

(PROVOST APPROVED 10-6-14)

GRADUATE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Department of Equity, Leadership Studies, and
Instructional Technologies (ELSIT)

CRITERIA FOR RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION

The Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Committee of the Department of Equity, Leadership Studies, and Instructional Technologies (ELSIT) will use the following criteria that meet the department's standards of excellence. These criteria are in conformity with San Francisco State University's RTP and post-tenure review policies.

Mission Statement

The faculty members in the Department of Equity, Leadership Studies, and Instructional Technologies at San Francisco State University, acknowledge the rich and complex socio-cultural context in which we work. Our programs and courses in Adult Education, Educational Administration, Equity and Social Justice Education, and Instructional Technologies are designed to develop an understanding of theory, pedagogy/andragogy, management and leadership skills necessary for effective practice in linguistically and culturally diverse educational environments.

Department Profile

The Department of Equity, Leadership Studies, and Instructional Technologies offers three credentials: (a) Preliminary Administrative Services; (b) Professional Administrative Services; and (c) Designated Subject Credential in Adult Education. In addition, the department offers a Master of Arts in Education degree with five distinct concentrations: Adult Education, Educational Administration, Equity and Social Justice, Instructional Technologies, and Special Interest. The ELSIT department is home to the faculty unit in educational research and evaluation. Additional programs and courses are housed in ELSIT, including the Step to College program and the undergraduate Quantitative Reasoning courses. In addition to teaching, ELSIT faculty members collaborate with surrounding school districts, community colleges, and public agencies. This collaboration represents a significant aspect of faculty work.

ELSIT faculty members hold additional responsibilities, including continually reviewing and revising their programs and program documentation and evaluating the credential programs according to standards set by external accrediting agencies, including the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). The ELSIT department has established common criteria and standards for retention, tenure, and promotion that are described below for all program areas.

Self-Statement

Candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion are required to provide a self-statement of teaching effectiveness, professional achievement and growth, and contributions to campus and community that provides an introduction to their accomplishments. The goals of the self-

statement are to provide a context for understanding the candidate's achievements and introduce the candidate's materials and qualifications within each area for subsequent levels of review. It is recommended that the self-statement narratives for each area (teaching effectiveness, professional achievement and growth, and contributions to campus and community) not to exceed 750 words per section.

The following ELSIT RTP common criteria are listed for the areas of Teaching Effectiveness, Personal Achievement and Growth, and Contributions to Campus and Community. The following common criteria, with corresponding types of evidence, are identified and listed for all programs within the ELSIT Department.

Criteria Area 1 – Teaching Effectiveness

The primary mission of SFSU is teaching, and the Department of Equity, Leadership Studies, and Instructional Technologies takes that mission seriously. All faculty members are expected to be effective teachers in the ELSIT department. This means that they guide, engage, and motivate their students and provide an appropriate mixture of both theory and practice. Innovations in the classroom and instructional materials are encouraged and fully recognized as important and sometimes risky efforts. Non-traditional teaching methods are also encouraged and fully recognized as important.

The RTP Committee will consider in its summary evaluation of teaching performance all evidence submitted by the faculty member based on the criteria stated in this document. The Department considers course evaluation ratings of 1.0 to 2.0 to be evidence of effective teaching, with additional consideration given to complicating factors such as student comments or particular course content. Faculty evaluated as below acceptable levels of teaching effectiveness are expected to take advantage of mentorship opportunities within the department or university and to show improvement in teaching effectiveness.

Faculty must provide a narrative that articulates the purposes, strengths and growth in their teaching and teaching effectiveness. The narrative should reflect a commitment to improving teaching and include brief statements of the faculty member's philosophical framework for teaching, description of teaching methods, and a self-appraisal of achievements and development in teaching, with particular attention given to the impact of teaching on student learning.

A. Student and Peer Evaluation

Probationary and tenured faculty must provide evidence of teaching effectiveness based on student and peer evaluations and other evidence administered according to Department guidelines. Evidence includes course/instructor evaluations, including comments and peer observations distributed across the period of the review. Course ratings between 1.0 and 2.0 are expected.

- Student ratings and comments reflect effective teaching practices.
- Student letters attest to particular aspects of effectiveness in instruction.
- Peer observations and evaluations reflect effective and innovative instruction, subject expertise, student rapport, development of an effective learning environment, and high-quality presentation of materials.

- The candidate's narrative and/or letters attest to the nature, quality, and extent of advising activities related to courses; to the nature, quality, and extent of creative works, and/or independent study advising.
- Awards for teaching excellence further attest to teaching quality.

B. Scholarly Level of Instruction

Faculty must demonstrate how they maintain a scholarly level of instruction and a commitment to high academic and pedagogic excellence. They must demonstrate a commitment to excellence in instructional growth and development, curriculum and instructional design, and pedagogical practice.

- Currency of course materials, topics and issues addressed, texts and readings, and online resources incorporated in instruction are required.

At least two types of evidence across the period of the review are required and should be supported by course/instructor evaluations, student comments, and/or peer observations. Evaluation considers the quality, scope and extent of evidence.

- Continued study in theory and best practices in instructional design and use of instructional technologies for teaching and learning.
- Participation at professional conferences, seminars, symposia, professional meetings or workshops related to current technology developments, new pedagogical techniques, or other appropriate topics.
- Innovative teaching and curriculum development, clear statements of student performance and outcomes, and currency in instructional design research.

C. Curricular Innovations

The Department recognizes the importance of curricular innovations – such as development of academic programs, new courses or course content, new pedagogical approaches or applications of technology, or new areas of instructional expertise.

- Development of new courses or course content, disciplinary and/or pedagogical approaches, and technological innovations.
- Professional evaluations and/or reviews attest to curricula or instructional innovations.

D. Advising and Supervision of Practica and Culminating Experiences

The Department values faculty work with students on practica, internships, and culminating experiences, and recognizes evidence of this work in support of the category of Teaching Effectiveness.

- **Practica or Internships**
Evidence of teaching effectiveness may include samples of supervision of practicum, advising, directing student research, mentoring, and field research supervision.
- **Field Studies or Theses**
Evidence of teaching effectiveness may include data on completed student studies, feedback on studies from students, evidence of quality of studies, joint research presentations or publications with students, or related documentation.

- **Creative Works**
Evidence of teaching effectiveness may include data on completed created works, user studies of creative works, joint presentations or publications with students, or related documentation.

Criteria Area 2 – Professional Achievement and Growth

The ELSIT Department expects all faculty who are considered for retention, tenure, and promotion to pursue a research and scholarship agenda. Given the Department's varied educational emphases, ranging from teaching and work with schools to program development, organizational management and leadership, and technological development in learning, the Department expects candidates' research and scholarship agendas to reflect excellence in their program specialties. The Department values the generation, dissemination, and presentation of scholarship in multiple forms and venues. The Department also values faculty work that reflects collaboration with students in presentation, dissemination, and publication of research and creative works.

Faculty must provide a narrative self-statement of professional achievement and growth. The narrative should describe a context for understanding the faculty's accomplishments in the area of Professional Achievement and Growth.

For Tenure and for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, faculty must develop a consistent record of professional achievement and growth, either from the Research and Publication area (A) or the Creative Works area (B), together with the Presentations area (C), while Grants (D) are optional and encouraged.

For the Research and Publication area (A) and the Creative Works area (B), by the time of tenure, at least one-half of the work produced must have been published or disseminated via peer-reviewed sources. For promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, an increased level of rigor is expected. There should be more first authorships, greater contributions to the field, and greater demonstration of impact on the field. The criteria for establishing professional achievement and growth include, but are not restricted to the following:

A. Research and Publication

Faculty are strongly encouraged to pursue a record of publication and scholarship that increases in depth and/or breadth and increasingly impacts scholarship and practice/policy in their field as faculty pass through the various stages of the RTP process. Evaluation considers the quality of the evidence, scope, refereed sources, research base, magnitude of impact, and reviews or awards. The Department feels that professional achievement and growth is most strongly demonstrated by research, policy, and position statement publications. In the area of publication, uppermost consideration is given to refereed papers and monographs; second ranking to non-refereed publications, textbooks, and chapters in books; and third ranking to technical reports, unpublished manuscripts, and published book reviews. Consideration is given to prestige of the place of publication. In publications of multiple authorship, a candidate should clearly communicate to the committee the candidate's role in the work reported. Collaborative research that includes participation by San Francisco State university students is

encouraged, and interdisciplinary endeavors that cross programs, departments, and campuses are highly valued.

OR

B. Creative Works

The diverse academic fields covered in the department continually evolve and change. To maintain faculty currency in their specialties and areas of expertise, the Department encourages research and development of new methods, models, and products to improve teaching, learning, and instructional management. Evidence of peer review or other judgment of quality must be presented for each work included in the WPAF. Evaluation considers the quality of the evidence: scope, research base, magnitude of impact, and evidence of peer review or other judgment of quality.

- Instructional products and/or creations (written, created, published, and copyrighted by the candidate).
- Instructional and curricular materials designed for audiences outside the department and/or the university.
- Professional evaluations and/or reviews, or awards regarding creative works in the field.

AND

C. Presentations

Presentations at local, state, national, and/or international professional conferences, organizations and associations are also expected of all faculty. Evaluation considers the quality of the evidence: scope, research base, magnitude of impact, and reviews.

- Invited Presentations and Reports.
- Peer-Reviewed Presentations/Participation in workshops or meetings of professional organizations.
- Non-Peer-Reviewed Presentations/Participation in meetings or workshops of professional organizations.

OPTIONAL, ENCOURAGED

D. Grants

The department encourages candidates to actively apply for external grant funding of their professional endeavors. Since grant proposals for external funding of research are often very competitive and typically receive extensive outside professional review, successful external grant funding will be considered as evidence of a candidate's professional achievement and growth. All grants are viewed positively. However, more weight is given to grants on which the candidate is Principal Investigator. Positive reviewers' comments on an unfunded proposal may also be taken into account. The RTP committee recognizes that writing and submitting grant applications can take an enormous amount of time and may also take into account grant applications that are not funded. Candidates are in addition encouraged to take advantage of available internal grants as an avenue to pursue scholarship and funding.

Grants will be evaluated on the basis of how the grant contributes to the faculty member's research agenda, creative work agenda, and Departmental goals. Grants will be assessed in the following priority order:

- Peer-reviewed grants/proposals that have been funded.
- Grants/proposals that have been submitted and are under review.
- Non-funded, peer-reviewed grants with reviews.

Criteria Area 3 – Contributions to Campus and Community

The ELSIT faculty's main task involves the effective instruction and preparation of students for the Master's degree or Credential. However, the department recognizes that part of what makes an effective instructor is involvement in the academic life on the campus and as contributing members to the larger community. Faculty are encouraged to address their campus and community involvement in their self-statement. The common criteria for establishing contributions to campus and community include:

A. Contributions to Campus

The extent, duration, impact and quality of service are the primary considerations for establishing the value of service to campus. While the number, diversity, and levels of contributions are deemed important, the extent, duration, impact, and quality of service are of primary consideration. These include, but are not limited to:

- Administrative assignments that attest to the faculty's role and performance.
- Participation in faculty governance.
- Participation on committees: departmental, college, or university-wide.
- Participation in program development.
- Sponsorship of a student organization.
- Direction of a non-instructional activity or project on behalf of the department or that contributes to the field.

B. Contributions to Community

Faculty may use their academic expertise or university status to serve the community at the local, state, national, and/or international levels. While the number, diversity, and levels of contributions are deemed important, the extent, duration, impact, and quality of service are of primary consideration. These include, but are not limited to:

- Use of academic expertise or University status to serve school district, city, state, national, international, or professional communities.
- Professional services to community.
- Offices held in professional educational organizations.
- Contributions to the production of professional journals or publications.
- Professional consulting in education and training.