

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

SS-S21-2, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Expressing Support for Reform of RTP for Fairness, Equity, and Inclusion to be carried out by the Professional Standards Committee AY 2021-2022

Legislative History:

On April 9, 2021 the Academic Senate approved the following Sense of the Senate Resolution presented by Senator Peter for the Professional Standards Committee.

Resolved: The Academic Senate of San José State University receives the attached report by the Professional Standards Committee entitled “Roadmap for Equity Reform of RTP policies;” be it further

Resolved: The Academic Senate endorses the approach outlined in the “Roadmap” and looks forward to reviewing the particular policy recommendations that may emerge from this effort.

Approved: April 12, 2020.

Vote: 11-0-0

Present: Peter, Wang, Raman, Cargill, Saldamli, Riley, Quock, Mahendra, Barrera, Monday, Smith

Absent: None

Financial Impact: Long term reforms unknown, no impact to produce the policy recommendations.

Workload Impact: Significant work for the Professional Standards Committee and others.

Roadmap for Equity Reform of RTP policies

The Professional Standards Committee

April 2021

Overview and Rationale:

In AY 2020-2021, the Professional Standards Committee began the process of examining our Retention, Tenure, and Promotion policies to better promote fairness, equity, and inclusion in the retention, tenure, and promotion of our faculty. While our university has spearheaded various initiatives to recruit diverse faculty, progress in faculty diversification has been slow. As noted in our report from Spring 2020, the University needs to carefully examine how it supports our diverse faculty as they transition through the various career stages laid out in the CBA and University policy.¹

The Professional Standards Committee is concerned that our RTP policies lack sufficiently specific language about fairness, equity, and inclusion. The obsolete policy (S98-8) referred to educational equity, but this reference and other related paragraphs were not carried forward into the new policy (S15-8.) While the new policy (S15-8) is broad enough to encompass educational equity activities, the lack of specific language misses an opportunity to further shift our culture towards wider acceptance and reward for this important work. Furthermore, we suspect that the workload associated with educational equity activities falls disproportionately on certain segments of our faculty. Failing to adequately reward this work introduces structural inequalities into the RTP system.

To address the situation, Professional Standards drafted and the Senate reviewed a first reading item, “On enhancing service to students” (first reading included in Appendix B). While there were no specific objections to the language we drafted, we received considerable feedback that much more substantive changes were warranted, including deeper and wider consultation with the Campus community. Professional Standards has “heard” this advice, and decided to focus its work over the next year on a broader review of equity issues in the Criteria and Standards RTP policy. This resolution is a first step designed to memorialize the work done so far, to organize the future reform effort, and to solicit Senate support going forward.

Record of the Spring 2021 Service Amendment:

Appendix B reflects the initial amendment presented to the Senate with revisions undertaken immediately after by the Committee. The Committee realized that this proposed amendment would not be comprehensive or sufficient, but hoped it could address some aspects of fairness, equity, and inclusion in RTP evaluation in time for the next cycle. But the feedback from the Senate was that a half measure may be worse than no measure, and so a broader reform effort would be needed, even at the

¹ <https://www.sjsu.edu/senate/docs/rtpreport.pdf>

cost of delay. We record this amendment as an initial step—parts of which may be useful in the upcoming broader reforms. The following steps outline the broad approach for the Professional Standards Committee in AY 2021-2022.

Consultation and Information Gathering:

To undertake a careful review of our RTP Policies with an eye on fairness, equity and inclusion will require consulting with a broad range of members of our University community. The Professional Standards Committee is committed to consulting with groups and individuals throughout the campus community. The following list is far from exhaustive:

1. BIPOC faculty: three focus group meetings each with a focus on different areas of achievement: Academic Assignment, Service, RSCA. Separate groups should focus on assistant professors vs. ranks
2. The Faculty Diversity Committee
3. Center for Faculty Development
4. Campus Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
5. Director of Black and African American Equity, Patience Bryant. Director Bryant has received and shared correspondence (e.g. Black Spartan Advisory Council, APIFSA)
6. UCCD: may be beneficial to break it out as focus groups on three different areas, Academic Assignment, Service, RSCA
7. Past RTP evaluators from college and university committees
8. Individuals who have just gone through the RTP process
9. Consultation with faculty more generally
10. Additional groups yet to be identified

Timeline for Reform:

Taking more time to do a thorough review of RTP equity has a cost—every year faculty go through the existing system. Since changes in RTP policies cannot go into effect except between RTP cycles (as per contract) Professional Standards is committed to completing any necessary policy changes during the next Academic Year. To meet this deadline the following timeline will be necessary:

1. Fall 2021 - intensive series of consultations, rough draft of language for RTP document. Focusing on Criteria and Standards policy.
2. Spring 2022 - share rough draft with RTP committee, work through edits, collect feedback from groups on language/changes, edit draft further, bring forward to Senate by end of Spring 2022.

Appendix A:

Materials consulted to date:

Asian Pacific Islander Faculty and Staff Association, letter to President Papazian and SJSU Community, July 28, 2020.

Belong @ SJSU survey results. <https://www.sjsu.edu/belong/findings/index.php>

Black Spartan Community, letter to President Papazian, August 25, 2020.

Gibson, Amerlia M. *Civility and Structural Precarity for Faculty of Color in LIS*. Journal of Education for Library and Information Science 2019 Vol. 60, No. 3. Kezar and Posselt, eds. *Higher Education Administration for Social Justice and Equity*. Routledge, 2020.

Rucks-Ahidiana, Zawadi. "The Inequities of the Tenure-Track System." Inside Higher Ed, June 7, 2019.

SfN Neuronline. "Leveling the Playing Field: Improved Tenure and Promotion Practices Lead to a More Diverse Faculty."

Shillington et. al. "Commentary: COVID-19 and and Long-Term Impacts on Tenure-Line Careers." *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research*, Volume 11, Number 4.

SJSU Diversity Initiatives. <https://www.sjsu.edu/diversity/systemic-racism/initiatives/index.php>

SJSU Faculty Survey summary. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1zWhMnbCTrZHe-ydP4-HpA67CRdaXd077/view>

Wong(Lau), Kathleen. Letter to Black Spartan Advisory Council. March 16, 2021.

Appendix B:

First reading presented to the Senate on February 8, 2021, with committee edits from February 15, 2021

**POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Amending S15-8
University Policy, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty
Employees: Criteria and Standards
To enhance service to students**

....

1.4.1

2.0 Categories of Achievement:

....

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,~~ and to contribute to our core mission of providing equal educational opportunities for our diverse students.

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

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.

2.4.2.5 Educational equity activities. Providing support to historically underserved students, helping to shrink the achievement gap, increasing student retention, helping students transition to work or to further education, working to make our 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 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, the creation of opportunities for students, and other tangible results should be independently evaluated in order to be eligible to be designated at higher levels of achievement.

....

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

....
3.3.3 Service

-
- 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 planning, accreditation, outreach, and advising. This level of achievement 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 has documented extensive and effective engagement in one or more service categories. The nature of this documentation will vary depending on the nature of the service, but in all cases the service must be described and evaluated by faculty, administrators, students, or community members in a position to understand its importance and impact. Service at this level will usually transcend basic department functions and may include college-level service, University level service, service in the community, significant activities in a professional organization, engagement with students and student organizations, and effective educational equity activities.
- 3.3.3.5 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.
- 3.3.3.6 Excellent. In addition to a good performance as described above, the candidate has documented significant influence at a high level characterized by leadership in one or more service areas. For University service, candidates will generally have occupied several elected or appointed positions of leadership. For service to students, to the community, and towards educational equity, candidates will document leadership leading to specific accomplishments that have widespread and/or deep significance. In service to the profession/discipline, candidates will also have taken leadership roles in their professional organizations or may have served as leading editors of journals or senior organizers of professional activities
- 3.3.3.7 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.~~