

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

S15-7, University Policy, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Procedures [University Policy S15-7 with Amendments A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, and M included]

Effective: Fall 2016

- Amended by S15-7, Amendment A**
- Amended by S15-7, Amendment B**
- Amended by S15-7, Amendment C**
- Amended by S15-7, Amendment D**
- Amended by S15-7, Amendment E**
- Amended by S15-7, Amendment F**
- Amended by S15-7, Amendment G**
- Amended by S15-7, Amendment H**
- Amended by S15-7, Amendment I**
- Amended by S15-7, Amendment J**
- Amended by S15-7, Amendment K**
- Amended by S15-7, Amendment L**
- Amended by S15-7, Amendment M**

At its meeting of April 27, 2015, the Academic Senate approved the following policy recommendation presented by Senator Peter for the Professional Standards Committee. University Policy S15-7 was approved by President Mohammad Qayoumi on June 12, 2015, and it repl([-38 j0.004 Tc -0.00(ep11TJ0.07TJ-010 (n)4 (i)6 (d ITJ0ITJ.10ITd)10 ,TJ-04 (iV7 (e)TJA7 (e Employees.

S15-7 was amended by University Policy F15-1. F15-1 was approved by Interim President Susan W. Martin on September 18, 2015. S15-7 was further amended by University Policy S16-2 approved by Interim President Susan W. Martin on February 9, 2016. University Policy F15-1 was renamed University Policy S15-7, Amendment A, on March 21, 2016. University Policy S16-2 was renamed University Policy S15-7, Amendment B, on March 21, 2016.

Amendment C to S15-7 was approved by the Academic Senate at the April 25, 2016 meeting ~~2016 April 25~~

Amendment D to S15-7 was

University Policy Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Procedures

- Resolved: That all procedural portions of S98-8 be deleted, including Section III “General Procedures,” V.A “Procedures for Retention/Tenure Decisions,” and VI.A “Procedures for Promotion Decisions.” Be it further
- Resolved: That this policy be adopted effective for Fall 2016 Semester; be it further
- Resolved: The Senior Director, Faculty Affairs, in consultation with the Professional Standards Committee, shall determine a timeline for the conversion to electronic dossiers, but the conversion shall be completed no later (and preferably earlier) than the end of a five-year phase-in period (AY 2020 21.) be it further
- Resolved: That Professional Standards will report to the Senate with a draft of the Dossier Format Guide (referred to in 5.4.5.1) for feedback in Spring 2016; be it further
- Resolved: That this policy shall be given a thorough review by the Professional Standards Committee at least once during each six-year cycle; meaning no later than AY 2021-2022.
- Resolved: Any probationary faculty member who has completed a performance review under S98-8 prior to Fall 2016 (e.g., received a second year review during AY 2015-16 or earlier) shall continue to be reviewed under the timeline (2-4-6) begun under the old policy until the tenure decision is completed. The Senior Director, Faculty Affairs, in consultation with the Professional Standards Committee, shall be further empowered to adjust the implementation of this policy to accommodate other issues that may arise as a result of the transition from S98-8 to S15-7. This clause will expire at the end of AY 2019-20.

Rationale: 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/tt faculty. What we discovered was

**POLICY RECOMMENDATION: RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION FOR
REGULAR FACULTY EMPLOYEES:**

PROCEDURES

- 1.0 Introduction: This document is the policy of San José State University that organizes the evaluation system for retention, tenure, and promotion for all

promotion decision, faculty will undergo performance reviews to be considered for

recommendation for an additional performance review may be made either as a result of a periodic evaluation or a prior performance review. Candidates may also request an additional performance review.

- 2.2.4 When the probationary period is extended by leave or preceded by service credit there will be a corresponding adjustment to the schedule for all reviews. Performance reviews shall not, however, be required for newly appointed faculty in their first year at SJSU who have been given service credit on appointment. Faculty appointed with two years of probationary credit will receive performance reviews in their fourth year.

3.0 Procedures for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

3.1 Procedures and principles for all personnel committees

- 3.1.1 Training. All committee members must be thoroughly trained in the use of the present university policies on Criteria and Standards and for Procedures for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion. Department chairs, college deans, and the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs shall arrange for appropriate training in the application of this policy.

3.1.3.6 Only faculty who will be on academic assignment for both semesters of the Academic Year are eligible to serve on Department – and College-level RTP committees. Faculty who are on leave in the Fall, but who return to active service in Spring, are eligible to serve on the University RTP Committee, which convenes in the Spring semester.

3.1.3.7 Faculty members who are enrolled in the early retirement program (FERP) are eligible to serve on RTP committees if they meet all other criteria, including holding the appropriate rank, and being elected by secret ballot. Elsewhere where this policy says "tenured faculty" it includes FERP faculty in that definition, as per the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

3.1.4 Recusals: A procedure to request, and criteria to evaluate, the administrative recusal of committee members in cases of bias or conflict of interest will be developed by Faculty Services in consultation with the Professional Standards Committee.

3.1.5 Quorums

Dec (15) 411(10)(1)2(e)1(Dec)4 (S)453(e)4B.(10)3 (16)1(10)2(d)2.(e)1(10)2

3.2 Department Committees.

3.2.1 Departments will establish one or more committees to recommend retention, tenure, and promotion decisions. (For example, a department

tenure/tenure track faculty of the academic unit shall adopt one of the following methods as part of the unit's mandatory guidelines:

- 3.2.8.1 The first level committee and the Provost or his/her designee shall prepare a mutually acceptable list of nominees. The probationary and tenured faculty unit members shall elect the members of the second level review from that list.
- 3.2.8.2 The academic unit may designate the College RTP committee of another college as its second level review committee. This designation would be made as part of the unit's department guidelines. If this method is selected, then the academic unit shall be entitled to elect a representative to that College RTP committee. The choice of college committee must be approved by the Senior Director, Faculty Affairs as part of the review of department guidelines.
- 3.2.8.3 Regardless of the method chosen, the administrative head of the academic unit (Dean of the Library, Associate Vice President for Student Services) shall function as the college Dean in the review process.
- 3.2.9 Department Chair participation. A Department Chair is eligible to serve on the department committee, and if elected to the committee the Chair of the Department shall not write a separate Chair's recommendation. If the Chair is not elected to the department committee or if the Chair declines to serve on the committee then the Chair may write a separate recommendation. The Chair of the Department may participate in either capacity only if he/she is of sufficient academic rank as per 3.2.5. Such recommendations shall be forwarded to the college level along with the recommendations of the department committee and any responses to the departmental level recommendation(s) supplied by the faculty member.
- 3.2.10 The department chair shall schedule any department personnel committee, which shall elect its own chair. If the Chair is not a duly elected member of the committee, then he/she may meet with the committee as a non-voting member only if invited to do so. The votes of the committee shall be recorded.

3.3.6 A faculty member shall have ten calendar days after notification of the college level recommendations in which to respond to or rebut those recommendations in writing. Responses or rebuttals should be addressed via the college dean to the next level of review (i.e., either to the University Retention and Tenure Committee or the President) but should be delivered to the college office for placement in dossiers. A faculty member may also request a meeting be held to discuss with the college dean the recommendations within ten days after notification. Dossiers shall be forwarded to the next level on the eleventh day after notification, accompanied by any response or rebuttal materials.

3.4 University Level Review

3.4.1 The (m) 20.5 (w) T Joil3ache Unle-0.004 T(pani.depans)-1o82yssioeae .8 (m)

- 3.4.4.2 Candidates for retention which have received any negative votes or recommendations at earlier levels of review.
- 3.4.4.3 When allocating its workload, the university committee should devote particularly thorough attention to cases that have resulted in divided votes or recommendations at earlier levels of review.

probationary faculty shall be notified of the final decision by June 1; if terminated, third-through-sixth- year probationary faculty shall receive a terminal year appointment.

- 3.6.3 The candidate shall be notified in writing of the final decision and the reasons for that decision. A copy of the decision shall be given to the faculty member and all review levels and shall be placed in the candidate's personnel file. When the recommendation is contrary to the recommendation of the university committee, a statement of reasons shall also be given in writing.
- 3.6.4 When the final decision is not consistent with the recommendation of the university committee, the President, or the Provost if so designated, shall meet with the committee to discuss the reasons for the action.

3.7 Modified Procedures for Joint Appointments

- 3.7.1 Candidates who hold joint appointments, as indicated in their appointment letters (S15-6, 5.6) shall be evaluated at the department level by a committee with representation from each relevant department, and this representation shall be roughly proportionate to the assignment of the candidate. The committee shall be chaired by a committee member from the home department as identified in the appointment letter.
- 3.7.2 Members on joint committees shall be elected as per all normal provisions of policy, save only that a current department committee may simply designate some of its already elected

While there is no specific provision for College guidelines, they may be created simply by act of the constituent departments developing and then approving common guidelines.

- 4.1.2 In the case of Departments that do not have approved guidelines, “levels of achievement” will be judged exclusively by the more general language of the policy on Criteria and Standards.
- 4.1.3 In the case of Departments that do have approved

believe their discipline's teaching or service profiles are sufficiently unique. They may also include in their guidelines notes on synergistic practices and accomplishments that span more than one category of achievement. Any category without guidelines will be evaluated exclusively with the general language of the policy on Criteria and Standards.

- 4.2.4 Departments which contain more than one discipline, or contain very different subdisciplines, may produce more than one set of specialized guidelines. When this occurs, particular care must be taken to specify to which faculty each set of guidelines applies. The applicable guidelines should be specified in appointment letters and the Chair's description of assignment.

4.3 Approval of Department Guidelines

- 4.3.1 Department Guidelines must be approved by a vote of department probationary and tenured faculty, using secret ballots.
- 4.3.2 Guidelines must be approved by the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs in consultation with the Professional Standards Committee of the San José State University Academic Senate. Prior to making its recommendation, the Professional Standards Committee shall solicit the input both of the home department and of the corresponding college RTP committee.
- 4.3.3 Guidelines must be kept current. They shall be reviewed every five years and shall clearly display the date they were last approved by the Senior Director, Faculty Affairs. Guidelines that display a date more than five years old calculated from the time of the submission of the dossier shall be considered invalid, except as provided below in "Continuity of guidelines throughout review period."
- 4.3.4 Department guidelines should meet these conditions:
 - 4.3.4.1 They provide inclusive examples of accomplishments within the discipline that represents the given levels of achievement.
 - 4.3.4.2 They provide realistic estimates of the resources required to meet each given level of achievement.
 - 4.3.4.3 They comport entirely with the principles, categories, and standards defined by the Criteria and Standards policy.

5.4.2 Missing materials. According to the Agreement (Section 15.12.b.), if, during the review process

- 6.0 Responses to Recommendations. Candidates shall indicate that they have read the recommendations of each committee and administrator.
- 6.1 If candidates disagree with any recommendation, they have the right to respond in writing to those recommendations within ten calendar days after receiving the recommendations. Responses should be addressed to the next higher faculty committee but should be delivered to the administrative office currently holding the dossier for placement in the dossiers.
- 6.2 Candidates may also request a meeting be held to discuss the recommendation within ten days after receipt of the recommendation (see the Collective Bargaining Agreement 15.5.) If requested, the meeting should be held with the author of the particular recommendation in question, such as the Chair, Dean, or Provost, or with the Chair of the particular committee responsible for the recommendation.
- 6.3 Dossiers shall be forwarded to the next level no earlier than the tenth day after faculty unit members have been notified of the recommendations made. Responses or rebuttals received within the ten-day limit must accompany the dossiers.