

February 18, 2008

San Francisco State University
Department of Secondary Education
Criteria for Retention, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-tenure Reviews

NEW POLICY – Academic Senate Bill #S07-241

Approved by the Provost Jan 2009

For faculty who choose to be evaluated by the new policy adopted by the Academic Senate in 2007, the RTP Committee of the Department of Secondary Education will use the following criteria, based on SFSU retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review policies. Each university criterion as it pertains to the Department is described using examples and descriptions of the review process.

Teaching Effectiveness

Single subject teacher preparation for credentialing by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) is the primary focus of faculty teaching in the Department of Secondary Education. The Department also has a Masters in Education, Concentration in Secondary Education, and most students in this program are classroom teachers. Thus, the teaching effectiveness criterion is deemed especially important because faculty must be able to demonstrate high quality teaching to students.

The summary evaluation of teaching effectiveness by the RTP Committee will take into consideration evidence submitted for all sub-criteria.. Given the importance of teaching performance within the department, faculty are expected to present evidence for each sub-criterion. The RTP Committee also will consider other types of evidence the faculty provides if a rationale is given for why it should be considered evidence of teaching effectiveness.

Sub-criteria	Examples of Evidence	Review and Evaluation
Scholarly level of instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Continued study of theory and best practice in secondary level instruction and teacher preparation.• Attendance at professional conferences and workshops in education and disciplines related to the teaching assignment.• Currency of course materials, including topics addressed and text(s) and/or readings.• Course and curriculum development for courses taught and the department's overall program.	<p>A variety of evidence distributed across the period of the review is required.</p> <p>Evaluation considers quality, scope, and extent.</p>

Teaching Effectiveness, continued

Sub-criteria	Examples of Evidence	Review and Evaluation
Commitment to high academic standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written course requirements in syllabi are complete and clear and aligned with CCTC program standards, elements, and teaching effectiveness expectations (TPEs). • Evaluation procedures require multiple assessments of candidates, are aligned (with above), and are tied to field experiences where possible. • Examples of student performances show high quality work. 	<p>A variety of evidence distributed across the period of the review is required.</p> <p>Evaluation considers quality, scope, and extent.</p>
Commitment to high pedagogic standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflection on one’s teaching is provided in a narrative or other documents (e.g., statement of teaching philosophy) submitted for the review. • Participation in instructional development seminars and workshops. • Innovative teaching techniques are reflected in course syllabi, materials, and/or peer observations of instruction. • Currency in instructional theory and research is reflected in course syllabi, materials, and/or peer observations of instruction. 	<p>A variety of evidence distributed across the period of the review is required.</p> <p>Evaluation considers quality, scope, and extent.</p>
Effectiveness in instructing students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student ratings on course/instructor evaluations. • Student comments on course/instructor evaluations. • Peer observations and evaluations of instruction attesting to command of subject; skills in organizing and presenting course materials; and student rapport and learning environment. Student letters attesting to particular aspects of effectiveness in instruction/supervision. • Letters from master teachers attesting to effectiveness in supervision. 	<p>Course/instructor evaluations, including comments, and peer observations, distributed across the period of the review are the minimum evidence required.</p> <p>Evaluation deems ratings exceeding recent department means on course/instructor evaluations to be significant, but considers the quality of <i>all</i> evidence submitted.</p>

Teaching Effectiveness, continued

Sub-criteria	Examples of Evidence	Review and Evaluation
Effectiveness in advising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descriptions in the candidate’s narrative and/or letters attest to the nature, quality, and extent of advising activities. • Descriptions in the candidate’s narrative or letters attest to nature, quality, and extent of thesis, field study, student teacher, and/or special project advising. • Descriptions in the candidate’s narrative or letters attest to participation in department-wide academic advising activities. 	<p>Participation in department – wide advising activities (e.g., applicant reviews and orientation) is required.</p> <p>Evaluation considers quality, scope, and extent.</p>
Effectiveness in guiding and motivating students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student ratings on course/instructor evaluations. • Student comments on course/instructor evaluations. • Student letters attesting to particular aspects of effectiveness in guidance and motivation. • Peer observations and evaluations of instruction attesting to student guidance and motivation. • Letters from master teachers attesting to effectiveness in guiding and motivating student teachers. • Examples of evaluated student performances showing feedback provided. 	<p>Course/instructor evaluations, including comments, and peer observations, distributed across the period of the review are the minimum evidence required.</p> <p>Evaluation deems ratings exceeding recent department means on course/instructor evaluations to be significant, but considers the quality of <i>all</i> evidence submitted.</p>
Fair and appropriate application of evaluative standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student ratings on course/instructor evaluations. • Student comments on course/instructor evaluations. • Student letters attesting to particular aspects of fair and appropriate application of evaluation standards. • Examples of assessment and evaluation systems, rubrics, and/or scales used in instruction. 	<p>Course/instructor evaluations, including comments, and peer observations, distributed across the period of the review are the minimum evidence required.</p> <p>Evaluation deems ratings exceeding recent department means on course/instructor evaluations to be significant, but considers the quality of <i>all</i> evidence submitted.</p>

Professional Achievement and Growth

As indicated in the Teaching Effectiveness section, the faculty in the Department of Secondary Education work with pre-service and in-service teachers. While the main arena of work for the faculty is at the post-secondary level, work targeted at secondary audiences (high school and middle school teachers and students) may also be considered in evaluating professional achievement and growth.

The summary evaluation of professional achievement and growth by the RTP Committee will take into consideration its review and evaluation on all sub-criteria but evidence in each sub-criterion is not required. The RTP Committee also will consider other types of evidence the faculty provides if a written rationale is provided for why it should be considered evidence of professional achievement and growth.

Sub-criteria	Examples of Evidence	Review and Evaluation
Research and publication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publications, e.g., articles, books, and textbooks. • Presentations and workshops at meetings of professional organizations. • Reports on research projects. • Manuscripts in progress, submitted for publication, and accepted for publication. • Scholarly evaluations and/or reviews of the above. 	Evaluation considers the quality of the evidence, e.g., scope, refereed, research base, magnitude of impact, reviews, whether it reflects a body of work, and financial support .
Creative works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Films, videos, and electronic media productions designed explicitly for instructional purposes and available beyond the faculty’s teaching assignment. • Scholarly evaluations and/or reviews of the above. 	Evaluation considers the quality of the evidence, e.g., scope, refereed, research base, magnitude of impact, reviews, whether it reflects a body of work, and financial support.
Curricular innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of original academic programs, new courses or course content, disciplinary and/or pedagogical approaches, applications of technology. • Scholarly evaluations and/or reviews of the above, 	Evaluation considers the size, impact, financial support, and extent of the innovation.

Contributions to Campus and Community

The summary evaluation(s) by the RTP Committee will take into consideration its review and evaluation of all types of contributions but examples of each type cited below are not required. .

The RTP Committee also will consider other types of evidence the faculty provides if a written rationale is provided for why it should be considered evidence of contributions to campus and community.

Criterion	Examples of Evidence	Review and Evaluation
Contributions to campus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of administrative assignments, attestation(s) to effectiveness, and other documents as pertinent. • Description of and attestation(s) to participation in faculty governance. • Description of and attestation(s) to participation on a committee (departmental, college, or university-wide). • Description of and attestation(s) to special advising assignments. • Description of and attestation(s) to participation in program development. • Description of and attestation(s) to sponsorship of a student organization. <p>Description of and attestation(s) to direction of a non-instructional activity or project.</p>	<p>While the number and diversity of levels of contributions are deemed important, the extent, duration, impact, and quality of service are of primary consideration.</p>
Contributions to community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of and attestation(s) to use of academic expertise or University status to serve school district, city, state, national, or international communities. 	<p>While the number and diversity of levels of contributions are deemed important, the extent, duration, impact, and quality of service are of primary consideration.</p>
Professional leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Election to or offices held in professional educational organizations. • Awards, honors, and other formal recognition by professional educational organizations. • Attainment of new licenses or certificates in education. • Conducting workshops and symposia on educational topics for peers. • Contributions to the production of professional journals or publications. • Professional consulting in education. 	<p>Evaluation considers the time commitment, level of participation, and magnitude of impact.</p>