

The following forms are embedded in eFaculty for each committee and all individual reviewers to make recommendations using Retention, S98-8, S15-8, and Range Elevation recommendations respectively. Use the form provided in eFaculty.

Retention Evaluation

To be used in all retention cases.

Recommendation

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.

Recommendation on Retention *

Select the recommendation for this case. Committee Managers: Select the recommendation receiving a majority vote (greater than 50%). Report vote in next item.

- Retain
- Do Not Retain

Committee Vote

Report the vote tally (including all committee members) for this case. Report votes for each option: Retain, Do Not Retain, Absent, Abstain

Retain

Do Not Retain

Absent

Members absent from deliberations

Abstain

Members who recused themselves from all deliberations and did not participate in review.

Special Review?

Recommendation on Special Review *

Select the recommendation for this case. Committee Managers: Select the recommendation receiving a majority vote (greater than 50%). Report vote in next item.

- No Special Review Required
- Require 4th Year Review
- Require 5th Year Review
- 5th Year Case, No Recommendation Required

Committee Vote

Report the vote tally (including all committee members) for this case. Report votes for each option: No, Yes, Absent, Abstain

No

Does not require a special review

Yes - 4th year

Require a 4th year review.

Yes - 5th year

Require a 5th year review.

Absent

Members absent from deliberations.

Abstain

Members who recused themselves from all deliberations and did not participate in review.

Evaluation

At each level of review, committees and administrators will evaluate levels of achievement in each of the three categories. However, this is an evaluation for "Retention," and as such, does not determine a level of achievement for the 3 areas of achievement in S15-8. Committees **do NOT** report a vote for, or recommendation about, level of achievement. Administrative reviewers **do NOT** report a level of achievement.

Academic Assignment**Service****Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement****Final Comments**

Reviewers may make general remarks about the case or recommendations for improvement in this section.

[Submit Form](#)[Save Responses](#)[Cancel](#) (back to case details)

S98-8 Promotion and/or Tenure

Use this form to evaluate candidates for promotion and/or tenure under University Policy S98-8.

Recommendation on Promotion and/or Tenure *

Select the recommendation for this case. Committee Managers: Select the recommendation receiving a majority vote (greater than 50%). Report vote in next item.

- Recommend
 Do Not Recommend

Committee Vote

Report the vote tally (including all committee members) for this case. Report votes for each option: Recommend, Do Not Recommend, Absent, Abstain

Recommend**Do Not Recommend****Absent****Abstain**

Evaluation of Achievements

Reasons for recommendations shall be explained below.

I. Academic Assignment (Teaching and/or Other Assignments) and Service to Students and the University

II. Scholarly/Creative/ Professional Achievement and Service to the Profession

Final Comments

Reviewers may make general remarks about the case or recommendations for improvement in this section.

[Submit Form](#)

[Save Responses](#)

[Cancel](#) (back to case details)

Promotion and/or Tenure Evaluation

Administrators and committees use this form to report recommendations and voting, and to write evaluations explaining the ratings of each area of professional responsibility. Chairs/Directors and Administrators report their recommendations. Committee chairs report the committee's recommendations and votes in each area.

Overall Recommendation *

Please report the recommendation for this case using the ratings standards.

Promotion to Associate or Equivalent and/or Tenure

Excellent in either teaching or scholarship and at least Baseline in the other 2 OR Good in any 2 categories and at least Baseline in the 3rd

Early Promotion to Associate or Equivalent and/or Tenure

Excellent in 2 categories and at least Baseline in the 3rd

Promotion to Full Professor or Equivalent

Excellent in 2 categories and at least Baseline in the 3rd OR Excellent in 1 category and at least Good in the other 2

Early Promotion to Full Professor or Equivalent

Excellent in 2 categories and at least Good in the 3rd

Select an option

- Do Not Recommend
- Tenure and Promotion to Associate or Equivalent
- Promotion to Associate or Equivalent
- Tenure
- Promotion to Full Professor or Equivalent
- Early Tenure and Promotion to Associate or Equivalent
- Early Tenure
- Early Promotion to Full Professor or Equivalent

Academic Assignment (Teaching and/or Other Assignments)

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

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.

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.

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.

Academic Assignment Rating *

Select the recommendation for this case. Committee Managers: Select the recommendation receiving a majority vote (greater than 50%). Report vote in next item.

- Unsatisfactory
- Baseline
- Good
- Excellent

Academic Assignment: Committee Vote

Report a vote tally (including all committee members) using the following options:

<p>Unsatisfactory</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 30px; width: 100%; margin-top: 5px;"></div>
<p>Baseline</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 30px; width: 100%; margin-top: 5px;"></div>
<p>Good</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 30px; width: 100%; margin-top: 5px;"></div>
<p>Excellent</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 30px; width: 100%; margin-top: 5px;"></div>

Service

Unsatisfactory - The candidate has not documented service activities that meet the baseline level described below.

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.

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.

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.

Service Rating *

Select the recommendation for this case. Committee Managers: Select the recommendation receiving a majority vote (greater than 50%). Report vote in next item.

- Unsatisfactory
- Baseline
- Good
- Excellent

Service: Committee Vote

Report a vote tally (including all committee members) using the following options:

Unsatisfactory**Baseline****Good****Excellent**

Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement

Unsatisfactory - The candidate has not created scholarly, artistic, or professional accomplishments that meet the baseline level as described below.

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

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

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, or professional achievement requires a body of work that is recognized as significant within the discipline.

RSCA Rating *

Select the recommendation for this case. Committee Managers: Select the recommendation receiving a majority vote (greater than 50%). Report vote in next item.

- Unsatisfactory
- Baseline
- Good
- Excellent

Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement: Committee Vote

Report a vote tally (including all committee members) using the following options:

Unsatisfactory

Baseline

Good

Excellent

Next, please report the number of absences and/or abstentions from committee deliberations.

Absent**Abstain****Evaluation of Achievements**

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 provide a detailed rationale for the classification.

Academic Assignment (Teaching and/or Other Assignments)**Service****Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement****Final Comments**

Reviewers may make general remarks about the case or recommendations for improvement in this section.

[Submit Form](#)[Save Responses](#)[Cancel](#) (back to case details)

Range Elevation Recommendation

Use this form to submit recommendations for range elevation cases.

Lecturer Name

Current Lecturer Range
 Select an option

L-A
 L-B
 L-C

Recommendation on Range Elevation *

Select the recommendation for this case. Committee Managers: Select the recommendation receiving a majority vote (greater than %50). Report the vote in next item.

"No Recommendation" may be used by chairs or administrators who have reason to recuse themselves. Department chairs who served on the department committee should choose "No Recommendation." Chairs may only submit recommendations if they did not serve on the department committee.

Recommend Range Elevation
 Do Not Recommend Range Elevation
 No Recommendation

Committee Vote

Report the vote tally (including all committee members) for this case. Report votes for each option: Recommend, Do Not Recommend, Absent, Abstain

Recommend

Do Not Recommend

Absent

Abstain

Evaluation of Achievements

Reasons for recommendations shall be explained below.

Please report the reasons for the recommendation (Recommend or Do Not Recommend) provided above.

Explain whether the faculty member's packet of materials demonstrates a form of advancement, having reached a level of performance consistent with the requirements for appointment at the next higher range. In doing so, consider only expertise that will impact or is related to their current and prior work assignments during the period of review.

Additional Comments

Reviewers may make general remarks about the case or recommendations for improvement in this section.

[Submit Form](#)[Save Responses](#)[Cancel](#) (back to case details)