



---

**SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE**

16-17 CAHS 2  
May 15, 2017

**TO:** The Executive Committee

**FROM:** Ad Hoc Committee on Sustainability

**SUBJECT:** 16-17 CAH Sustainability 2: Amendment of Cal State East Bay's *Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policies and Procedures* to address work in support of the Institutional Learning Outcomes

**PURPOSE:** To obtain Academic Senate approval of the proposed amendments to the *Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policies and Procedures* document

**ACTION REQUESTED:** That the Executive Committee refer the recommended amendments to the appropriate body

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

Article III, Section 1(1) of the Sustainability Committee Policies and Procedures for Committee Operation, directs the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Sustainability (the Committee) to:

*Section 1:*

*(1) Make policy recommendations to the Academic Senate regarding means to achieve the University's sustainability commitments and goals. As part of that work:*

- a. Review Senate Policies and Procedures as they relate to achieving Senate sustainability commitments and goals;*
- b. Work with other Senate bodies, the Campus Sustainability Committee, and other campus entities to support the University's sustainability commitments and goals; and*
- c. Report to the Senate annually on the status of sustainability affairs on campus, including but not limited to, monitoring progress toward meeting Senate Sustainability Resolution (06-07 BEC 9).*

Based on Committee discussions that continued throughout Winter and Spring of 2017, the Committee

concluded that the primary issue of concern raised by the above duties is the extent to which our RTP Policies and Procedures support the University's sustainability commitments and goals, as reflected in the University's sustainability ILO, and work related thereto.

In May of 2012 (11-12 CAPR 12) the Academic Senate unanimously approved Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) for Cal State East Bay. They express a shared, campus-wide articulation of expectations for all degree recipients. In October 2015 (15-16 CIC 5) the Senate approved overlays in the areas of Diversity, Social Justice, and Sustainability as graduation requirements for the semester curriculum to meet those ILO areas. Accordingly, the faculty have been developing overlay coursework. Additionally, the university has hired cohorts of new faculty with these specialties areas (affinity hires), whose work often transcends traditional departmental and college boundaries—as is increasingly true of new hires in general. Thus, we should expect work in these areas to be increasingly reflected in all four of the major criteria areas of faculty dossiers: instructional achievement, professional achievement, university service, and community service.

It is a widely recognized best practice to explicitly incorporate into the RTP process, evaluation of work that supports institutional objectives. If not, there is no real incentive to do that work. Without instruction to do so, candidates for RTP will not consistently incorporate such work into their dossier and committees will not consistently value such work in their decision-making. Such lack of consistent valuation makes engagement in such work dangerous for faculty, undermining the university's mission. Such is currently the case for faculty work in the areas of diversity, social justice, and sustainability. This is especially true when such work transcends the traditional disciplinary and college boundaries into which our university is divided. While some universities have addressed the problem by creating departments and colleges centered on issues, rather than disciplines. Many universities have instead addressed the issue through adjustments to RTP policies and procedures. Indeed, the internationally used Sustainability Tracking, Assessment, and Rating System (STARS)—a program of the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education—uses as a criteria for rating progress, whether the institution has “formally adopted policies and procedures that give positive recognition to interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary, and multidisciplinary research during faculty promotion and/or tenure decisions.” Of the 294 international institutions reporting into the STARS database, 47% self-identify as having formally adopted such policies and procedures.

While Cal State East Bay's [Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy and Procedures](#) document addresses contributions to university service generally, it does not address contributions to the ILOs specifically, nor does it address institutional barriers to the kinds of transdisciplinary professional and teaching work often related thereto. Given that the restructuring of departments and colleges around issue areas may or may not be desirable for other reasons, and certainly appears out of our institution's reach for the foreseeable future, amendment of the RTP Policies and Procedures appears to be the appropriate remedy for Cal State East Bay.

The Committee discussed specific means to address these issues within the RTP document at its meeting of April 3, 2017. It approved preliminary recommendations at its April 17, 2017, meeting. Additional recommendations were proposed and approved at its May 1, 2017, meeting. This document was reviewed and approved at the May 17<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### **Proposed Amendments to the RTP Document**

To encourage and protect faculty engaged in professional, teaching, and service work that directly and indirectly support the university's overlay ILOs, the Committee recommends the following changes to *Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policies and Procedures* document (added text is in red and deleted text is in ~~red-strike-though~~).

#### Recommended Changes to 3.5 Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committees, page 7

**3.5. *Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committees*** Throughout this document, the "Committees" shall be deemed to include: the Department Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee; the College Tenure and Promotion Committee; and the University Tenure and Promotion Committee.

3.5.1. The Department Committee may be a single Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee; or a separate Retention Committee and a separate Tenure and Promotion Committee, depending on the availability of eligible faculty to serve. **Candidates engaged in transdisciplinary work have the right to have an additional non-voting member participate in the Department RTP committee to represent areas of work outside of their department's traditional discipline.**

3.5.2. The College Committee is a Tenure and Promotion Committee only, but may be asked to evaluate applications for retention under certain circumstances. **Candidates engaged in work that transcends Cal State East Bay's College boundaries have the right to a College-level-equivalent committee that represents their fields of work. That committee will replace the college level committee.**

3.5.3. The University Committee is a Tenure and Promotion Committee only, but may be asked to evaluate applications for retention under certain conditions.

#### Recommended Changes to 3.8. Rights of the Candidate

##### 3.8. Rights of the Candidate

3.8.1. The candidate is entitled to be informed of and to have read all materials in their WPAF as it goes forward from one level to another.

3.8.2. The candidate shall be informed of the recommendation in their case at each stage of the reviewing process, and of the reasons for that recommendation. The candidate shall therefore receive copies of the letters of the Committees and of the Department Chair and the College Dean, regardless of whether the recommendation is positive or negative. The Department Chair and the College Dean have the responsibility for providing the candidate with such letters at the

appropriate level in accordance with Sections 10.2.5, 10.2.6, 11.2.7, and 11.2.8 of this document.

3.8.3. The candidate shall have the right to respond to the decision at the Department, College, University or Provostal level and to add a letter of rebuttal to their WPAF in accordance with provisions of Section 10.2.5, 10.2.6, 11.2.7, 11.2.8, 12.2.10 and 13.3.2 of this document.

3.8.4. Any candidate for promotion to any rank may withdraw their candidacy at any stage of consideration by requesting this action in writing, of the Department Chair, who shall take immediate steps to stop all further consideration.

3.8.5. When all provisions of this document have been exhausted, a candidate for retention, tenure, or promotion who has received a negative decision from the Provost (in the case of retention) or President (in the case tenure or promotion) may then appeal their case in accordance with Article 10 of the CBA ("Grievance Procedures"). In retention cases, this shall not be interpreted to mean that the candidate must first have requested an investigation of bias under provisions of Section 11.2.9 of this document.

3.8.6. The candidate will have supervised access to their WPAF upon request at any point in the evaluation cycle.

3.8.7. Candidates engaged in transdisciplinary work have the right to have their dossiers reviewed by experts in their field(s), and that input must be considered in the RTP process.

#### Recommended Changes to Uniform Criteria, 4.4. University Service, page 14

#### 4.4. University Service

Internal University contributions may be demonstrated by documentary material showing service *to the University in such areas as:*

4.4.1. *faculty government;*

4.4.2. *committee service at the Department, College, or University levels;*

4.4.3. *activities that enhance the University's ability to serve the needs of a multiethnic and non-traditional student body;*

4.4.4. *activities that support the university's mission, as reflected in Cal State East Bay's Institutional Learning Outcomes and the General Education Overlays for Diversity, Social Justice, and Sustainability, and in Cal State East Bay's and the CSU's system-wide commitments related thereto.*

4.4.4.5. *assistance in student activities;*

4.4.5.6. *University administrative assignments;*

4.4.6.7. *coordination of graduate programs;*

4.4.7.8. *coordination of single subject programs;*

4.4.8.9. *coordination of student-learning activities;*

4.4.9.10. *coordination of Academic Major assessments;*

4.4.10.11 *administrative assignments not involving instruction.*