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. 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.)

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.
On April 7, 2021, President Mary A. Papazian signed and approved Amendment E to University Policy S15-8. Amendment E adds the category of “Scholarship of Engagement.”

On February 14, 2022, Interim President Steve Perez signed and approved Amendment F to University Policy S15-8. Amendment F includes within the category of Service, activities that specifically enhance inclusion, educational equity and engaged service with students and in the surrounding and broader communities.

On April 13, 2022, Interim President Steve Perez signed and approved Amendment G to University Policy S15-8. Amendment G includes changes to Section 2.3, Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement.

On June 1, 2022, Interim President Steve Perez signed and approved Amendment H to University Policy S15-8. Amendment H includes changes to Sections 2.2 and 3.3.1.

On May 9, 2022, Interim President Steve Perez signed and approved Amendment H to University Policy S15-8. Amendment H includes changes to Sections 2.2 and 3.3.1.

On April 25, 2023, President Cynthia Teniente-Matson signed and approved Amendment I and J to S15-8. Amendment I modified Section 3 and Amendment J modified Section 4.

Amendments A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I and J 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, D, E, F, G, H, I and J)

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/t 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; academic assignment includes work in the department to support educational equity and/or close equity gaps through the recruitment, mentoring, retention, and academic support for historically underserved students in the department, and training of colleagues in such efforts. For some faculty, such as department chairpersons, coordinators, and field supervisors, part or all of their academic assignment is of a non-teaching nature, and they should be evaluated accordingly; RSCA release should be evaluated under Scholarly/Creative/Professional Achievement. However, release for departmental administration and the like can be evaluated as appropriate in other Categories of Achievement (Academic Assignment, Service, or Scholarly/Creative/Professional Achievement), depending on the emphasis of the work as represented by the candidate.

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”, especially the most recent “SOTE/SOLATE Interpretation Guide”, and have explicit training with respect to issues of subjectivity and bias in SOTEs, especially for faculty traditionally underrepresented within their field.

2.2.2.2 Examples of contextual factors include whether the teaching resulted from newly created or substantially modified curricula (e.g., but not limited to, changes to promote educational equity); 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, especially where these impact historically underserved students.

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.

2.2.4 Department Chairs, Directors, Coordinators, etc. may be nonteaching faculty due to the portion of their chair assignment or other academic assignments. In such cases, their related duties should be discussed as part of Academic Assignment – especially as related to curriculum and program development and oversight. Other areas of a Chair’s or coordinator’s Academic Assignment may also be discussed more thoroughly under RSCA or Service.

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, or application of scholarly expertise to improve the community, are expected for continuation and advancement in the university. This category is subdivided into several areas for ease of description and reference. These areas are not perfectly distinct and some candidates will demonstrate their disciplinary expertise within two or more of the areas. Some achievements may have characteristics of more than one area. The overarching principle should be to reward significant scholarly/artistic/professional achievement regardless of the form it may take.

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 engaged 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. Such evaluations should characterize the broad impact, scope, or significance of the work, whether within academic fields or beyond. Significant contributions that would not otherwise be peer reviewed should be evaluated in this manner. 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 evaluated by an objective disciplinary expert, or juried will normally receive the greatest weight. Achievements that have a broad impact, scope, or significance are particularly valued, and department guidelines may explain the most appropriate evidence for making this determination. 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 include but are not limited to: books, chapters, articles, reviews, technical reports, computer software and hardware development, positively reviewed grant proposals, presentations at scholarly conferences, invited papers/presentations in recognition of discipline expertise, documentaries, works of journalism, patents, copyrights, trademarks, translations, etc.

2.3.3 Artistic achievement includes, but is not limited to, the creation of original work or adaptations in poetry, fiction, drama, dance, digital arts, visual arts, performance, music, theatre, curatorial work, etc., often requiring critique, interpretation, mastery of a skill, experimentation, or improvisation.
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 but may also include ongoing professional requirements for currency (e.g., licensure) in an applied discipline.

2.3.5 Scholarship of Engagement. Similar to professional achievements, the scholarship of engagement requires the application of expertise and/or talent grounded in the candidate’s discipline or interdisciplinary fields. Achievements that do not require such expertise and/or talent shall be evaluated under the category of service. This form of scholarship typically engages in identifiable problems, needs, and issues, and is often concerned with advancing equitable practices and reforms in the professional, academic, local, or broader public/global communities.

2.3.5.1 The scholarship of engagement may take place in a wide range of fields, and often exhibits a reciprocal, collaborative relationship between the expert and the public, and may involve student participation. Examples of such relationships would include but are not limited to: engagement with government, private sector, non-profit sector, educational and cultural institutions, community groups, and environmental, humanitarian and civil rights organizations.

2.3.5.2 Examples of achievements growing from such relationships could include, among many others:

2.3.5.2.1 the integration of expertise into university-community partnerships and collaborations;

2.3.5.2.2 community-based research, scholarship, or creative activities (RSCA); examples may
include participatory action research, implementation and dissemination science, or translational scholarship contributing to identifiable changes or critical debate; (e.g. the enactment of legislation or production of advisory reports)

2.3.5.2.3 change-based RSCA (e.g. informed by emancipatory frameworks or involving issues, places, or persons not traditionally part of social/academic/creative discourse)

2.3.5.2.4 sharing of expertise or original work to the public (sometimes known as “public scholarship” or “public humanities”)

2.3.5.2.5 tangible evidence of professional achievement (e.g. forms of entrepreneurship; significant changes in professional practice; evidence-based improvements to the management or administration of organizations)

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

2.3.6.1 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.

2.3.6.2 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.

2.3.6.3 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.

2.3.7 Resources and scholarly, artistic or professional achievements.
2.3.7.1 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.

2.3.7.2 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.

2.3.7.3 For each performance review, candidates shall provide lists of resources they have received to support their scholarly, artistic, and professional development.
2.3.7.4 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 and engage the surrounding and broader communities. There is often a synergy between activities considered Scholarship of Engagement and Service. Achievements that do not require specific subject area disciplinary expertise and/or talent shall be evaluated under the category of Service. The Scholarship of Engagement (a category of “Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement”) requires the application of expertise and/or talent grounded in the candidate’s discipline or interdisciplinary fields.

2.4.2 Types of Service. For ease of reference only, service may be divided into several areas. Representational work that demonstrates cultural and identity taxation should be considered in each category.

Examples:

2.4.2.1 Service to students. Advising, mentoring, and participating in curricular development and assessment activities, and representational engagement to enhance student learning and success that are not subsumed in teaching or the primary academic assignment. Of particular importance are activities to achieve educational equity such as providing support to historically underserved students: helping to reduce the opportunity gap, increasing student retention, and helping students transition to work or to further education.

2.4.2.2 Service to the University. Participation in the Academic Senate and its committees, search and review committees, program coordinators and 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 assignment are not the primary academic assignment), work with affinity groups, University Diversity, Equity & Inclusion (DEI) initiatives and campus climate reporting/feedback sessions, and participation in campus organizations and clubs that benefit students, staff and/or
faculty; working to make faculty, staff, and administration more representative of the student population we serve.

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 such as founding/directing a community organization, serving on boards of non-profit organizations, organizing public events, public facing commentary as an expert in the field, establishing bridge building pathways and events between the academic and general community reflecting the faculty member’s expertise addressing inclusive and equitable practices. Service to the community includes partnering with community members and other allies in the effort to make our educational opportunities equitable for all.

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. Developing public programs or events to bridge the profession/discipline and the public/global community. 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.

2.4.2.5 Service related to Educational Equity Activities. Providing support to historically underserved students: Helping to shrink opportunity gaps, increasing student retention, helping students transition to work or to further education, working to make faculty, staff, and administration more representative of the student population we serve, and partnering with staff, community members, and other allies in the effort to make our educational opportunities equitable for all.

2.4.3 Significant service should be systematically evaluated and documented. Election to a position is a form of peer evaluation of service. Faculty serving as committee members, whether elected or appointed, should 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. If any faculty member, including a candidate, believes a committee member may have a bias or conflict of interest that could affect their impartiality, that person should immediately report their concerns to their college Dean and/or Faculty Services before deliberations begin. Faculty Services will determine whether recusal is necessary following administrative recusal guidelines.

Evaluators who are recused 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 nonteaching faculty, including potentially 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 taught assigned courses that are well crafted and appropriate for the catalog description as evidenced by syllabi and other materials related to the academic assignment. The candidate has taken measures to correct any problems identified earlier in either direct observations or prior evaluations. Recent direct (e.g. peer) observations are supportive. Student numerical SOTEs, narrative SOTEs, and other evidence indicate effectiveness in academic assignment. All materials submitted should be examined from a holistic view that takes into account the nature, subject, and level of classes taught. Numerical SOTEs are generally within norm ranges by the end of the review period, particularly for classes within 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 and provides evidence of using inclusive or equity-based practices, especially use of related techniques in the classroom. For example, a candidate at this level may have effectively taught a wide range of courses, or created one or more new courses to fill important curricular needs, or documented the use of high-impact practices in teaching, or been actively involved in mentoring, outreach, or student support, particularly for historically underrepresented students. Candidates meeting this level of achievement have direct (e.g. peer) observations that identify a faculty member with good skills in the academic assignment. Numerical SOTEs, taking into account the nature, subject, and level of classes taught, are generally above
mean, and above norm ranges where possible, by the end of the review period, particularly for classes within the candidate’s primary focus and any curriculum specifically identified in the appointment letter. Narrative SOTEs further confirm effective teaching and support for student learning, keeping in mind the nature and subject of the course.

3.3.1.3.4. Excellent. In addition to criteria for good performance as described above, the candidate has engaged in a higher level of curricular or pedagogical innovation, documented consistent positive impacts for student success or educational equity, or received peer and student course evaluations that are consistently above mean (and, where possible, above 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, may have mentored other teachers, or may have created curriculum that is adopted in other departments or at other institutions. Excellence in academic assignment may include exceptional advising, recruitment, retention and mentoring of students, and the like.

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, educational equity activities, the creation or revision of curricula, the assessment of student learning outcomes, or participating in department program planning, accreditation, outreach, and advising. This level of service must include some documented service to students. 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 may lead more advanced Department-level service. Candidates may have 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. It may also include extensive and effective engagement with students and student organizations within one’s Department or beyond the department, or extensive and effective educational equity activities, such as advisement or mentorship for students. 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 leadership and/or influence at a high level, in any of the five described service categories (students, University, community, profession/discipline, and educational equity). 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. 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 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 leases 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 remaining category.

4.1.4 Early decisions. Candidates may request consideration for tenure and promotion up to two years early, provided they have previously completed a performance review for retention and are not currently scheduled for a special retention review.

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 categories.

4.1.4 Early decisions. Candidates may request consideration for tenure and promotion up to two years early, provided they have previously completed a performance review for retention and are not currently scheduled for a special retention review.

4.1.4.1 Favorable early decisions require a significantly higher level of achievement than a favorable decision after the normal period of review.

4.1.4.1.1 One year early. Candidates may be tenured and promoted to Associate one year early if they attain evaluations of Excellent in two categories and Baseline or better in the remaining category.

4.1.4.1.2 Two years early. Candidates may be tenured and promoted to Associate two years early if they attain evaluations of Excellent in two categories and Good 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.