into the policy below.

On September 21, 2020, President Mary A. Papazian signed and approved Amendment C to University Policy S15-8. Amendment C allows the President to declare a campus-wide emergency and provides for flexibility in RTP during these times.

On January 14, 2021, President Mary A. Papazian signed and approved Amendment D to University Policy S15-8. Amendment D removes the exclusion of the College of International and Extended Studies from S15-8 section 1.5.2.

Amendments A, B, C, and D are incorporated into the policy as follows:

# **University Policy**

## **Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards (includes Amendment A, B, C and D)**

Resolved: That S98-8 be rescinded and replaced with the following policy according to the following time schedule and conditions:

- 1) This policy will be effective for all tenure/tenure track faculty appointed for AY 2016/17 and subsequently.
- 2) This policy will be effective for all tenure/tenure track faculty regardless of appointment date beginning in AY 2021/22 (after six years.)
- 3) During a transition, tenure/tenure track faculty appointed before AY 2016/17 shall have the choice to be evaluated using the criteria and standards of the old policy or according to this policy. (The criteria and standards of the old policy means these sections of S98-8: II (Criteria) V.B (Standards for Tenure), and VI.B (Standards for Promotion) excluding the procedural sections on retention.)
- 4) Faculty who choose to be evaluated under this policy may not subsequently return to be evaluated by the criteria and standards of the old. Their decision must be made prior to the faculty member's next performance review and be included as a statement in the beginning of the Working Personnel Action File (i.e. the dossier) for all performance reviews during the transition period.
- 5) The Office of Faculty Affairs will devise a method by which the personnel committees and other reviewing bodies may readily distinguish between candidates being evaluated under S98-8 and the attached policy (e.g., different color binders).
- 6) Resolution of discrepancies during the transition. The choice between the old and new criteria and standards applies to those sections of policy explicitly identified above, but also to any other sections of policy scattered elsewhere in the overall policy that clearly reference criteria and standards. If there is ambiguity about whether the old or the new sections apply, the AVP Faculty Affairs shall define which applies.
- 7) The AVP 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 S15-8. This entire resolved clause will expire when no more faculty are covered by S98-8 and shall be edited out of public copies of S15-8.

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

Rationale: Prior to 1998, SJSU's ARTP policy was regularly revised every few years in response to changes in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, to problems encountered in implementation of the policy, and to changes in expectations and working conditions over time. In 2006 a major redraft of

this policy was produced after 6 years of work, but it was never signed into effect. The Senate temporarily lost interest after the failed effort, but it became increasingly clear that the existing policy was accumulating problems and inconsistencies with every passing year.

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

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

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

In AY 2014-15 the committee has spent the year working on revised language, section by section and at times word by word. Even a simple paragraph may have received an hour or two of debate in committee, as we examined conflicts with the current Collective Bargaining Agreement and considered the numerous problems identified with the old policy in recent years. The committee is not finished, and if truth be told—the ARTP Policy needs far more regular oversight than it has received over the past 17 years. The current draft is a major step forward to address those original concerns expressed to us about transparency, fairness, and flexibility while maintaining high standards for all phases of Appointment, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion, but Professional Standards intends to continue to monitor and update the policy regularly as was the practice prior to 1998.

Approved: (April 20, 2015)

Vote: (7-1-0)

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

Absent: (Romero, White)

Financial Impact: Few direct impacts beyond the existing ARTP processes

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

# **RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION FOR REGULAR FACULTY EMPLOYEES: CRITERIA AND STANDARDS**

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

## 1.1 Flexibility in Professional Development:

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

## 1.2 Fair Process of Evaluation by Peers:

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

## 1.3 Clear Standards for Advancement

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

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

- 1.4 Integration of Professional Development and Holistic Evaluation.
  - 1.4.1 Categories of Achievement are devices that should prompt evaluators to consider all dimensions of a candidate's professional development. The categories should promote a holistic evaluation of the effectiveness of a faculty member in serving the mission of San José State University, and reviewers should apply this policy with a holistic temperament.
  - 1.4.2 San José State encourages faculty to integrate the various components of their academic career whenever the outcome enhances student success, faculty achievement, and the university mission.
- 1.5 Definitions
  - 1.5.1 This document pertains to all regular tenure track/tenured faculty of the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement. This includes Professors, Librarians, and Counselors. When the document uses the term Professor, or Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor it applies to the equivalent titles in the other professions, such as for Counselors ( Student Services Professional - Academic Related I, II, and III), or Librarian, Associate Librarian, or Senior Assistant Librarian.
  - 1.5.2 When this document refers to colleges it means those colleges that administer departments which are home to Unit 3 tenure/tenure track faculty.
- 1.6 Maintenance of the Policy
  - 1.6.1 Interpretation and Implementation. The AVP Faculty Affairs is responsible for interpreting this policy and supervising its implementation. When significant issues of interpretation arise, the AVP Faculty Affairs will consult with the Professional Standards Committee.
  - 1.6.2 This policy shall be reviewed by the Professional Standards Committee at least once during each six year cycle; the first review shall occur no later than AY 2021-2022.
- 2.0 Categories of Achievement:
  - 2.1 Synergism amongst Categories of Achievement. There are three basic categories of achievement, each of which warrants careful and individual evaluation. However, at a comprehensive university with a broad mission, there is extensive overlap that could occur amongst these categories. In such cases, evaluators should be careful to ascertain the extent of which the categories overlap to enhance the mission of the university. Levels of achievement should be awarded appropriately not only in the individual categories but also for the level of synergism that could not have been

achieved without the overlap.

## 2.2 Effectiveness in Academic Assignment

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

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

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

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

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

## 2.3 Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement

2.3.1 The second basic category for evaluation is scholarly/artistic/professional achievement. Such contributions to a faculty member's discipline or professional community are expected for continuation and advancement in the university. This category

is subdivided into three areas: scholarly, artistic, and professional; this division is for ease of reference only. These three areas are not perfectly distinct and some candidates will demonstrate their disciplinary expertise within two or all three of the areas.

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

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

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

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

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

2.3.3 Artistic achievement includes, but is not limited to, the creation of original work in poetry, fiction, drama, dance, the aural, visual and computationally generated arts; or performances or direction in

music, theatre and dance often requiring interpretation, mastery of a skill, formal experimentation, or the curatorial arrangement of such works in an original and interpretive manner.

2.3.4 Professional achievements involve the application of disciplinary expertise whether within or outside the University. Professional achievements will usually be evaluated within the category of service, except when department guidelines establish that professional activities are the primary method of demonstrating expertise within the discipline. Such disciplines shall adopt department guidelines that explain appropriate standards for evaluating these activities and distinguishing them from the service category of achievement. Examples of achievements that could qualify when explicated by guidelines are listed under “Service to the Profession/Discipline” below.

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

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

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

An explicit requirement that faculty must obtain external support is permitted when the appointment letter designates that some or all of the following activities will constitute the primary academic assignment of the position: grant writing, fundraising, coordinating or teaching in a doctoral program, or directing research centers or galleries or analogous activities. Those so



appointed must be provided the appropriate assigned time and resources to support a focus on the pursuit of external funding. Work done under such circumstances must be evaluated.

2.3.5.3 The Scholarship of Teaching. Noting the particular requirements for curricular development in a period of 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.

2.3.6 Resources and scholarly, artistic or professional achievements.

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

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

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

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

## 2.4 Service

2.4.1 The third basic category for evaluation is service. Contributions in service are expected for continuation and advancement in the University. All faculty have an obligation to contribute to the governance of the institution and to enhance the surrounding

community.

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

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

2.4.2.2 Service to the University. Participation in the Academic Senate and its committees, search and review committees, program coordinators and part-time department chairs, leadership in the California Faculty Association, membership in the Academic Senate of the CSU, work on system-wide committees and task forces, administrative activities (to the extent that such assignments are not the primary academic assignment), and participation in campus organizations and clubs of benefit to faculty or students.

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

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

2.4.3 Significant service should be systematically evaluated and documented. Election to a position in a contested election is a form of peer evaluation of service. 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.

2.4.4 Considerations for Applying the Criteria for Service

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

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.

### 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 four levels described below (3.3) and provide a detailed rationale for the classification.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 3.3.1 Academic Assignment

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

3.3.1.2 Criteria for non-teaching faculty.

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

3.3.1.3 Criteria for teaching faculty.

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

3.3.1.3.2 Baseline. The candidate has documented effectiveness in teaching, particularly for classes within the candidate's primary focus and any curriculum specifically identified in the appointment letter. Assigned courses are well crafted and appropriate for the catalog description,

as shown in course syllabi and other teaching materials. The candidate has taken measures to correct any problems identified earlier in either direct observations or prior performance evaluations. Recent direct observations and surveys of student opinion of teaching effectiveness (SOTEs) are also supportive. SOTEs are considered supportive if they are either within appropriate norms, or if a preponderance of student opinion from objective and subjective questions indicates effective teaching.

3.3.1.3.3 Good. In addition to the baseline as described above, the candidate has documented a degree of innovation within the teaching assignment. This could mean that the candidate has effectively taught an unusually wide range of courses, or that the candidate has created one or more new courses to fill important curricular needs, or that the candidate has documented the use of high-impact practices in teaching. Candidates meeting this level of achievement have at least some student evaluations above the norms, when taken in context of the nature, subject, and level of classes taught.

3.3.1.3.4 Excellent. In addition to a good performance as described above, the candidate has either engaged in a higher level of curricular innovation than described above, or documented widespread positive impacts for student success, or achieved both student and peer evaluations that are consistently above the norms when taken in context of the nature, subject, and level of classes taught. Excellent teachers may have received recognition or awards for their teaching, they may have mentored other teachers, or they may have created curriculum that is adopted at other institutions.

### 3.3.2 Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement

3.3.2.1 Committees and administrators shall write an evaluation of a candidate's scholarly/artistic/professional

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

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

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

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

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

### 3.3.3 Service

3.3.3.1 Committees and administrators shall write an evaluation of a candidate's service achievements and shall rate the overall performance in this category according to the following descriptive scale. When a candidate's achievements are significant but depart from the general

description below, evaluators should exercise judgment and give credit for unusual, unique, or unanticipated service activities at the same level as better known activities of comparable significance. Especially in unusual cases, candidates should carefully document the significance of their service accomplishments.

- 3.3.3.2 Unsatisfactory. The candidate has not documented service activities that meet the baseline level described below.
- 3.3.3.3 Baseline. The candidate has undertaken a fair share of the workload required to keep the Department functioning well. This includes activities such as work on department committees, the creation or revision of curricula, the assessment of student learning outcomes, or participating in department planning, accreditation, outreach, and advising. A baseline level of achievement for promotion to Professor will also include at least some service at the University level.
- 3.3.3.4 Good. In addition to the baseline described above, the candidate has also participated in significant service activities beyond the department. This will usually include college-level service and may include University level service, service in the community, or significant activities in a professional organization. In at least one facet of service, the candidate will have demonstrated leadership resulting in tangible, documented achievements.
- 3.3.3.5 Excellent. In addition to a good performance as described above, the candidate has documented significant influence at a high level, whether it be service to students, the University, the community, or the profession. Candidates who achieve an evaluation of “excellent” in service will generally have occupied several elected or appointed positions of leadership and will document multiple specific accomplishments that have significance for people beyond the candidate’s department or college.

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

##### 4.1 Tenure and promotion to Associate

- 4.1.1 Timing of performance review for tenure and promotion.
  - 4.1.1.1 Under normal circumstances, probationary faculty are considered for both tenure and promotion to Associate during their sixth year, to be effective at the beginning of the following academic year.
  - 4.1.1.2 The probationary period may be extended for an additional year (for a variety of medical, personal, and professional leaves) as defined under the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 13.
  - 4.1.1.3 When probationary faculty are initially appointed with one or two years of service credit (as per the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 13), this credit is simply counted toward the “normal” timeline for tenure and promotion to Associate. All achievements (in all categories) earned during the years for which service credit was awarded must be fully documented and considered.
- 4.1.2 Relationship of tenure to Associate status. When considered at the normal time, promotion to Associate and tenure must be linked: both must be awarded or neither.
- 4.1.3 Standard for tenure and promotion to Associate. Faculty must meet or exceed one of these profiles across the three categories:
  - 4.1.3.1 Excellent in either Academic Assignment or in Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement and at least Baseline in the other two categories:
  - 4.1.3.2 Good in any two categories and at least baseline in the remaining category.
- 4.1.4 Early decisions. Favorable early decisions require a significantly higher level of achievement than a favorable decision after the normal period of review. Candidates may be tenured and promoted to Associate prior to the end of their probationary period if they attain evaluations of Excellent in two categories and Baseline or better in the remaining category.
- 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 during their fifth year at the rank of Associate, to be effective at the beginning of their sixth year at rank. (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.)



- 4.2.2 Standard for promotion to Professor. Faculty must meet or exceed one of these profiles across the three categories:
  - 4.2.2.1 At least Excellent in two categories and at least Baseline in the remaining category.
  - 4.2.2.2 At least Excellent in one category and at least Good in the remaining two categories.
- 4.2.3 Early decisions. Associates may be promoted to Professor prior to serving five years in rank if they meet the standards for Excellent in two categories and Good in one.

## 5.0 Standards for Retention

It is expected that a candidate show increasing effectiveness in academic assignment, or consistent effectiveness in the case of individuals whose performance in academic assignment 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.