

Department of Computer Science San Francisco State University Expectations for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

Approved by the Office of Faculty Affairs &
Professional Development on September 21, 2020

These RTP Guidelines detail the expectations for retention, tenure, and promotion in the Computer Science Department consistent with Academic Senate Policy # S19-241. They were developed by the RTP committee of the Department of Computer Science at SFSU and were approved by all tenure/tenure track faculty at all ranks and levels. The Guidelines are provided 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 policies. The Guidelines are to be used to give a greater degree of understanding, definition and agreed upon specificity to the criteria in the policies. Faculty are encouraged to meet with their RTP Chair for any needed clarifications. The RTP Guidelines are intended to make the tenure/tenure track faculty evaluation process relevant to each tenure/tenure track faculty member in Computer Science Department and to allow each member the latitude to have that process reflect individually different interests, specialty areas and professional focus.

The mission of the Computer Science Department is to prepare students for careers as software professionals and for advanced studies in Computer Science. We develop and work with a range of technologies to build systems and applications that help solve today's problems, and share skills and knowledge with the community. We are committed to providing the opportunity to master the computer science discipline to students from all backgrounds at undergraduate and graduate level. Our program combines strong fundamentals, project- and team- oriented activities, as well as soft skills, leading to a well-rounded professional education.

The CS Department RTP criteria and required evaluation documentation 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. All candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion shall be evaluated on all criteria as described below.

The Department's RTP Committee conducts an annual review of probationary faculty. The purpose of the annual review is to determine if candidates for retention are making sufficient progress toward tenure. If the RTP Committee decides a candidate is not making sufficient progress, but the situation is not sufficiently serious to recommend non-retention, the RTP Committee and the Chair of the Department shall 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. All candidates are encouraged to actively seek continuous mentoring from other faculty.

Successful candidates for tenure or promotion must meet the standard of excellence normally expected of faculty. A candidate's activities while in his or her current rank are of primary relevance to promotion considerations. Candidates for promotion are advised that the

Department has higher expectations for promotion to Professor than for promotion to Associate Professor in all criteria, as outlined in sections 1-3.

Early Tenure and Promotion: In accordance with Academic Senate policy, a pre-tenure faculty member may request review for tenure in any pre-tenure year. Should a candidate wish to be considered for early tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, they must discuss it with their Department chair, RTP chair and RTP committee. To be awarded early tenure and promotion, faculty must demonstrate outstanding and exceptional achievements in all evaluation criteria at the quality and quantity level expected for tenure and promotion in regular time.

Candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion are responsible for providing the RTP Committee with an up-to-date Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) consistent with current process for submission of such material by the closing date as determined by the University RTP Deadline Calendar. The WPAF consists of a candidate's curriculum vitae, an index of supplementary materials, and materials and evaluation documentation that represent the candidate's accomplishments in teaching effectiveness, professional achievement and growth, and contributions to campus and community as outlined below

Candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion shall also include in the WPAF a self-statement in each of the areas of teaching effectiveness, professional achievement and growth, and contributions to campus and community that summarizes the candidate's accomplishments. In cases where an activity may be considered in more than one area, candidates shall make a selection in consultation with the RTP Committee. In addition to above documentation candidate shall submit the names of at least three potential external reviewers to RTP Committee at latest by May 15th in the year when WPAF is to be submitted. Only reviewers who have not collaborated with the candidate can serve as external reviewers. In addition to the reviewers named by the candidate, the RTP Committee may solicit assessments and letters from other external reviewers.

All candidates must demonstrate professional ethics and principles in interacting with faculty colleagues. The candidate must accept responsibility for working effectively with colleagues to achieve Departmental, College and University expectations.

1. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

Effective teaching is central to the mission of San Francisco State University and CS department. For all faculty, excellence in teaching is required. To merit tenure and/or promotion, all candidates must meet the standard of excellence normally expected of faculty and required by the university. In addition, involving students in supervised projects and research is a critical component of CS department teaching activities since it enhances both the graduate and undergraduate experience and is expected from all faculty.

Evaluation criteria include but are not limited to the following:

1.1 Classroom teaching.

Depth and breath of candidate taught courses. A candidate who contributes across a wide range of curricular needs or at different levels of instruction will receive favorable consideration, as would a candidate who excels at filling a particular need. Evaluations shall also take into account the importance of a course for the CS curriculum, its complexity, as well as currency with respect to the fast moving field of Computer Science.

Student evaluations of teaching. Students evaluate most instructors each semester using a standard SFSU SETE survey. The RTP Committee will review these student evaluations as they provide some indication of the quality of a candidate's classroom teaching. The RTP Committee will also review written comments made by students on the survey. The candidate shall prepare a summary table that includes all courses taught at SFSU. For each course include enrollment, number of students that submitted evaluations, the corresponding numerical scores for question #6, the overall course mean, and the department mean for that semester.

Peer evaluations of teaching. The RTP Committee will review letters of evaluation from Department faculty who have observed a candidate's classroom teaching. Candidates will be evaluated at least once per year by a faculty member of higher rank than the candidate's.

Course material and assignments: Evaluation of teaching may, if deemed necessary by the RTP Committee, include evaluation of selected course material and assignments

Letters from students and colleagues. The RTP Committee will consider other letters, either solicited or unsolicited, that address a candidate's teaching effectiveness. However, the RTP Committee will not consider anonymous letters.

1.2 Curricular innovations

The RTP Committee may consider curricular innovations such as the development of original academic programs, certificates, courses, new and effective pedagogical approaches, and instructional applications of new technologies as evidence of a candidate's teaching effectiveness. Evaluation shall be based but not limited to program/certificate/course materials, their importance for CS program, and currency in the field of study. The candidate's specific involvement in these activities shall be documented as well (e.g. letters from CS Chair, Committee Chairs, etc).

Course material, syllabi, assignments. Evaluation of new course materials developed by the candidate shall be based but not limited to content organization, required format (including objectives, grading rubrics), currency in the field, and assignments that promote student involvement

Activities in this area may also be evaluated under professional achievement and growth or contributions to campus and community, depending on the nature of the activity.

1.3 Directing theses and student supervision activities.

Connecting students with current research is vital for attracting students to the discipline and enhances both the graduate and undergraduate experience. These activities are central to the department mission for the graduate program and in preparing undergraduate students for graduate studies and R&D careers. Candidates are expected to supervise culminating experience theses/projects. In addition, candidates shall participate as committee members for culminating experience theses/projects, as departmental needs dictate. RTP Committee will also take into account candidates' contributions in sponsoring research activities with students, publishing refereed papers with students; teaching seminar courses or directing special projects involving students. The Committee will also consider student awards, student presentations, and other recognition obtained by the advisees of the candidate as strong evidence of effective supervising. Candidate shall provide well organized list and necessary documentation for the above.

1.4 Presentations at professional conferences related to CS education.

The RTP Committee may consider presentations at professional conferences or active participation in workshops related to Computer Science education as evidence of a candidate's teaching effectiveness. The candidate shall make a list of refereed and non-refereed presentations at CS Education conferences and workshops. The candidate shall also indicate the person who delivered the presentation, and the type of presentation (i.e., poster, talk), as well as any information that indicates the impact of that presentation on the field or on the participants, and include representative materials (e.g., mini-version of the poster or powerpoint presentation) presented. CS Education research presentations at professional conferences may also be evaluated under professional achievement and growth. In addition, candidate's participation in teaching institutes and workshops for the purpose of improving their teaching skills shall also be evaluated given appropriate documentation.

Compared to candidates for promotion to Associate Professor, candidates for promotion to Full Professor shall demonstrate continuing efforts to improve their teaching in the numbered areas above. In addition, they must demonstrate leadership in developing departmental teaching more broadly by contributing, for example, in:

- Mentoring junior faculty through classroom observation and sharing of teaching techniques;
- Mentoring undergraduate and graduate students in special projects, theses, presentations, manuscript preparation and other scholarly work.
- Leading program development and evaluation; or
- Demonstrate leadership in curriculum innovation and development.

2. Evaluation of Professional Achievement and Growth

Candidates are expected to engage in professional and research activities that enhance their professional achievement and growth, contribute to student learning experience and success, and enhance the reputation of the department. The evaluation of professional achievements and growth will be sensitive to standards appropriate to a candidate's area of expertise. The RTP Committee will consider, but is not limited to, the criteria and documentation described below to evaluate a candidate's professional achievement and growth.

2.1 Research and publications

All candidates are expected to have an active research program. Furthermore, the candidates' research program shall involve students from SFSU since research and research driven projects are essential part of the student learning process in a fast moving field of Computer Science. The RTP Committee considers papers published or accepted for publication in refereed high-quality research journals, conferences, or monographs as primary evidence of a candidate's professional achievement and growth. Significantly less weight is given to publication of non-refereed papers and technical reports, and to unpublished manuscripts. Papers and monographs published by premier journals with high impact factors and by reputable publishers are given more weight. Publishing and presenting research at refereed conferences sponsored by major professional associations, with stringent review processes and with highly selective acceptance rates is a tradition relatively unique to computer science and are also given high weight. For evaluation, candidates shall provide the list of papers clearly grouped by those published at journals then at conferences followed by the list of papers under review. For the publications, whenever available, candidates must provide statistics such as the journal's (conference's) impact factor, the total number of submissions and acceptance rates. The count of citations is another indicator of the quality of these publications and candidates are encouraged to submit citation counts of their publications along with other statistics outlined above. In the case of multiple faculty authors candidates shall provide brief summary of their role in the work leading to the paper. In such cases, first and/or senior authorship will be given greater weight, following the standard in science and engineering. Candidates shall also mark student coauthors with asterisk to help evaluate impact of their research to student learning. Other relevant information like best paper award or nomination for best paper award shall also be taken into account in review, with appropriate documentation provided.

The RTP Committee will also consider presentations of current research at refereed high- quality professional conferences as evidence of a candidate's professional achievement and growth. This may include presentations by candidate's students. For example, the most important activities within this area include being a plenary or invited speaker at an established national or international symposium or conference. For evaluation, candidates shall provide list of their talks with related info and note the talks that are of significance, like plenary and invited talks with necessary documentation. Presentations by candidate's students at selected events like COSE

Student Project Showcase, SFSU Graduate Research and Creative Works Showcase (and any related awards) will also be evaluated.

Writing technical books or monographs in candidate's area of expertise is also recognized as valuable component of professional achievements and will be evaluated using criteria like relevance and currency of the topic, quality of the publisher, book adoption or sales etc.

2.2 Grants and other sources of research funding

The Department considers it essential that all candidates apply for funding of their research interests. Since grant proposals for external funding of research are often very competitive and typically receive extensive outside peer review, the RTP Committee considers successful external grant funding as a very strong evidence of a candidate's professional achievement and growth. The RTP Committee recognizes the highly competitive nature of research grants especially those from national funding agencies such as NSF and NIH. Therefore, it is expected from all faculty that strong and continuous efforts are made towards obtaining research funding, regardless of whether the efforts are successful or are not successful initially. Grant and contract funding of research efforts from the computing industry and foundations will be evaluated if they also provide and support research driven projects with students and can lead to publications. Grant and contract funding related to CS education technologies and innovations will also be highly evaluated using similar criteria as above, and may also be reported under teaching effectiveness section. Grant and contract funding of non-research projects may be evaluated under teaching effectiveness or contributions to campus and community, depending on the nature of the project.

For evaluation in this area, candidates shall provide the list of awarded grants and contracts, as well as the list of grants they applied even if they were not granted. For all grants and contracts, candidates shall, besides the agency and the title, provide the overall funding amount and in case of multiple PIs briefly outline his/her role in the proposed/awarded grant as well as the specific grant amount allocated to them. For grants and contracts from industry and foundations a letter/agreement shall be provided.

Finally, to help CS RTP Committee evaluate candidate professional growth and achievements, which can be in areas outside the specific expertise of RTP Committee members, in addition to above documentation candidate shall submit to RTP Committee at latest by May 15th in the year when WPAF is to be submitted the names of at least three potential external reviewers who were and are not their direct collaborators or coauthors. In addition to the reviewers named by the candidate, the RTP Committee may solicit assessments and letters from other external reviewers.

2.3 Curricular and Educational Innovations

Activities in this area may be evaluated under teaching effectiveness or contributions to campus and community, depending on the nature of the activity. Candidates whose research program focuses on computer science education are encouraged to enter evidences of their curricular innovations in this section.

The RTP Committee may consider curricular and educational methodology innovations such as the development of original academic programs or courses, new and effective pedagogical approaches, or instructional applications of new technologies as evidence of a candidate's professional achievement and growth provided the activities receive sufficient recognition outside the Department consistent to criteria outlined above, as well as those specified in the section for evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

The normal expectation for establishing significance in professional achievement and growth for purposes of promotion to Full Professor is continued professional growth in the discipline and the ability to clearly illustrate their substantial impact upon the discipline. The research agenda for candidates for Full Professor should illustrate a continuing extension of research or applied skills and applications and a continued contribution to the discipline. In addition to meeting the expectations discussed for promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to Full Professor includes the following expectations:

- Demonstrated sustained scholarly productivity and an established research agenda.
- Sustained record of peer reviewed publication such as conference and journal articles; published monographs, book, book chapters;
- Success and evidence of continued efforts to attain external funding;
- Increase in presentations in their area of scholarly interest at professional conferences or meetings

3. Contributions to Campus and Community (Service)

The CS Department RTP Committee defines contributions in the area of service as a combination of service to the university at the department, college and university level, and service and enhancement of relationship to professional and civic communities and/or educational institutions at the city, state, national and international level.

3.1 Service to University

The RTP Committee expects *all tenure-track faculty* to focus their efforts primarily on service to the department. The type and level of this service are outlined in the CS department's adopted bylaws. The bylaws mandate participation in a number of standing committees which address CS Department needs in service. In addition, service may include activities such as administrative assignments, ad-hoc committees, faculty governance, advising assignments, mentoring faculty in the CS department or at other institutions, organizing and supervising department labs, sponsorship of student organizations, or direction of non-instructional projects.

The RTP Committee expects *all candidates for promotion to associate and full professor* to provide service to CS department as outlined above, and also to provide service to college, campus and community. Candidates are expected to provide leadership by influencing the quality and direction of service activities commensurate with their level of experience and seniority. Candidates for promotion to Full Professor are expected to provide service to College and Campus in addition to service to the CS department. Evaluation of these contributions shall be based on but not limited to the following documentation:

- Expected service assignments allocated to faculty in regular CS Department service planning meetings; these meetings are held yearly and on an as-needed basis
- CS Department adopted bylaws
- Memos of committee composition
- Documented contributions of the faculty to committee work
- Support letters by committee chairs or CS Chair
- Letters of recognition and related documentation from external organizations

3.2 Service to the profession

The RTP Committee expects *all tenure track faculty* to participate in professional organizations, and participation in major professional organizations in CS Profession such as IEEE and ACM will be evaluated highly. This participation includes but is not limited to: election to offices in professional organizations; participation on editorial boards; organization of conferences or symposia; or service as a referee for manuscripts and grants.

All candidates for associate or full professor are expected to provide service to the profession as outlined above; in addition, candidates shall provide leadership including but not limited to contributing to organization of professional meetings, workshops and conference sessions.

Evaluation of these contributions shall be based but not limited to the following documentation:

- Documented contributions of service work
- Letters of recognition and related documentation (internal or external)

3.3 Service to the community

The RTP Committee shall also consider activities in which candidates directly use their professional expertise to provide service at the community, city, state or national level. Some of these activities may include (but are not limited to): enhancing relationships with alumni, outreach and collaborations with K-12 schools and other educational institutions, and promoting diversity in computing.

Evaluation of these contributions shall be based but not limited to the following documentation:

- Description of the service
- Documented contributions of service work
- Letters of recognition and related documentation (internal or external)

The candidate for Full professor must demonstrate a consistent pattern of exemplary leadership, collegiality and professional contributions within the department, college and university. Their professional contribution should include those to the campus and the community. Examples of these contributions may include but are not limited to the following:

- The candidate chairs or is a significant contributor in committees at various levels (university, college, department)
- Mentorship of junior faculty and student leaders
- Demonstrates leadership in writing accreditation evaluation, chairing a standing committee, and/or taking leadership in curricular evaluation and/or revision.
- Serves as key officer of professional organization, receives induction or recognition from a prestigious professional organization, program planner of symposia and/or conference.
- Serves as a board member or key organizer of a significant community service organization.
- The candidate will demonstrate leadership in work of importance and relevance to the field (e.g., professional advisory boards, external reviews, editorial journal reviews).