

Department of Counseling, College of Health & Human Services, SFSU
Process and Criteria for Retention, Tenure, Promotion and
Post Tenure Review
Approved by the Provost October 2009

The faculty of the Department of Counseling (DoC), through its Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Committee evaluates candidates for retention, tenure, promotion, and post tenure reviews according to the policies and procedures outlined in the University Faculty Manual. All members of the DoC are advised to be familiar with the University policies that address any personnel action. In particular, the Retention, Tenure and Promotion Guidelines provided below are consistent with the Academic Senate's Retention, Tenure and Promotion Policy #S07-241 and Academic Senate Policy #S00-122 concerning the Evaluation of Tenured Faculty, also called post tenure review. These policies are available on the University Faculty Affairs website, <http://www.sfsu.edu/~acaffrs/>. All members of the DoC are also advised to be familiar with Articles 13, 14, and 15 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) as these pertain to retention and tenure, promotions, and the evaluation of tenured faculty respectively. These articles are available on the California Faculty Association website at <http://calfac.org>.

This document shall be revised on an as needed basis by the RTP Committee and/or an ad-hoc committee of the tenured/tenure track faculty. Each candidate reviewed for a personnel action may choose whether to use the department procedures in place during the first semester of his/her employment or the procedures outlined in this document at the time of the personnel action.

PREAMBLE

The RTP Guidelines were developed by an ad hoc rainbow committee of the DoC including faculty at all ranks and levels. The Guidelines are provided to the DoC in order to create benchmarks or standards that candidates can use to evaluate their progress on all of the many different criteria that are provided in each of the aforementioned policies. The Guidelines are to be used to give a greater degree of intersubjective understanding, definition and agreed upon specificity to the criteria in the policies.

The RTP Guidelines are intended to make the faculty evaluation process relevant to each DoC faculty member and to allow each member the latitude to have that process reflect individually different interests, specialty areas and professional focus. Formative (process focused) and summative (decision focused) evaluation is an ongoing process in the DoC for all faculty members regardless of rank or level. Input on this process is welcomed by the RTP committee.

The DoC is, mostly, a graduate level, professional education and training program. We seek to educate and train culturally competent, ethical professional counselors specializing in one or more of six distinct professional emphases. As such, our faculty members must embrace and

reflect through their accomplishments a strong commitment to professional counselor education and training.

If the RTP Guidelines enclosed are to be at all successful, they must support traditional as well as nontraditional forms of scholarship that improve counselor education and training. The Guidelines also seek to foster a commitment and recognition to all actions that facilitate collaboration and community building within the department, the college, the university, and beyond.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The chair of the RTP Committee will make all candidates aware of the dates that their materials are to be delivered to the RTP Committee. Each candidate should provide the Committee with an updated Curriculum Vita and a self study based upon the supplemental material demonstrating experience and expertise. Candidates for all personnel actions are asked to submit the supplemental materials organized with the index tabs provided by Faculty Affairs.

It is most helpful if the self study addresses the criteria listed below, and explains both what has been done by the candidate within a particular personnel action cycle, and how the candidate evaluates his/her work in terms of realized strengths and areas for growth. The self study should include a statement of teaching philosophy, a critique of work as an instructor as well as teaching effectiveness. The statement may include responses to peer and student evaluations that are in the WPAF. In addition, the self study ought to address the candidate's plans to successfully achieve a given personnel action goal or summative review (e.g., tenure, promotion) or positive formative review (e.g., retention). Finally, the self study ought to reflect an integration of the candidate's accomplishments around a coherent theme or themes.

CRITERIA FOR RETENTION, TENURE and PROMOTION

There are three criteria for Retention, Tenure and Promotion: (a) Teaching Effectiveness, (b) Professional Achievement and Growth, and (c) Contributions to Campus and Community. Candidates for retention, tenure and promotion will be evaluated on all three criteria. In order to be retained, tenured or promoted, a candidate must demonstrate substantial achievement in each area. The criteria for substantial achievement are broad enough to reflect the individual disciplines in the DoC and provide for a reasonable degree of flexibility.

A. **Teaching Effectiveness** including teaching performance, liaison and advising.

B. **Professional Achievement and Growth** including research and publications, creative works, curricular development, unpublished works and works in progress.

C. **Contribution to Campus and Community** including service to professional societies or other professional activities, faculty governance, university non-teaching activities, collegiality and departmental fit.

A. Teaching Effectiveness

Assessment of teaching effectiveness is based on systematically gathered evidence and the RTP Committee must indicate the basis on which that judgment was made. An analysis of teaching evaluations of all courses and all instructors within the DoC has yielded the following broad guidelines: (a) At a minimum, in order to be retained, tenured or promoted, the candidate must have a pattern of quantitative evaluations that are generally below 2.0 and qualitative evaluations that show interest and skill in teaching and (b) It is desirable that the candidate's performance should show a pattern of quantitative scores that are below 1.5 and qualitative evaluations that demonstrate an outstanding level of skill and interest in teaching. There should be support of the candidate in the form of collegial class visits and a demonstration of currency in the field. A dossier of supportive letters may also be available. Hence, teaching effectiveness is assessed through multiple sources of evaluative data. In reviewing this evaluative data, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to identify and be cognizant of their own pattern of teaching strengths and areas for growth. Details regarding this evaluative process can include the following:

a) **Quantitative Student Ratings.** The DoC has a policy of having students evaluate every class; these evaluations provide data on the impressions that students have of their instructors. They can be used in a formative way in the early stages of a faculty member's career to assist with mentoring. The data provide an overall profile of a candidate's teaching performance including the type of class (clinical or content based), size of the class, and the percentage of class respondents to the evaluation. The RTP committee looks for consistency of strong ratings over a period of time. The committee also studies those individual item markers that speak to areas where a faculty member is particularly strong or those places where the member needs further mentoring and guidance. Both mean and median data can be used and the RTP committee makes a determination of how a candidate compares to successful others in the DoC with similar levels of teaching experience in similar courses. When presenting the summary of the numerical ratings, candidates are encouraged to use the following format:

NUMBER AND NAME OF CLASS AND SEMESTER TAUGHT	YOUR OVERALL MEAN	DEPARTMENT MEAN	NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS/ Enrollees	ENROLLMENT CAP ON COURSE
	You should have this for each class.		You should have these data for each class.	Check with DOC Chair for this information.

Department means for particular classes can be obtained from the Chair of the RTP Committee or the DoC Chair.

b) **Qualitative Student Ratings.** The DoC considers written comments on the teaching effectiveness questionnaires and uses these data to extract individually different themes that characterize a candidate's teaching. All student comments should be placed in the WPAF. These comments can be seen as equally significant to quantitative ratings as long as the comments are representative and not merely outliers.

With respect to points a) and b) above, the RTP Committee recognizes that a primary professional responsibility held by our faculty is that of maintaining high standards for the profession: We must ensure that the students we graduate are competent, appropriate, and ethical. Exercising this responsibility (e.g., appropriately discriminating levels of performance through grades, discussing students in student progress meetings, assigning failing grades to those who earned them) sometimes has adverse consequences which are reflected in negative feedback from students about a candidate. In order for the Committee to fairly evaluate negative student feedback, the candidate must address such feedback directly in his/her self study. The candidate is encouraged to provide relevant contextual information including unusual classroom characteristics, classroom size and comfort, inordinate numbers of students, disruptive students, grading policy, the number of times the candidate has taught the class and the like.

c) ***Collegial Class Visits.*** Each year, every candidate for a personnel action will have at least one classroom visitation and formative evaluation. This visit will be arranged by the RTP Committee with the candidate and will result in a meeting and the preparation of a written report using the form developed by the DoC for that purpose. A signed copy of the report will be presented to the RTP Committee and the candidate and placed in the candidates' WPAF. These class visits are an alternative data source beyond the comments that students provide about an instructor since quantitative evaluations can be influenced by class size, instructional demands, lecture versus discussion versus clinical lab activity, and grading policy. Comments from the reports should be a part of a candidate's formative and summative evaluation.

d) ***Student Letters.*** Letters are regularly solicited by the RTP Committee from students. Signed letters of evaluation will be made a part of the WPAF and will be considered by the RTP as lending support to the overall profile of teaching effectiveness being established. Individual faculty members of the Department of Counseling may not solicit letters from current students.

e) ***Professional Currency and Growth.*** Professional currency can be established by attending workshops on teaching, professional conferences and other activities focused on enhancing courses. It can be evaluated, in part, by examining the syllabi for different courses as well as statements of intentionality in the self study. Candidates should keep copies of course syllabi, bibliographies, reading lists, evaluation criteria, and technical innovations in teaching and present them to the RTP committee. For those candidates who have experienced difficulty adjusting to the demands of teaching, recognition will be given for those who use the services of a mentor or a facility like the Center for Teaching and Faculty Development (or its later rendition) to address some of the concerns that students and colleagues may have about their approaches to their topics.

f) ***Relevant Commitment to the Teaching Mission of the DoC and SFSU.*** This can be demonstrated through a variety of means: by consistently teaching sizably demanding courses (e.g., Counseling 690) or time consuming skill development (e.g., practicum courses), by regularly teaching core or specialization courses, or by embracing the challenges of teaching a variety of courses when possible or when asked to do so by the Chair. The DoC recognizes that some of our courses can be extremely demanding on instructors due to the intensive nature of the assignments associated with them (e.g., courses in the practicum sequence). Finally, the DoC

also looks favorably upon those instructors who choose to branch out, attempting new courses of instruction to assist in their own development while giving a fresh perspective to a class.

g) **Advising.** Advising is an integral part of the role of an instructor and a record of faculty members' efforts as an advisor will be considered. Meeting advising responsibilities, attending orientation and advising group sessions are expected by the DoC. The DoC has a mandatory advising policy and takes this faculty obligation seriously. Advisors should be familiar with both university and DoC policies (as written in the University Bulletin, the Course Schedule, and the DOC Advising Handbook). Candidates should include an evaluation of their work as advisors in their self study.

h) **Liaison.** To facilitate an optimal learning experience, liaisons serve as intermediaries and monitors for students in the field, their field placement site and their field supervisor. Many tenure track faculty have liaison responsibilities. This is a critical function in the DoC. When this is an assigned part of the workload, it is expected that candidates will perform the liaison duties as outlined by the Fieldwork Coordinator. Candidates are responsible for including a self-evaluation of their work as liaison in their self study. Generally, knowledge of liaison effectiveness is established by contributions to the twice annual supervisors meetings, student progress meetings or from feedback provided to the Fieldwork Coordinator by Field Supervisors. Although the RTP committee may ask for written feedback from the Fieldwork Coordinator, students, and Fieldwork Supervisors to be placed in the WPAF, the principal material used to evaluate liaison effectiveness will be the candidate's self study. The Committee will also take into account the number of students, supervisors, and additional work that may have occurred with some placement settings.

Faculty going through the RTP process should demonstrate successful growth and, when needed, corrective action to improve teaching. Corrective action may include activities such as consultation with colleagues, revision of syllabi and course content, or using campus resources (e.g., Center for Teaching and Faculty Development, Academic Technology, etc).

B. Professional Achievement and Growth

The DoC views professional achievement and growth as having a complementary role to teaching and scholarship. Professional achievement and growth may be exhibited in a variety of ways depending upon the interests and the focus of the faculty member. These include research and publications, grant writing, workshops, presentations to professional societies, development of new areas of expertise, attainment of new professional licenses or certification as well as their maintenance, creative work, curricular and/or programmatic innovation, and unpublished manuscripts or papers in progress. Publications may include work in refereed journal articles, books, book chapters, clearinghouse papers, training manuals, newsletters and other published materials. As a general guide, the RTP Committee expects a candidate for tenure or promotion to have work either published or accepted for publication and to have made presentations at state, regional, national or international conferences on scholarly topics to professional audiences.

Given that opportunities for publications and presentations of one's scholarship vary widely in the field of counseling, the DoC emphasizes quality rather than quantity of work. The DoC

recognizes that scholarship can be evaluated by multiple criteria such as the impact on the profession, community, or university, innovation, the external reviews of colleagues, the quality of the journal or publisher and so forth. Therefore, the evaluation of faculty's professional achievement and growth is best achieved through a profile analysis of multiple criteria, rather than reliance on any one single criterion. In an effort to provide tenure track candidates with guidance in their professional development, it is recommended that a candidate have 3 or more peer-reviewed publications at the time he/she applies for tenure and promotion. The quality and significance of the contributions to the counseling profession will be evaluated and determined by the DoC RTP committee. It is important to note, however, that this recommendation is intended as an approximate guideline. Given the DoC's emphasis on multiple criteria for evaluating scholarship, it is conceivable that a successful faculty member may submit a profile of scholarship that diverges from this guideline.

The strongest evidence in the evaluation of professional achievement and growth is the publication of the faculty member's work. There are a variety of works that can be given consideration and the manner of evaluating each type of work is given below.

a) **Journal Articles.** A range of articles in a variety of journals reflect a broad interest in the field while longer articles published in a few journals can be perceived as a development of professional focus. The reputation of the journals in the candidate's area of expertise will be given consideration as will testimonials provided by colleagues in the field regarding a candidate's contributions. In cases of multiple authorship, candidates should specify the significance of their roles if they are not the first or second author. Candidates should also inform the RTP Committee of the level of importance a particular journal carries in their specialization.

b) **Books.** Books and book chapters will be given consideration if published by respected publishers. Self published books, books produced for a fee and books that have not had the scrutiny of acquisitions and copy editors will not be considered. Contributions to edited books and the editing of a book will be considered. In an edited book, the editor should describe the role that was played especially in those cases where the editor does not provide a chapter contribution. The DoC expects that a book editor will provide at least one chapter of text to an edited contribution.

c) **Grants.** The DoC views grants as means to an end and not the end themselves. Candidates are encouraged to develop internal and external sources of funding only to the extent that such grants are needed to advance a faculty member's scholarship, his/her professional agenda, or the well-being of the community. There is the expectation that the funding will result in relevant publications or when appropriate, contributions to the professional community or the public at large. Grant proposals that are submitted and under review but are currently without funding should be included in the WPAF. Candidates may also include unfunded grant efforts as an indication of professional effort.

d) **Presentations.** These include keynote addresses, invited lectures, symposia, papers, roundtables, and posters at professional meetings. Presentations at international, national, regional and state associations appropriate to the candidates' interest area are seen as noteworthy. Serving as a keynote or invited speaker is given special consideration. In the event of joint

presentations, the candidate should describe the role that was played in both preparation and the actual presentation.

e) ***Continuing Education.*** Providing continuing education workshops is also seen as important as is the provision of in house seminars, workshops and consultations to faculty in the DoC or in other departments on the campus. Generally, however, this is viewed as a contribution to the campus or community. Taking classes and continuing education units to fulfill professional licensing requirements is important to the DoC and to the candidate's growth.

f) ***Licensure and Certification.*** The DoC encourages all faculty to acquire those additional credentials, licenses, or certifications that are appropriate to their specializations as a part of their professional achievement and growth. These credentials include but are not limited to: Licensure as a Psychologist, Marriage and Family Therapist, or Clinical Social Worker in California, a Pupil Personnel Service Credential - Counseling in the State of California, Certification as a Rehabilitation Counselor, Certified Counselor by the National Board of Certified Counselors, Licensed Professional Counselor.

g) ***Professional Recognition.*** Recognition in the form of honors given by professional societies is viewed as important. Achieving new status with a professional license or becoming a diplomate in the profession deserves acclamation.

There is no limit to the type or number of activities a candidate may become involved in. The number and type of activities shall reflect a pattern of meaningful contributions that demonstrate a candidate's professional identity and aspirations. The RTP Committee does wish the candidates to involve colleagues in ongoing consultations, and to seek both internal and, when possible, external documentation of activities as they occur. Thus, evaluations by colleagues will be an important substantiation to assist the Committee. These should be placed in the WPAF.

C. Contributions to Campus and Community

The DoC believes that one's expertise as a counselor can be an invaluable asset in the service of one's department, the university, the larger community as well as the one's professional discipline. Therefore, it is the belief of the DoC that faculty members have a variety of opportunities and venues, as noted below, through which their expertise and skills may be of service.

a) ***Campus Contributions.*** The DoC values service to the University community. Most notably, this includes active service in department, college, and university-wide committees including Academic Senate service, participation in DoC, college, and university task forces, consultations with faculty in other departments, active involvement in the development of policies and procedures at any level, and assuming leadership roles in DoC activities, including Coordinator of a Specialization, standing committee, ad hoc committee or task force leader, work on accreditation, or program development. While the Committee recognizes that participation in these activities is also limited by both time and resources, it does have the expectation that all faculty will participate in some visible way in department, college, and/or university service each year.

This document does not set limits as to the type or number of activities. The number and type of activities shall reflect a pattern of meaningful contributions that demonstrate a candidate's professional identity and aspirations. The RTP Committee does wish the candidates to involve colleagues in ongoing consultations, and to seek both internal and external reviews of activities as they occur.

b) **Community Contributions.** A primary part of the mission of the DoC is to provide service to the community at large. This may be done in a variety of ways. The DoC particularly encourages presentations to community groups, in-service trainings, or service through professional practice and organizational consultations. Also encouraged is participation in counseling activities of other colleges and universities, and in appropriate national, state, and local government boards and agencies as well as maintaining professional licensure and volunteering or receiving honoraria in non-profit settings or private practice. The Committee encourages candidates to become involved in several activities and to engage in some service work that may not necessarily be related to the counseling profession every year. These activities may be exemplified by service to parent teacher student associations, homeowners associations, community boards and associations, social movements, and running for or holding elected offices.

This document does not set limits as to the type or number of activities. The number and type of activities shall reflect a pattern of meaningful contributions that demonstrate a candidate's professional identity and aspirations. The RTP Committee does wish the candidates to involve colleagues in ongoing consultations, and to seek both internal and external reviews of activities as they occur.

c) **Professional Organization Service.** Holding office in professional organizations in the field is viewed as an important contribution as is serving as a program chair for a convention. Coordinating a convention or chairing a program selection committee is seen as particularly important. The roles, functions, and time commitments of all outstanding professional organization service activities should be included in the self study.

d) **Editorial Service.** Serving as an editor, on editorial boards or as a reviewer is considered a part of contributions to campus and community. Serving on these boards and participating as a reviewer or ad hoc reviewer is seen as an important contribution. Service as an editor in chief is viewed as a major professional contribution and may be noted in professional achievement and growth. Service as an associate editor, editorial board member, or ad hoc reviewer should be explicated in the self study indicating the number and the types of manuscripts reviewed.

e) **Departmental Citizenship.** "Citizenship" and "Collegiality" are important concepts in academic settings, but are difficult to define. The DoC is committed to developing a sense of community among ourselves. The DoC expects all candidates to "share the load" and to contribute to the overall well being of the DoC. When collegiality is discussed in the DoC, it traditionally has been used to address two areas: contributions to the DoC and "fit" with the DoC. The first has to do with what the DoC has come to consider "departmental citizenship." In order to function effectively, the Department must have active participation from the faculty in

its own administration. Issues, policies, and procedures are regularly discussed at faculty meetings, information is conveyed and decisions are made. Implementation of policies and procedures is carried out through regular standing committees and through task forces set up by the Chair.

The following questions reflect continuing departmental citizenship:

- Does the faculty member regularly attend and meaningfully contribute to faculty meetings, committee meetings, and other meetings of the DoC?
- Does the faculty member actively participate in DoC committee work and task forces?
- Does the faculty member comment and behave toward other faculty colleagues in ways which are supportive and constructive?
- Does the faculty member volunteer to assume responsibilities and undertake tasks which benefit the DoC and contribute to its functioning?
- Does the faculty member actively contribute in the identification of and attempts to resolve problems which are affecting the DoC?
- Does the faculty member consult on all matters of policies and procedures for the department and within each specialization?
- Does the faculty member keep office hours?
- Does the faculty member inform the Chair of absences?

The second area deals with the present “fit” of the faculty member in the DoC.

The following questions reflect this:

- Does the Committee judge that the candidate is competent to do his/her job?
- Does the candidate realistically and accurately articulate the significance of his/her endeavors?
- Does the candidate interact with the faculty in ways that appear mutually beneficial, such as using counseling skills in communications, giving and receiving honest and constructive feedback, responding appropriately to criticisms from students, staff, and colleagues, recognizing others’ successes, and sharing credit for accomplishments?
- Does the candidate encourage his/her colleagues?
- Does the candidate collaborate effectively on projects, grants, articles, books, and other projects?

In order to address these issues, the Committee will evaluate the following materials which are submitted by the candidate: Letters from DoC faculty which specifically address the candidate’s work and interactions in the DoC, observations and personal interactions of the members of the RTP Committee with the candidate; statements made by the candidate in his/her self study.

The Committee will emphasize in its evaluation how consistently candidates have demonstrated these competencies and whether candidates respond in a professional way to feedback from colleagues, staff, and students.

f) **Faculty Fit.** This criterion addresses the future “fit” of the candidate with the plans and needs of the department. While all other criteria measure past performance, this is a projection of future performance.

Dimensions may include:

- Does the candidate have specific areas of expertise that are not already well-represented in the DOC?
- Does the candidate contribute to the department's continuing commitment to diversity?
- Does the candidate contribute to the department through multilingual/multicultural expertise?
- Does the candidate appear to have a focus in his/her research and service interests which will continue to contribute to the department's mission as a professional, service oriented, training program?
- Has the candidate contributed in meaningful ways to emerging plans of the department for future change and/or to resolution of emerging problems which the Department has identified?
- How will the candidate's achievements help us meet our mission in years to come?
- How can the candidate's skills be used to enhance our department's work?

Materials for this section could come from:

- Letters from DoC faculty members.
- Personal observations and interactions of the RTP Committee members (placed in the WPAF prior to the closing date).
- The candidate's self study document.

It is quite important that the candidate provide the Committee with material in the self study to assist the Committee in evaluating how past performance will translate to future performance. The Committee needs a clear sense of how the candidate fits into the issues mentioned above in order for the Committee to effectively recommend a candidate for retention or tenure in this criterion.

PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE TO FULL PROFESSOR

Promotion from Associate to Full Professor necessitates a more noteworthy dossier than for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor. Both the number and significance of activities must surpass those used for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor. Only those achievements in rank as Associate Professor may be used in seeking a promotion to Full Professor. Candidates are strongly encouraged to meet with the RTP Committee on a yearly basis to discuss their progress towards promotion.

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY

The evaluation of tenured faculty takes place in five year cycles. The Office of Faculty Affairs informs the DoC and the tenured faculty member about all review timelines and procedures and provides the cover sheet when the notice of the review of the tenured faculty member is given. The RTP Committee is the DoC committee that prepares the report evaluating the tenured faculty member. This report may include recommendations to enhance the productivity and service of the tenured faculty member and to improve teaching effectiveness.

The DoC has adopted a policy of having the tenured faculty member forward the following two documents to the RTP Committee: A maximum five page self study that includes information on Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Achievement and Growth, and Service to the University and Community, a current curriculum vita. The RTP Committee prepares a one page summary report with recommendations that is sent forward to the DoC Chair.