The requirements and criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion as set out in a series of policies adopted by the Academic Senate and approved by the President are divided into three areas: (1) Teaching Effectiveness, (2) Professional Achievement and Growth, and (3) Contributions to Campus and Community. As required by University Policy on Retention and Tenure (Policy #F11-241), all faculty members in the School of Humanities and Liberal Studies who are being considered for retention, tenure, and promotion will be evaluated in each of those categories.

The primary emphasis of the School is on teaching effectiveness; excellence in the classroom is essential. As the School is interdisciplinary, judgments about Professional Achievement and Growth will vary with differences in disciplines, professional expectations within a discipline, and School objectives and goals. Contributions to Campus and Community are also an important benchmark toward retention, tenure and promotion. The School allows for a range of activities to count toward service to the School, University, field, and community.

I. Documentation


The RTP committee and School director will be available to advise the candidate on the file’s contents and organization. Files should be clearly organized and as succinct as possible. Documentation should aim to be sufficient but not voluminous.

II. Professional Education and/or Equivalency

An appropriate doctoral degree, or, in the case of artists, MFA is necessary for tenure or promotion in the School of Humanities and Liberal Studies.

III. Teaching Effectiveness

The School of Humanities and Liberal Studies considers the primary mission of its faculty to be teaching. To be considered for tenure or promotion, Humanities and Liberal Studies faculty members must excel in teaching according to the criteria listed below. The School expects all faculty members to develop a style or styles of teaching appropriate to the needs manifested by the full range of SFSU students’ economic and cultural diversity and their varying levels of academic preparation. For probationary
faculty who lack experience in teaching and/or who are having difficulties with their teaching, the School will provide or recommend appropriate forms of assistance for improvement.

The following evidence will be used to evaluate teaching effectiveness:

1. **Range and Breadth of Courses.** Faculty members are expected to teach a variety of courses utilizing appropriate pedagogical modes. Candidates are expected to teach some combination of large introductory lecture courses, courses designed primarily for non-majors as well as courses for the major, core courses for the major, moderate-sized upper division lecture/discussion courses, undergraduate seminars and graduate seminars. The School expects faculty members to teach effectively within and beyond their area of specialized research.

2. **Course Materials.** As evidence of teaching effectiveness, candidates may include a variety of course materials in their WPAFs, including syllabi, bibliographies, reading lists, class projects and assignments, examinations, online resources and platforms, and other instructional materials as evidence of course and class organization, the level at which the course is taught, and the faculty member’s expectations for student learning.

3. **Peer Class Visits.** Visits to classes by fellow faculty members are important to a new faculty member’s development as a teacher. For candidates for retention, tenure and promotion to associate professor, the RTP Committee and/or Director will ensure that at least two class periods per year are visited and reviewed by faculty member at a higher rank and at least once by the director of the School. For associate professors seeking promotion to full professor, the RTP Committee and/or Director will ensure that at least one class period per year is visited and reviewed by faculty member at a higher rank. The visitor will write a report of each class visit, assessing the quality of the candidate’s presentation, class materials, expectations, and ability to engage students, to be given to the faculty member for placement in the WPAF.

4. **Student Evaluations.** Students evaluate all courses each semester. The School regards these surveys as important because they provide a large representative sample of student reactions, and include both quantitative and qualitative evaluation. Scores of 1.5 or below on the questions of the survey instrument suggest highly effective teaching. Scores of 2.0 or higher suggest a need for improvement. We generally expect candidates for tenure and promotion to receive mean scores between 1.0 and 2.0. The School values improvement over time and gives more weight to the final two years prior to tenure if the earlier teaching evaluations fall outside the recommended range. In assessing student scores and comments, the School considers the impact of course size, academic level, student population, and extraordinary circumstances.

5. **Student Letters.** The committee takes letters written by students about a candidates teaching seriously, but because they usually represent a small sample of student opinion, they are not regarded as highly as classroom surveys. The School gives higher value to letters that are signed, dated and addressed to the committee or school director than letters addressed to the candidate. Student letters addressed to the candidate may also be
included in the WPAF if they are signed and substantive. Brief, casual notes of thanks will not add value to the WPAF and are discouraged.

6. Curriculum Development and Innovation. The school expects candidates for tenure or promotion to associate or full professor to develop, when appropriate, new courses or new versions of existing courses, new disciplinary or pedagogical approaches, and/or new areas of instructional expertise and that all courses will reflect the faculty members’ familiarity with current scholarship in an appropriate field. Attendance and presentation at professional conferences and workshops devoted to instructional and curricular improvement shall be taken into account.

7. Master’s Theses and/or Culminating Experience Requirements Supervision. The school expects those candidates assigned to teaching in the MA program to demonstrate teaching effectiveness through the regular and proportionate supervision of MA theses and Culminating Experience examinations as first or second readers, depending on the relevance of their area of expertise.

8. Independent Study. Candidates may demonstrate teaching effectiveness in supervising graduate and undergraduate independent study courses.

9. Mentoring of Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) and Graduate Assistants (GAs). School expects candidates to take their turn in the mentoring GTAs and GAs.

10. Advising. Candidates must be reliably available to students during regularly scheduled office hours and knowledgeable about program requirements and academic resources available to students.

For promotion from associate to full professor, candidates should demonstrate continuing efforts to improve their teaching in the abovementioned areas. In addition, they should demonstrate leadership in developing teaching more broadly by contributing, when applicable, to:

- Mentoring junior faculty through classroom observation and sharing of teaching techniques;
- Leading program development and evaluation;
- Ongoing curriculum innovation and development.

IV. Professional Achievement and Growth

The School of Humanities and Liberal Studies maintain that faculty professional achievements and intellectual growth enhance the lives of students, the school, and the university itself. Our school evaluates scholarship according to its quality and impact, not according to quantitative measures of productivity alone.

Our programs are interdisciplinary, and the terminal degrees of our faculty are in different disciplines that can vary widely in terms of opportunities and criteria for publication, forms of presenting one’s scholarship in professional venues, and
disciplinary conventions and practices. These differences need to be recognized and respected in evaluating a candidate’s scholarly activities. The School may thus include on RTP committees faculty from other departments or programs who share the candidate’s particular area of expertise beyond that offered by faculty members of the School.

Retention:
The school expects candidates for retention to exhibit a pattern of professional achievement and scholarly growth during their probationary period. Unless otherwise specified at the time of hiring, this means that probationary faculty members are expected to make a significant scholarly contribution to the field and to continue to grow intellectually within their given areas of expertise, demonstrating clear progress toward meeting the standards for tenure and promotion.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:
The school expects candidates to demonstrate professional achievement and growth by the publication of original research, either in the form of a monograph, or three articles in appropriate peer-reviewed journals, or chapters in peer-reviewed books or anthologies, or an equivalent combination of books, articles, and chapters.

Promotion to Full Professor:
The school expects candidates to have demonstrated a sustained record of scholarly achievement either in the form of a monograph, or three articles in appropriate peer-reviewed journals, or chapters in peer-reviewed books or anthologies, or an equivalent combination of books, articles, and chapters. In addition, the school expects candidates to be able to demonstrate significant impact of their scholarship. As the candidate will have developed into a mature scholar, value will be accorded both to published works of original research and those that synthesize and integrate knowledge, revealing new patterns of meaning and new relationships between the parts and the whole. A textbook offering original insights, a critical edition or annotated translation, or an edited anthology, would carry the same weight as a monograph.

1. The highest value is given to original work in the form of monographs, anthologies, journal articles or book chapters that have been published by university presses or other presses appropriate to the faculty member’s field, including scholarship on teaching and learning, that employ a rigorous peer-review process. The following peer-reviewed publications are deemed appropriate:

- Books including manuscripts that have been accepted for publication and are in production;
- Articles in peer-reviewed journals;
- Articles/chapters in peer-reviewed books, including conference proceedings;
- Chapters in peer-reviewed anthologies;
- Collaborative (co-authored) peer-reviewed books, articles and chapters (the relative contributions of the candidate must be clearly stated and significant);
- Creative work published, performed or exhibited in juried or peer-critiqued forms/venues that are recognized as significant in their respective fields;
• Textbooks that offer original insights and perspectives (as deemed by scholarly reviewers, pre- or post-publication);
• Critical editions and annotated translations of significant texts;

2. The following evidence of professional achievement and growth is appropriate when presented in combination with items above.

• Peer-reviewed manuscripts, articles and chapters under contract but not in production
• Work that has been published in the form of invited or editor-reviewed articles, book chapters, book reviews, encyclopedia entries;
• Articles for popular audiences linked to one’s area of expertise;
• Editing and/or introducing an anthology, a collection of essays, or a special issue of a professional journal;
• Serving as the chief editor of a professional journal (which we count primarily as “service” although it also underscores one’s professional reputation);
• Significant contributions to online sites that contribute to scholarly discourse, such as blogs, exhibits, or archival projects;
• Unpublished manuscripts that have been reviewed and commented on by appropriate objective experts;
• Presentation of research at peer-reviewed professional meetings or other scholarly gatherings;
• Recognition of professional achievement through awards, fellowships, and appointments;
• Securing an external grant for federal or other funding for the individual’s scholarly research.

3. The following evidence of professional impact is deemed appropriate:

• Scholarly citations of one’s published work;
• Invitations to speak at conferences or other scholarly venues;
• Invitations to serve on editorial boards of peer-reviewed journals or university presses;
• Invitations to serve as external reviewer of faculty retention, tenure, or promotion reviews at other institutions;
• Invitations to review manuscripts for peer-reviewed journals or university presses.

External Letters of Evaluation
In order to fairly judge the significance of a candidate’s scholarly output, the School will refer to the prevailing standards and expectation of the candidates field(s), as demonstrated by the full range of evidence, including outside evaluations solicited by the Director, chosen in consultation with the RTP committee and the candidate.

Candidates may propose up to six outside reviewers. The RTP committee, in consultation with the school director, may add up to six additional outside reviewers. The RTP
committee, the candidate, and the school director will discuss the list of up to twelve possible reviewers to arrive at a final list of six potential reviewers. During this stage of the process all parties have the right to veto suggested reviewers while maintaining a balance between the two lists. The RTP committee will select and rank reviewers from the final list with the goal of securing at least three reviews for inclusion in the candidate’s WPAF. The RTP committee will not reveal to the candidate the names of the final evaluators until their letters have been received.

- Reviewers shall not have been the candidate’s dissertation chair or committee member, or have a close, extensive collaborative relationship with the candidate;
- Reviewers shall not be SFSU faculty members nor relatives;
- Reviewers shall be from peer institutions, and hold a higher rank than the candidate being reviewed;
- Reviewers will be asked to include a description of their relationship to the candidate and state potential conflicts of interest they might have in doing the review;
- Reviewers will be informed that candidates have access to their letters.

Candidates shall provide the RTP committee the following materials to be sent to reviewers by June 1 before the fall semester in which the candidate's file is due:

1. Personal statement
2. Current CV
3. All of candidate’s scholarly relevant work produced during the period under review

The RTP Chair will begin the invitation process, track the process of securing the external reviews, answer questions from the reviewers, receive review letters, and place letters in the candidate’s WPAF;

The RTP chair will add a biographical sketch of each outside reviewer to the WPAF.

V. Contributions to Campus and Community

The School expects all faculty members to offer service to the campus and community. Such service may involve some crossover from the Teaching category (in program advising, for example) or the Professional Achievement and Growth category (in giving public talks, for example), if the service activity relies on the faculty member’s pedagogical or scholarly expertise. For retention, tenure and promotion to Associate and Full Professor, the candidate is expected to demonstrate the ability to work well with colleagues and staff and a willingness to share the burden of administrative tasks. For
promotion to Full Professor, the candidate is expected to demonstrate the ability and willingness to take on leadership roles in the school in constructive and collegial ways.

A. School-related service can include:
   • Service on standing or ad-hoc committees;
   • Taking leadership roles (serving as school director, associate director or acting director, chairing RTP or other school committees, coordinating the Graduate Program, the American Studies program, etc.);
   • Sponsoring student organizations;
   • Program Advising;
   • Contributing to the School Website.

B. Campus Service can include:
   • Service on College committees;
   • Service on the Academic Senate and University committees;
   • Contributing to campus interdisciplinary programs;
   • Collaborating with other departments, programs, and administrative units;
   • Serving on HRTP Committees for other Departments;
   • Serving on MA Culminating Experience Committees (Exam or Thesis) for other Departments;
   • Participating in the creation and management of University Area Studies Programs and Minors;
   • Organizing and participating in informal faculty organizations.

C. Community Service can include:
   • Participating in professional organizations;
   • Organizing conferences, workshops, and conference sessions;
   • Serving on editorial, organizational, or executive boards;
   • Creating and/or helping to maintain a website or other form of online publishing in one’s field;
   • Creating and/or helping to moderate a listserv in one’s field;
   • Reading manuscripts for academic journals and presses;
   • Evaluating candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion at other institutions;
   • Serving as chair, moderator, or respondent to papers on a conference panel;
   • Serving as a program reviewer at another institution;
   • Consulting with and serving community colleges, high schools, community organizations, and/or other education-related organizations;
   • Consulting with and serving community organizations on subjects related to the faculty member’s field or to the university;
   • Contributing to media (newspapers, radio, television);
   • Other outreach activities, including: workshops and talks geared towards community groups, alumni groups or educational institutions;
   • Active participation in Community Service Learning Courses or supervising student internships