School of Engineering
San Francisco State University
Fall 2007
Approved by the Provost September 2008

Criteria for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

PREAMBLE

1. Document. This document details the criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) in the School of Engineering consistent with Academic Senate Policy #F06-241. This document is subject to review and approval by the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the School of Engineering each year prior to the beginning of an RTP cycle. No changes can be made during an RTP cycle. Revised procedures shall be submitted to the Dean and Provost for final approval.

2. Criteria. The criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion are divided into three areas: (a) teaching effectiveness, (b) professional achievement and growth, and (c) contributions to campus and community. Candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion shall be evaluated only according to these three criteria as described below. Criteria not specifically mentioned in this document may not be used.

3. WPAF. Candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion are responsible for providing the RTP Committee with an up-to-date Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) by the closing date as determined by the University RTP Deadline Calendar. The WPAF consists of a candidate's curriculum vitae, supplementary materials that represent the candidate's accomplishments in teaching effectiveness, professional achievement and growth, and contributions to campus and community. Candidates should include in the WPAF a self-statement that summarizes the candidate's accomplishments in each of the areas of teaching effectiveness, professional achievement and growth, and contributions to campus and community. Candidates may include in their WPAF letters from external reviewers commenting on the professional accomplishments of the candidate. It should be noted that the evaluation will be based only on the candidate's accomplishments that are verifiably documented in the WPAF.   It is strongly recommended that candidates submit a well-organized WPAF.

4. Retention. The School's RTP Committee conducts an annual review of every tenure-track faculty member. The RTP Committee is responsible for providing an objective and impartial evaluation based strictly on the three criteria described in this document. The purpose of the annual review is to determine if the candidate for retention is making sufficient progress toward tenure. The RTP Committee will clearly indicate deficiencies, if any. If the Committee decides that a candidate is not making sufficient progress, the Committee and the Director of the School may meet with the candidate to devise a plan for improving the candidate's performance to the level required for progress toward tenure. The plan must include a timeline and specific goals.

5. Tenure. The School's RTP Committee conducts the tenure review. The RTP Committee is responsible for providing an objective and impartial evaluation based strictly on the three criteria described in this document. The outcome of the review will be either satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance according to the three criteria described in this document. Candidates applying for tenure will submit names of at least three external reviewers to the RTP committee prior to the closing date of WPAF so that the RTP committee may request comments from external reviewers on the candidate's accomplishments.

6. Promotion. In response to candidate's request for promotion, the RTP Committee is responsible for providing an objective and impartial evaluation based on the three criteria described in this document. The outcome of the review will be either satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance according to the three criteria described in this document. If the decision is against promotion, then the committee must specify areas in which the candidate must improve in order to merit promotion. Candidates for promotion are advised that the School has higher expectations for promotion to the rank of Professor than for promotion to rank of Associate Professor. Candidates applying for promotion need to submit names of at least three external reviewers to the RTP committee prior to the closing date of WPAF so that the RTP committee may request comments from external reviewers on the candidate's accomplishments for promotion.

Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

Effective teaching is central to the mission of the School of Engineering. The criteria for evaluating the teaching effectiveness of the candidate are based, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Classroom teaching. Candidates are expected to be excellent classroom teachers at San Francisco State University. Evaluation of a candidate's performance in this area will be based on the following:

   a. Student evaluations of teaching. Students evaluate all instructors each semester using a standard School of Engineering survey. The RTP Committee will review these student evaluations as one of the metrics for evaluating the quality of a candidate's classroom teaching. The Committee will also review written comments made by students as part of the survey.

   b. Peer evaluations of teaching. The Committee will review letters of evaluation from tenured faculty who have observed a candidate's classroom teaching. Evaluation letters must be written by a tenured faculty member at a higher rank than that of the candidate.

   c. Letters from former students and colleagues. The Committee may consider letters from former students and colleagues that address the candidate's teaching effectiveness. However, the Committee will not consider anonymous letters.

2. Curricular innovations. The RTP Committee will consider curricular innovations such as the development of new courses, upgrade/revision of existing courses and academic programs, new and effective pedagogical approaches, instructional applications of innovative technologies, etc., as evidence of the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

3. Advising. Supervising student projects and master's theses/projects will be considered by the RTP Committee an integral part of teaching effectiveness. All undergraduate student projects and graduate theses/research projects are equally important. The Committee may also consider student awards, student presentations, other recognition obtained by the advisees of the candidate, and publications by the candidate with students as strong evidence of effective supervising.

4. Awards and recognitions. Awards and recognition that are related to teaching effectiveness will be considered by the RTP Committee.

Evaluation of Professional Achievement and Growth

The School of Engineering regards research and professional development, and scholarly publications as very important aspects of professional development and growth. Members of the engineering faculty are expected to have significant research activity throughout their career at SFSU. The RTP Committee will use, but are not limited to, the following criteria in order to evaluate a candidate's professional achievement and growth:

1. Publications. The RTP Committee will consider technical publications as one of the main metrics for measuring the candidate's professional achievement and growth.

   a. Journal publications. Papers published, or accepted for publication, in reputable, peer-reviewed journals are primary evidence of a candidate's professional achievement and growth.
   b. Conference publications. In addition to referred journals, in engineering it is typical to publish in refereed or peer-reviewed conference proceedings, symposia, and workshop proceedings. It is noted that some of these conferences are prestigious and characterized by low acceptance rates. Therefore the committee will also consider these venues as evidence of a candidate's professional achievement and growth. An important activity within this area would be presenting of invited talks and tutorials at leading national or international conferences.
   c. Books and Monographs. Books, monographs, and other scholarly publications that have received professional recognition will also be considered as accomplishments in this category.
   d. Non-refereed papers and technical reports. Publications that have not been peer reviewed or unpublished manuscripts may be taken into account in this category, but receive significantly less weight.

2. Funded Grants. The School expects candidates to actively apply for external 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 strong 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 be taken into account. The RTP committee recognizes that writing and submitting grant applications can take enormous amount of time and may also take into account grant applications that are not funded. Candidates are also encouraged to take advantage of available internal grants. However, less weight shall be given to internal grants.

3. Laboratory development. Laboratory development can take a substantial amount of time and effort. The Committee will consider new laboratory courses and experiments at the undergraduate and graduate level as evidence of a candidate's professional

achievement and growth. Included in this category are publications in the area of laboratory instruction and grants for laboratory equipment.

4. Creative works, designs, and patents. Engineering faculty can demonstrate professional development and growth through various creative works, designs, and patents. Examples in this category are patents and designs that have contributed to successful products, and /or have been referenced by others.

5. Awards and recognition. Awards and recognitions received by the candidate that are related to research accomplishments are strong evidence of excellence in research.

6. Professional Consulting. The School of Engineering is interested in maintaining close relationship with industry both nationally and internationally. Therefore high-level professional consulting with industry which benefits both the faculty member and the industrial partner will be considered as a metric for professional achievement, particularly if it results in publications, reports, patents, etc.

Evaluation of Contributions to Campus and Community

The evaluation of the contributions to campus and community will be done according to the following criteria:

1. Service to the profession. Members of the faculty are expected to participate in professional organizations in the area of engineering such as the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME), the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), and other premier professional organizations. As a strong evidence of a candidate's service to the profession the RTP Committee will consider, but is not limited to, the following activities,:

a) Election to national and/or international committees of professional organizations is a strong evidence of the candidate's high profile nationally and/or internationally, and distinguished service.

b) Organization of conferences or symposia related to engineering research and/or education also demonstrates strong commitment to the profession.

c) Honors and recognition by professional societies in connection with service on committees, conferences, etc.

d) Participation on editorial boards and conference program committees

e) Participation in various Distinguished Lecture Programs

f) Service as a referee for manuscripts and grants

2. Service to the University. The RTP Committee will consider work in committees at the School, College, and University level. In addition to committee work, the RTP Committee will also consider as important other work such as counseling of student organizations, curriculum advising, working with alumni groups, visiting schools and colleges for the purpose of recruiting, acting as liaisons to visitors, direction of non-instructional projects on campus, and representing the School, College, or University at special events.

3. Service to the community. The Committee may consider activities in which candidates use their professional expertise to enhance the relations between the community at large and the University or the profession as evidence of a candidate's service to the community.