

# CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY STANISLAUS

## RPT Survey: Overview of Results

*See the full report at:*

[https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/groups/Faculty%20Affairs/finalrptdraftreportqualitativeandquantitativefindings032214\\_waappendices.pdf](https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/groups/Faculty%20Affairs/finalrptdraftreportqualitativeandquantitativefindings032214_waappendices.pdf)

# RPT SURVEY GROUP

- ❑ Dr. Steven Filling, Chair, University Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Committee (URPTC)
- ❑ Dr. John Garcia, Speaker for the Faculty
- ❑ Dr. Mark Grobner, Faculty Representative
- ❑ Dr. Ian Littlewood, Faculty Representative
- ❑ Mr. Dennis Shimek, Vice President for Faculty Affairs and Human Resources
- ❑ Dr. James T. Strong, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
- ❑ Dr. James Youngblom, Faculty Representative

# OBJECTIVES

- ❑ **Goal of the Study:** Better understand views surrounding the RPT policy and procedures and to determine if steps can be taken to reduce conflict and/or build trust in the RPT process.
- ❑ **First Component:** Survey a select group of faculty leaders and administrators intimately involved in the RPT process to examine their views on the existing RPT policy and procedures.
- ❑ **Second Component:** Using the qualitative data generated from the first component, faculty (tenured and tenure-track) and deans completed a quantitative survey to gather their views on the specific issues revealed in the previous survey results.
- ❑ What do we do next ?

# OBSERVATIONS

- ❑ **Observation 1:** There is a clear agreement that the RPT Policy and Procedures as written are strong. That is, the primacy of discipline expertise, the inclusion of multiple levels of review, and the clarity of the process are the core components which most faculty and administrators concur make the policy and procedures highly functional.
- ❑ **Observation 2:** Based on the evidence generated from this study, the central issue which appears to be leading to conflict (and lack of trust) related to the RPT policy and procedures centers on implementation.

# OBSERVATIONS

- ❑ **Observation 3:** In the qualitative portion of the study with key informants, a small segment of participants targeted elaborations as a concern surrounding implementation. Their collective contention was that if elaborations were more uniform, it would be easier to conduct (implement) the review in a more consistent manner. However, the larger sample of participants in the quantitative portion of the study did not concur with this view. The data generated in the quantitative portion of the study suggest that elaborations are not viewed as problematic by a large majority of the participants. Rather than more uniformity and specificity in elaborations, there is general agreement from the participants that elaborations should be uniquely developed (by discipline experts) to capture the diverse nature of each discipline.

# OBSERVATIONS

- ❑ **Observation 4:** According to the overwhelming majority of participants, concerns surrounding implementation appear to focus on a central issue. Conflict arises when the RPT policy and procedures (namely the review criteria – to include elaborations) are not the basis for the review. In this study, the participants are particularly concerned that administrative reviews have deviated from the written policy and procedures. These deviations include not utilizing the elaborations as the basis for review and placing greater emphasis on scholarship at the expense of the other clearly articulated categories of review.
- ❑ **Observation 5:** A critical issue connected to conflict surrounding the RPT policy and procedures appears to stem from a very specific perception of (lack of) trust. There is an expressed sentiment that a significant number of faculty believe that the administration does not trust or value the expertise of the faculty.

# RECOMMENDATIONS

- ❑ **Recommendation 1:** Acknowledge that the University has a highly functional RPT Policy and Procedures. Understand that the conflicts that have developed around Retention, Promotion, and Tenure are (largely) symptoms of a broader organizational issue surrounding trust between faculty and administration. Continue efforts, similar to those outlined in 9/AS/11, to build trust around issues of shared governance, the primacy of faculty in issues related to the curriculum, and the leadership roles of administration in pursuing the mission of the institution.

# RECOMMENDATIONS

- ❑ **Recommendation 2:** Ensure that all parties involved in the RPT process are utilizing the established review criteria. This can be encouraged by continuing and expanding outreach and training efforts targeting the various groups involved in the process. These outreach efforts should ensure that all parties are informed of the candidate's rights, the review criteria, and the established timelines. All parties should also be informed that all review levels are receiving the same training and information.

# RECOMMENDATIONS

- ❑ **Recommendation 3:** Continue efforts to ensure that all tenured and tenure-track faculty, as discipline experts, have a good understanding of the complexity of developing elaborations and the role elaborations play in the RPT process. Share elaborations within and across Colleges and call upon all departments to regularly discuss and examine their elaborations with attention to both the unique aspects of their discipline and to the means by which other departments communicate their priorities and expectations. Utilize the Faculty Development Center to engage faculty in critical dialogue regarding strategies for thinking about and preparing elaborations.

# Q&A

## *Open Discussion*

Thank you!