

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

**Amendment H to University Policy S15-8
Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty
Employees: Criteria and Standards: To include within the
category of Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement,
activities that specifically enhance inclusion, educational
equity and achievement in the surrounding and broader
communities**

Amends S15-8

Legislative History:

At its meeting of May 9, 2022, the Academic Senate approved Amendment H to University Policy S15-8 presented by Senator Schultz-Krohn for the Professional Standards Committee. S15-8 was approved and signed by President Mohammad Qayoumi on June 12, 2015.

On September 18, 2015, Interim President Susan W. Martin approved Amendment A to University Policy S15-8.

On May 4, 2020, President Mary A. Papazian signed and approved Amendment B to University Policy S15-8. The revised language in Amendment B seeks to correct a problem with the way the current language discusses the “norms” of our SOTES. Amendment B also inserts a reference to “course syllabi and other teaching materials.” Amendment A and B are incorporated into the policy below.

On September 21, 2020, President Mary A. Papazian signed and approved Amendment C to University Policy S15-8. Amendment C allows the President to declare a campus-wide emergency and provides for flexibility in RTP during these times.

On January 14, 2021, President Mary A. Papazian signed and approved Amendment D to University Policy S15-8. Amendment D removes the exclusion of the College of International and Extended Studies from S15-8 section 1.5.2.

On April 7, 2021, President Mary A. Papazian signed and approved Amendment E to University Policy S15-8. Amendment E adds the category of “Scholarship of Engagement.”

On February 14, 2022, Interim President Steve Perez signed and approved Amendment F to University Policy S15-8. Amendment F includes within the category of Service, activities that specifically enhance inclusion, educational equity and engaged service with students and in the surrounding and broader communities.

On April 13, 2022, Interim President Steve Perez signed and approved Amendment G to University Policy S15-8. Amendment G includes changes to Section 2.3, Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement.

Amendment H is as follows below.

ACTION BY THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT:

**Signed and Approved by Interim
President, Steve Perez, on June 1,
2022.**

**Amendment H to University Policy S15-8
Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees:
Criteria and Standards: To include within the category of Academic
Assignment, activities that specifically enhance inclusion, educational
equity and achievement in the surrounding and broader communities**

Resolved: That S15-8 be amended as indicated by strikeout and underline as appropriate.

Resolved: That these changes become effective for AY 2022-2023.

Rationale: S15-8 revised S98-8 to improve and enhance the clarity of criteria in the category of Academic Assignment for faculty Retention, Tenure, and Promotion decision. The following changes were informed by SS-S21-2 Support for Reform of RTP for Fairness, Equity and Inclusion and the following documents: UP-FS Fall 2020 Faculty Survey, the RTP Process for BIPOC Faculty report from UP-FS, Black Spartans Community Letter to President Papazian, Asian Pacific Islander Faculty & Staff Association Letter to President Papazian, and discussions with the Faculty Diversity Committee.

Approved: May 2, 2022

Vote: 8-0-0

Present: Magdalena Barrera, Nidhi Mahendra, Priya Raman, Alaka Rao, Shannon Rose Riley, Gokay Saldamli, Neil Switz, Winifred Schultz-Krohn (Chair)

Absent: Nina Chuang, Nyle Monday

Financial Impact: No direct impact

Workload Impact: Additional training of RTP committee members addressing SOTE/SOLATE interpretation

S15-8 text:

2.2 Effectiveness in Academic Assignment

2.2.1 Academic Assignment is the specific role given to a faculty member to support the educational mission of San José State University. Academic Assignment is the primary, but not the only, consideration in evaluating a faculty member's performance and is the essential condition for continuation and advancement within the university. For most faculty, academic assignment consists primarily of teaching; academic assignment includes work in the department to support educational equity and/or close equity gaps through the recruitment, mentoring, retention, and academic support for historically underserved students in the department, and training of colleagues in such efforts. For some faculty, such as department chairpersons, coordinators, and field supervisors, part or all of their academic assignment is of a non-teaching nature, and they should be evaluated accordingly; RSCA release should be evaluated under Scholarly/Creative/Professional Achievement. However, release for departmental administration and the like can be evaluated as appropriate in other Categories of Achievement (Academic Assignment, Service, or Scholarly/Creative/Professional Achievement), depending on the emphasis of the work as represented by the candidate.

2.2.2 Considerations in applying the criteria for Academic Assignment to teaching.

2.2.2.1 When evaluating effectiveness in teaching, chairs, committees, and administrators are required to conduct a holistic evaluation. The teaching must be considered in the context of its purpose, its objectives, and the degree of difficulty of the assignment. Evaluators must be well versed in the University policy F12-6 "Evaluation of Effectiveness in Teaching", especially the most recent "SOTE/SOLATE Interpretation Guide", and have explicit training with respect to issues of subjectivity and bias in SOTEs, especially for faculty traditionally underrepresented within their field.

2.2.2.2 Examples of contextual factors include whether the teaching resulted from newly created or substantially modified curricula (e.g., but not limited to, changes to promote educational equity); participation in team or interdisciplinary teaching; the adoption of new pedagogical or technological approaches; whether the level or kind of teaching or number of students created special demands or challenges; and the extent to which student learning occurs outside formal instruction through mentoring, advising, or the integration of students into a research program, especially where these impact historically underserved

students.

2.2.3 For non-teaching Unit 3 faculty employees, effectiveness in academic assignment will be evaluated in conformity with guidelines developed by the unit of assignment, with appropriate components of peer evaluation and evaluation of impact on students.

2.2.4 Department Chairs, Directors, Coordinators, etc. may be nonteaching faculty due to the portion of their chair assignment or other academic assignments. In such cases, their related duties should be discussed as part of Academic Assignment – especially as related to curriculum and program development and oversight. Other areas of a Chair's or coordinator's Academic Assignment may also be discussed more thoroughly under RSCA or Service.

3.3.1 Academic Assignment

3.3.1.1 Committees and administrators shall write an evaluation of a candidate's achievements in academic assignment and shall rate the overall performance in this category according to the following descriptive scale. When a candidate's achievements are significant but depart from the general description below, evaluators should exercise judgment and give credit for unusual, unique, or unanticipated activities at the same level as better known activities of comparable significance. Especially in unusual cases, candidates should carefully document the significance of their accomplishments in academic assignment.

3.3.1.2 Criteria for nonteaching faculty.

Criteria for evaluating the Academic Assignment of nonteaching faculty, including potentially Librarians and Counselors, will be developed by the units as part of their department guidelines and will parallel the categories identified below, but will reference those specific responsibilities in their academic assignment rather than teaching. Department guidelines for academic assignment will be mandatory for such units.

3.3.1.3 Criteria for teaching faculty.

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

3.3.1.3.2 Baseline. The candidate has taught assigned courses that are well crafted and appropriate for the catalog description as evidenced by syllabi and other materials related to the academic assignment. The candidate has taken measures to correct any problems identified earlier in either direct observations or prior performance evaluations. Recent direct (e.g. peer) observations are supportive. ~~Narrative SOTEs must also be examined for a holistic view. Student numerical responses within the university and norms by the end of the review period narrative and/or numerical course evaluations, taking into account the nature, subject, and level of classes taught, are generally within the norms by the~~

end of the review period, particularly for classes within the candidate's primary focus and any curriculum specifically identified in the appointment letter.

Student numerical SOTEs, narrative SOTEs, and other evidence indicate effectiveness in academic assignment, taking into account the nature, subject, and level of classes taught. Student numerical SOTEs, narrative SOTEs, and other evidence indicate effectiveness in academic assignment. All materials submitted should be examined from a holistic view that takes into account the nature, subject, and level of classes taught. Numerical SOTEs are generally within norm ranges by the end of the review period, particularly for classes within the candidate's primary focus and any curriculum specifically identified in the appointment letter.

3.3.1.3.3 Good. In addition to the baseline as described above, the candidate has documented a degree of innovation within the teaching assignment and provides evidence of using inclusive or equity-based practices, especially use of related techniques in the classroom.

For example, a candidate at this level may have effectively taught a wide range of courses, or created one or more new courses to fill important curricular needs, or documented the use of high-impact practices in teaching, or been actively involved in mentoring, outreach, or student support, particularly for historically underrepresented students. Candidates meeting this level of achievement have direct (e.g. peer) observations that identify a faculty member with good skills in the academic assignment. Numerical SOTEs, taking into account the nature, subject, and level of classes taught, are generally above mean, and above norm ranges where possible, by the end of the review period, particularly for classes within the candidate's primary focus and any curriculum specifically identified in the appointment letter. Narrative SOTEs further confirm effective teaching and support for student learning, keeping in mind the nature and subject of the course.

3.3.1.3.4 Excellent. In addition to criteria for good performance as described above, the candidate has either engaged in a higher level of curricular or pedagogical innovation, than described above, documented consistent positive impacts for student success and/or educational equity, or received peer and student course evaluations that are consistently above mean (and, where possible, above 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 in other departments or at other institutions. Excellence in academic assignment may include exceptional advising, recruitment, retention and mentoring of students, and the like.