

Clarified by [S98-12](#)

S97-5 Post Tenure Review

Legislative History:

At its meeting of April 7, 1997, the Academic Senate approved the following Policy Recommendation presented by David McNeil for the Professional Standards Committee.

Supersedes S92-4

ACTION BY THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT:

"Approved as University Policy" signed Robert Caret, May 7, 1997.

POLICY RECOMMENDATION POST TENURE REVIEW

- WHEREAS: San Jose State University offers to faculty undergoing post tenure review the provision of opportunities to take a proactive approach that will lead to an enhancement of professional practice, with a focus on faculty career paths and the professorial "life cycle;" and
- WHEREAS: Substantial revisions to the current policy, S92-4 could provide for faculty undergoing post tenure review the opportunity to participate in reflection about career development in a formative and prospective nature; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the attached policy be implemented.
-

Post Tenure Review

Guidelines for Review of the Professional Effectiveness of Tenured Faculty

A. Introduction:

This policy is to provide a process whereby faculty performance is reviewed for the purpose of acknowledging, maintaining and improving a tenured faculty unit employee's performance. At San Jose State University the emphasis in post tenure review will be on providing opportunities to take a proactive approach that will lead to an enhancement of professional practice, with a focus on faculty career paths and the professorial "life cycle." Rather than following the traditional "summative" model of faculty evaluation employed in the RTP process, faculty-involved in post tenure review are to be provided the opportunity to participate in reflection about career development; the review is to be of a formative or prospective nature. A variety of activities are provided in this policy as options.

F. Review Content

1. Initial Review: The purpose of the Post Tenure Review is to review and acknowledge the professional effectiveness of a faculty member with reference to the scope and currency of their professional work, not only for the previous five year period, but particularly with reference to their current and future professional career plans . This, to the extent possible, should focus on a positive, formative, and proactive approach to enhancing faculty careers. To that end:

a. The standard "Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness" (SOTE/SOLATE) ratings completed during the five year review cycle shall be considered. Additional assessment forms devised by the department, the college, or the faculty member under review should be reviewed if requested by that faculty member. Signed letters, written by students, graduates, or professional colleagues during the period of review may also be considered.

b. Currency pertinent to the professional assignment of the faculty member shall be discussed.

c. When a faculty member elects to engage in a reflective model focusing on his/her professional career as it relates to scholarly, professional or artistic work, teaching, work within the community, or service to the university he/she should have an opportunity to discuss with the committee any previously developed professional development plan(s); such plans may be prepared in advance, perhaps in consultation with the chair, college dean, Office of Faculty Affairs, or others designated to assist with faculty professional development.

d. Additional Materials, including course green sheets, faculty developed course materials or a statement from the faculty member about his/her professional philosophy or style shall also be considered at the request of the faculty member.

2. Further Review

If the committee decides that a further review is necessary, it may take additional steps, such as those identified in University Policy S91-9, Evaluation of Effectiveness in Teaching for All Faculty, approved May 13, 1991.

Other information volunteered by the faculty member shall be considered.

G. Results of the Review

1. A written summary of the post tenure review shall be given to the reviewed faculty member by May 1, The reviewed faculty member may attach a written statement to it. The summary of the evaluation shall be placed in the faculty member's personnel file by May 15; the faculty member's response, if any shall be included when submitted. If areas for commendation and/or encouragement have been identified, the committee shall inform the faculty member.

2. The department chair, in every case, shall discuss the summary with the faculty member. When appropriate, the department chair shall also inform the faculty member about opportunities available within the department and elsewhere on campus for professional support and assistance. The summary shall be reviewed by the college dean and placed in the faculty member's Personnel Action File along with the faculty member's statement by May 15.

3. When the department chair's professional effectiveness is reviewed, the committee chair, or his/her designee, shall discuss the summary with the department chair.