2-09-18

TO: Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Faculty Affairs Committee

RE: Summary of proposed changes to University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy (SP 15-15)

Note: Major changes being proposed to SP 15-15 are highlighted in yellow in the draft version of the revised policy.

1. The abbreviation “CI” in SP 15-15 has been changed to “CSU Channel Islands” throughout the revised version.
2. A definition of the CBA has been added to the Definitions page.
3. Page numbers have been added to the policy.
4. The words “will” or “should” have been changed to “shall” as appropriate to indicate required action.
5. The definition of “Program Personnel Committee” on the Definitions page has been changed to comply with what is stipulated in the CBA. In SP 15-15, the definition of “Program Personnel Committee” includes the following, which has been deleted in the revised policy that we are proposing: “The composition of the PPC is stipulated in each Program Personnel Standard (PPS) for the program area (see below).”
6. The definition of “University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee” (Definitions page) has been changed to specify that “VSPA” stands for “Vice President for Student Affairs” since this abbreviation was not previously explained in the document. The verb “recommend” in the second sentence of the definition has been changed to the singular (“recommends”) in order to agree with other verbs in the sentence (“reviews” and “comments”).
7. In Section B, point 3, the verb “establishes” has been changed to “establish” ([subjunctive](http://www.mit.edu/course/21/21.guide/subjunct.htm) mood) in order to express obligation.
8. In SP 15-15, there is a section titled “Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities,” (Section D) that offers a philosophical description of *some* types of research, scholarship and creative activities that the University values and supports. This section was deleted from the revised policy by the Faculty Affairs Committee for the following reasons:
9. We could not find in SP 15-15 any similar philosophical statements corresponding to the other two areas of RTP evaluation: Teaching & Professional Activities, and Service
10. The committee considered that such statements belong in Program Personnel Standards rather than the University RTP Policy. In fact, a similar version of the philosophical statement in question is included in the General Personnel Standards.
11. The statement in question did not appear appropriate for a policy document given its vagueness and caveats (e.g., “a range of…”, “including…”, etc.)
12. In Section E, point 3e of SP 15-15 (Section D, point 3e of Revised RTP policy), the word “departmental” was deleted (in accord with campus nomenclature), and the word “simultaneously” was added for clarity.
13. In the section titled “University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee, (Section E, point 3g of SP 15-15, and Section D, point 3g of Revised RTP policy), the phrase “that position” was changed to “the position in question” for clarity and to eliminate overuse of the word “that” in the sentence.
14. The section titled “Program Personnel Committees” (Section F in SP 15-15, Section E in Revised RTP policy) has been modified to comply with the CBA (see CBA 15.41). The main difference here is that SP 15-15 allowed programs to create different PPCs for individual faculty members rather than calling for the creation of one PPC for the entire program.
15. In the section titled “Appointment” (Section G in SP 15-15, Section F in Revised RTP policy), changes have been proposed in the evaluation of new tenure-track faculty who have been given an initial two-year appointment. The current policy (SP 15-15) states that “all probationary faculty must be reviewed each year until tenured”, while the proposed policy states that “all probationary faculty must be reviewed after the first year of service until tenured.” The proposed policy revision goes on to clarify that “probationary faculty with a two-year initial appointment shall undergo performance reviews before they are reappointed to third, fourth, fifth, and sixth probationary years or are granted tenure”, as opposed to “Probationary faculty with two year initial appointment shall have a periodic review in their first year of probation” in the current policy.
16. In the section titled “Period of Review” (Section K in SP 15-15, Section J in Revised RTP policy, we have called for the PDP and a teaching observation to be submitted during the spring semester of the first probationary year.
17. In the section titled “Professional Development Plan” (Section I in SP 15-15 and Section H in Revised RTP policy), point 4c has been modified to require that faculty clarify in the WPAF any significant deviations from the goals originally set forth in their PDP.
18. In the section titled “Period of Review” (Section K in SP 15-15, Section J in Revised RTP policy), a new point was added (point #2) requiring new probationary faculty to submit a PDP and at least one peer teaching observation during their second semester at CSU Channel Islands.
19. In the section titled “Working Personnel Action File” (Section L in SP 15-15, Section K in Revised RTP policy), language has been added regarding the transition from paper to electronic files, with a timeline for all faculty eventually being required to transition to this format.
20. In the section titled “Working Personnel Action File” (Section L in SP 15-15, Section K in Revised RTP policy), the language referring to the different areas of evaluation has been streamlined to avoid redundancy/verbosity. For example, the narratives are now listed as a “self-assessment **of accomplishments in Teaching** (professional activities for librarians and counselors)” rather than “accomplishments **in the areas of performance in teaching** (professional activities for librarians and counselors)”.
21. In the section titled “Working Personnel Action File” (Section L in SP 15-15, Section K in Revised RTP policy), points 3 and 4 have been deleted in accord with changes made to the “Period of Review” as listed above.
22. In the section titled “Review Process and Levels” (Section M in SP 15-15, Section L in Revised RTP policy), point 5 has been divided into points 5 and 6 for clarity, and the wording has been edited for clarity in the new point 6.
23. In the section titled “Review Process and Levels” (Section M in SP 15-15, Section L in Revised RTP policy), the roles of the Provost and President have been modified according to the wishes of said administrators.
24. The section titled “Eligibility to Participate in the Personnel Process” (Section N in SP 15-15, Section M in Revised RTP policy) has been changed to “ELIGIBILITY TO PARTICIPATE IN THE RTP REVIEW PROCESS” for clarity’s sake.
25. In the section titled “Requirements for Tenure” (Section O in revised RTP policy), language has been added to point 2 to clarify the discrete nature of each RTP evaluation during the probationary years.
26. In the section titled “Requirements for Promotion” (Section P in revised RTP policy), language has been added to point 1 to clarify the discrete nature of each RTP evaluation during the probationary years.
27. In the section titled “Requirements for Tenure” (Section P in SP 15-15, Section O in Revised RTP policy), the exceptional nature of granting early tenure is clarified. In SP 15-15, there appeared to be no special circumstances required for granting early tenure.
28. In the section titled “Requirements for Promotion” (Section Q in SP 15-15, Section P in Revised RTP policy), the exceptional nature of granting early promotion is clarified. In SP 15-15, there appeared to be no special circumstances required for granting early tenure.
29. In the section titled “Requirements for Promotion” (Section Q in SP 15-15, Section P in Revised RTP policy), language has been modified for clarity: “growth and future potential” was changed to “continuous growth”.
30. In the section titled “Procedures for RTP Evaluations…” Section R in SP 15-15, Section Q in Revised RTP policy), the phrase “Service in the personnel evaluation process” (point 3) has been changed to “Service in the RTP evaluation process”.
31. In the section titled “Responsibilities of the Provost…” (Section X in SP 15-15, Section W in Revised RTP policy), the responsibilities of the Provost have been modified to include reviewing each retention file in addition to promotion and tenure file (as per the Provost).
32. Minor language clarifications have been made to the “Glossary of RTP Terms” (Appendix A) with regard to stages of publication.
33. In appendix B, the description of CSU Channel Islands as a “start-up university” has been deleted in favor of reference to the mission of the University as a guide for creating Program Personnel Standards.
34. In appendix B, the word “should” has been changed to “shall” to indicate that programs specify in their PPS how the following contributions to student learning will be recognized: development of new courses, innovative approaches to teaching and fostering student learning, supervision of student research or performance, delivering workshops for students, and other similar activities.
35. In appendix B, point 3 under Section D has been deleted. In SP 15-15, this point reads as follows: “Programs are encouraged to adopt the service guidelines in the General Program Standards for inclusion in their PPS.”