

1 **Amendment N to University Policy S15-7 University Policy, Retention, Tenure and**
2 **Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Procedures**

3
4 San José State University
5 Academic Senate
6 Professional Standards Committee
7 February 24, 2025
8 Final Reading
9

AS 1879

10 Rationale:

11 Amendments A through M to S15-8 Retention, Tenure, and Promotion for Regular Faculty
12 Employees: Criteria and Standards added language on the scholarship of engagement, the
13 scholarship of teaching, activities that enhance inclusion, educational equity, and achievement,
14 and so on. University RTP policy thus encompasses a broader range of work being done across
15 campus and greatly lessens the need for Department RTP Guidelines.

16
17 There has been uneven implementation of Department RTP Guidelines across campus; initially,
18 one college required its departments to create them; otherwise, only a handful of departments
19 have found Guidelines ~~necessary~~ useful. Of the roughly 66 departments/schools on campus, 18
20 have Department RTP Guidelines; only two of those are required to have them (Counseling and
21 Psychological Services and the University Library). Professional Standards has also observed
22 that many approved Department RTP Guidelines have expired and not been revised in relation to
23 recent Amendments to S15-8 possibly indicating no continued need for Guidelines.

24
25 Moreover, most of the Department RTP Guidelines that PS currently reviews tend to repeat
26 University policy and do not follow the requirements ~~for content~~ laid out in Section 4 of this
27 policy. PS has discussed the tremendous amount of labor invested in developing Guidelines that
28 often are returned to the Departments for revision, requiring additional time-consuming process.
29 Frequently, the Guidelines are never resubmitted to PS for subsequent review, so there is no
30 substantive outcome for all of the labor. Unproductive faculty labor is of concern and PS
31 believes it lowers faculty morale. PS is also aware of the unintended stress that the creation of
32 Guidelines causes, particularly among probationary faculty who have the sense that only perfect
33 and fully inclusive Department Guidelines will protect them during the RTP process. Finally, PS
34 is concerned that from an equity perspective, Guidelines may create additional barriers and
35 constitute a form of gatekeeping for faculty who are marginalized in their fields or the academy
36 ~~in general~~.

37
38 After significant consultation and deliberation ~~on these issues~~, Professional Standards strongly
39 encourages Departments to phase out any current Guidelines per the timelines already
40 established in §4.4.3 by Faculty Services in the second resolved clause. As a reminder,
41 allowances for the continuity of Guidelines across a faculty member's period of review are

42 articulated in §4.4.5 and will remain in place. PS ensures that there will continue to be a process
43 to create guidelines for academic units required to have them as well as for departments that are
44 not well-represented by University RTP policy in one or more of the Categories of Achievement
45 (Academic Assignment, Service, and/or Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement). To
46 ~~implement reforms, including the development of~~ develop a streamlined submission and review
47 process and to complete its work on Guidelines already awaiting review, PS requests a
48 temporary moratorium on the submission of Department RTP Guidelines.

49

50 Resolved:

51 1) A temporary moratorium on the submission of Department RTP Guidelines for review and
52 approval will be effective [August 17, 2025, through January 26, 2026, for a one-semester
53 moratorium following approval of this policy recommendation].

54 2) Faculty Services will establish the following timelines for all currently approved
55 Department RTP guidelines for Departments ~~that are not required to have them~~:

56 a. All Guidelines currently approved or approved during 2024-25 ~~for Departments not~~
57 ~~required to have them~~ will expire on the normal timeline outlined in § 4.4.3. by the end of
58 ~~the 2029-30 academic year. This will allow any faculty who may have been recruited~~
59 ~~while guidelines were in place to use them throughout their probationary period.~~
60 ~~Departments may re-apply for pre-authorization to create new Guidelines per this policy~~
61 ~~after that date.~~

62 b. Any Departments working on new or revised Guidelines that have not yet been
63 submitted for review will have to complete the process before the moratorium begins or
64 ~~be subject to use~~ the procedures in this proposed amendment after the moratorium ends
65 ~~begin the process after January 26, 2026. PS encourages departments to wait until after~~
66 the moratorium and the establishment of a supportive process unless their need is urgent.

67 3) Amend section 4.0 to clarify the purpose and content of Guidelines and to develop a more
68 efficient process for the creation and review of Department RTP Guidelines for specific
69 departments required to have them and for departments that may want to develop them ~~justify~~
70 ~~their need for and to seek pre-authorization to.~~

71 4) Amend section 5.2.2 to update changes to the Chair's Description of Assignment
72 relating to Department RTP Guidelines.

73

74 Approved: February 18, 2025

75 Vote: 9-0-0

76 Present: Magdalena Barrera, Caroline Chen, Dawn Hackman, Gilles

77 Muller, Chima Nwokolo, Sarika Pruthi, Priya Raman, Shannon Rose Riley
78 (Chair), Gigi Smith

79 Absent: Farzan Kazemifar

80

81 Financial Impact: None anticipated

82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121

Workload Impact: Overall, we anticipate a reduction in workload at multiple levels involved in the creation and approval of guidelines. There will be some increase in workload for Professional Standards in the semester of the moratorium as it prepares a new process for consultation and preparation of Guidelines.

4. Department Guidelines for Achievement

4.1. Purpose of Guidelines

The purpose of guidelines is to assist committees and administrators outside the department in understanding the standards appropriate to the applicant's profession and to ensure fair and equitable application of these standards to the broader procedures, standards, and criteria of University policies. They are not a roadmap for tenure-line faculty nor do they replace a well-crafted narrative statement and supporting evidence in the dossier.

4.1.1. Non-teaching units (Counseling and Psychological Services and the University Library) are required to develop Department RTP guidelines for the category of “Academic Assignment” in order to assist committees and administrators outside the unit in their evaluations.

4.1.2. ~~All Other Departments not well-represented by University RTP policy in one or more of the Categories of Achievement (Academic Assignment, Service, and/or Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement) must seek pre-authorization from the Professional Standards Committee and the Office of the Provost to develop Department RTP Guidelines for Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement, Academic Assignment, and/or Service that relate University policy on Criteria and Standards to the professional standards and breadth of activities of particular disciplines. See may develop Guidelines in order to assist committees and administrators outside the department in their evaluations. see 4.3, below for additional information on pre-authorization and approval.~~

4.2. Content of Guidelines

Guidelines have required elements and may include additional relevant information, as indicated below.

4.2.1. ~~If authorized,~~ Department RTP Guidelines may be created for one or more of the Categories of Achievement (Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement; Academic Assignment; or Service) in order to describe work that is relevant to the Department and not accounted for in University policy.

4.2.2. Department RTP Guidelines must offer at least two inclusive hypothetical sample faculty profiles for each level of achievement (unsatisfactory, baseline, good, or excellent per S15-8 §3.3 Criteria to be Used when

122 Evaluating Candidates for Promotion and Tenure) within a given Category
123 of Achievement. Note that while Department RTP Guidelines provide
124 sample faculty profiles that would warrant a given level of achievement,
125 they do not replace the Criteria and Standards of University Policy.
126 Rather, they augment/supplement them. What follows is a sample profile
127 template to be used as a model—it is not intended to be used as an actual
128 profile.

129 4.2.2.1. A sample profile contains a description of what kind of work
130 qualifies for a certain level of achievement: “A faculty member
131 achieving BLANK in Scholarly/Artistic/Professional
132 Achievement may have a published BLANK during the period of
133 review or may have produced a BLANK and BLANK.”

134 4.2.3. Guidelines may also specify the sorts of documentation that are expected
135 to be relevant to the evaluation of the professional effectiveness of faculty
136 in a particular academic area.

137 4.2.4. Guidelines are inclusive and not exclusive. They shall not be used to
138 exclude accomplishments from consideration that were unanticipated
139 when the guidelines were created. When candidates submit genuine
140 accomplishments that were not anticipated in the Guidelines, the
141 accomplishments will be assessed using the language of the University
142 policy on Criteria and Standards.

143 4.2.5. They provide realistic estimates of the resources required to meet each
144 given level of achievement.

145 4.2.6. They are equitable; they do not make it more or less difficult for faculty to
146 achieve tenure or promotion.

147 4.2.7. Departments that contain more than one discipline, or contain very
148 different subdisciplines, may ~~request authorization to~~ produce more than
149 one set of specialized guidelines. When this occurs, particular care must
150 be taken to specify to which faculty each set of guidelines applies; the
151 applicable guidelines should be specified in the Chair’s Description of
152 Assignment and included in the dossier (see §5.2.2).

154 **4.3. ~~Authorization~~ Development and Approval of Department Guidelines**

155 ~~Departments that are required to have Guidelines do not request pre-authorization;~~
156 ~~please skip to §4.3.2. All other Departments begin with §4.3.1.~~

157 4.3.1. ~~Pre-authorization~~ Consultation and Support: Departments interested in
158 creating Guidelines, whether required or not, will go through a pre-
159 development process in which Professional Standards will provide
160 consultation and support to minimize time and effort at the Department
161 level and to ensure that Guidelines conform with Section 4.2, Content of

162 Guidelines. PS will ~~develop~~ provide a ~~system~~ process to help both
163 Departments ~~not required to have Guidelines and the Committee~~
164 determine whether guidelines may be necessary ~~or desirable~~ and how to
165 proceed ~~with the development, submission, and approval process.~~
166 Departments required to have Guidelines will also receive support through
167 a consultation process designed to minimize labor in the creation or
168 updating of Guidelines.

169 4.3.2. After the consultation phase with PS, Departments must develop
170 guidelines that closely follow the criteria laid out in section 4.2, Content of
171 Guidelines, as well as any advice provided by Professional Standards ~~or~~
172 the Provost.

173 4.3.3. The proposed Guidelines must be approved by a vote of department
174 probationary and tenured faculty, using secret ballots. The vote tally and
175 date shall be reported at the top of the Guidelines document at the time of
176 submission to Professional Standards. Guidelines without this information
177 will be returned to the Department for correction.

178 4.3.4. ~~Acceptable~~ Guidelines that comply with 4.2 Content of Guidelines and
179 University policy shall be approved and authorized for use by the Provost
180 in consultation with the Professional Standards Committee. Before making
181 its recommendation to the Provost, PS shall review the proposed
182 guidelines and solicit input from the Dean or corresponding Associate
183 Dean, and/or the College Research Committee. The PS Committee's
184 determination will be shared in writing with all involved parties by the PS
185 Chair or the Provost's designee.

186 4.3.5. In some cases, Departments may need to revise and resubmit the
187 document for subsequent review. The Committee remains available for
188 consultation during this phase of development.

190 4.4. **Publication, Distribution, and Use of Guidelines**

191 4.4.1. All approved Department RTP Guidelines shall be posted on the Faculty
192 Services website (or equivalent) and shall display the date they were last
193 approved.

194 4.4.2. Once approved and published, Department RTP Guidelines must be
195 applied when judging the level of achievement of all candidates to which
196 they apply, bearing in mind the limits of such guidelines.

197 4.4.3. ~~Authorized~~ Approved Guidelines must be kept current. The Department
198 shall submit them to Professional Standards for review every five years;
199 Guidelines shall display the date they were last approved as well as the
200 new vote results at the top of the document. Guidelines without this
201 information will be returned to the Department for correction.

202 4.4.4. Guidelines that display a date more than five years old calculated from the
203 time of the submission of the dossier shall be considered invalid, except as
204 provided for in § 4.4.5, Continuity of Guidelines throughout the Review
205 Period.

206 4.4.5. Continuity of Guidelines throughout the Review Period. Normally, any
207 valid (current) guidelines must be included in each candidate's dossier. If,
208 however, guidelines have changed during the candidate's period of
209 review, the candidate shall have the right to choose to include either the
210 old or the new guidelines. Similarly, if guidelines that were valid during a
211 part of the candidate's period of review are no longer valid and have not
212 been replaced, the candidate may choose between including the old
213 guidelines or including no guidelines. Only one set of guidelines may
214 appear in the dossier, and reviewers are restricted to considering only
215 included guidelines.

216
217
218
219

220 5.2.2 Department Chair's Responsibilities. The department chair or school or
221 division director shall inform in writing faculty members who are to be
222 reviewed of the nature of materials required by the retention and tenure
223 committee and the date by which these materials must be received for the
224 committee's consideration. It is the responsibility of the chair to ensure
225 that a detailed Description of Academic Assignment of the faculty
226 member for the period under review is placed in the dossier at least one
227 week before the submission date of the dossier, in order to establish a
228 frame of reference for evaluation of the candidate by persons from
229 outside the department. The Chair's Description of Academic
230 Assignment must state whether there are Department RTP Guidelines in
231 use and the Chair must ~~be~~ ensure that a copy is included in the dossier. In
232 cases where a Department has more than one set of RTP Guidelines (per
233 §4.2.7., above), the Chair's Description of Academic Assignment must
234 specify which set of guidelines applies to the particular faculty member.
235 The faculty member may attach a response to the Chair's Description of
236 Academic Assignment before the closing date; any such response shall
237 also be included in the dossier. During the period that the dossier is open,
238 it is the responsibility of the Chair to ensure that the evidence necessary
239 for a full and fair evaluation is contained in the dossier.