

Department of Political Science

Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Criteria

Approved by Provost: 9/6/2018

A Guide to Standards for Lecturer Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion to Associate and Full Professor, and Post-Tenure Review in the Department of Political Science

Documentation: The candidate should follow the guidelines set out in the “Preparing for Tenure and Promotion Handbook” available at <http://facaffairs.sfsu.edu/sites/sites7.sfsu.edu.facaffairs/files/TandP-NEW-2014.pdf>

Early Tenure and Promotion: to be awarded early tenure and/or promotion, faculty must demonstrate achievements in all three categories that are outstanding or in excess of the required record.

Lecturer Evaluation

Teaching effectiveness: The primary mission of the California State University is teaching. Lecturers must meet standards of excellence in teaching that are normally expected of faculty and that are required by the University. The standards for evaluating teaching are:

- 1. Course Materials:** Syllabi, bibliographies, reading lists, and examinations are used by the committee as evidence of course and class organization, the level at which the course is taught, and the expectation of student learning. Information should also be included about the design or development of new courses. Syllabi and course materials (such as readings, bibliographies, assignments, online posts) are expected to reflect currency in the field.
- 2. Student Evaluations:** Although the committee does not regard student evaluations as definitive, they are useful because they provide a large representative sample of student opinions. Generally, scores between 1.0 and 2.0 on the critical questions of the survey instrument suggest strong teaching. Scores between 1.0 and 1.5 are considered excellent. Scores between 1.5 and 2.0 are considered good. Scores of 2.0 or higher suggest a need for improvement.
- 3. Peer class visitations:** Class visitations by fellow faculty members are vital for assessing the level of presentation and expectations. Lecturers receive one observation during their first semester of teaching at SFSU and, subsequently, one observation per year if SETE scores exceed 2 for any class during the previous year. Observers are required to complete and submit the Department’s “Classroom Observation Rubric.”
- 4. Instructional development:** Scholarly levels of instruction can also be demonstrated by evidence such as continuing study and curriculum development. Faculty are encouraged to attend workshops and special panels

on pedagogy in order to improve upon or sustain a high level of teaching effectiveness.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate and Full Professor

- I. **Teaching Effectiveness:** The primary mission of the California State University is teaching. To be considered for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, as well as for promotion from Associate to Full Professor, a faculty member must demonstrate a high level of teaching effectiveness in their teaching performance, including maintenance of high academic standards and a scholarly level of instruction. The standards for evaluating teaching are:
 1. **Range and Breadth of Courses:** Faculty in the Political Science Department are expected to teach a variety of courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels, with consideration of disciplinary and curricular demands.
 2. **Course Materials:** Syllabi, bibliographies, reading lists, and examinations are used by the committee as evidence of course and class organization, the level at which the course is taught, and the expectation of student learning. Faculty are expected to stay current in their field and frequently update their syllabi, learning objectives and assignments. Syllabi should be clearly written, outline learning objectives and grading rubrics as well as other university policies.
 3. **Student Evaluations:** Tenure and tenure track faculty are required to submit evaluation questionnaires for all courses except supervisory courses each semester through the SETES system. The committee takes into consideration both quantitative data and qualitative comments. Generally, scores between 1.0 and 2.0 on the survey instrument suggest strong teaching. Scores of 2.0 or higher suggest a need for improvement.
 4. **Peer class visitations:** Class visitations by fellow faculty members are vital for assessing the level of the professor's presentation and expectations. They serve as a check on student evaluations. It is the responsibility of the RTP committee to arrange these visits in consultation with the faculty member. Probationary faculty receive one visitation each year from a designated faculty member of higher rank. Tenured professors receive one observation in any year for which SETEs average > 2 during the previous year. (Faculty will be given advanced notice in a timely fashion of the schedule for visits). Observers are required to complete and submit the Department's "Classroom Observation Rubric."
 5. **Curricular innovation:** Faculty are encouraged to develop new courses, introduce innovative teaching methods, and/or integrate new technology into existing courses.

6. **Advising:** The candidate must engage in advising and maintain regularly scheduled office hours. There is also the expectation that faculty will supervise and/or serve on thesis committees and sponsor independent studies in their areas of specialization.
7. **Instructional development:** Scholarly levels of instruction can also be demonstrated by evidence such as continuing study, attendance at professional conferences and workshops, and curriculum development.
8. **Promotion to Full professor:** For Promotion from Associate to Full professor, candidates should demonstrate continuing efforts to improve their teaching in the aforementioned areas. In addition, they must demonstrate leadership for example in mentoring junior faculty and lecturers through classroom observation and sharing teaching techniques; leading program development and evaluation; ongoing curriculum innovation and development.

II. Professional Achievement and Growth: Candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion to associate or full are expected to maintain a significant and continuing record of professional achievement and growth, the evidence for which comes primarily in the form of publication of peer-reviewed work:

1. **Evaluation of materials:** In weighing merit for tenure and/or promotion, the department may adjust quantitative measures of scholarly output to take into consideration the depth of research associated with the project, or the project's impact on the discipline. In evaluating the quality and impact of the published work, the RTP committee will consider a range of factors, including the journal's or press's reputation; the scholarly reputations of the editor, editorial board members, and other authors who have published in the same venues; indicators that the publication has been widely read and recognized (e.g. , reviews, citations and awards): and the assessment of external reviewers,
2. **Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:** For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, professional achievement and growth will have been demonstrated by the candidate's publication of original research, either in the form of a monograph, or three articles in appropriate peer-reviewed journals, or three essays or chapters in peer-reviewed books or anthologies, or an equivalent combination of **peer-reviewed** articles, essays and chapters. For the purposes of tenure and promotion, articles should be published in peer-reviewed scholarly journals. No scholarship published in predatory journals will be counted.

One book can be considered the equivalent to three articles. Books - including textbooks – must be published by reputable publishers that employ a rigorous process of peer review

3. **Promotion to Full Professor:** For promotion to Full Professor, the department expects a candidate to have produced a second book if a first book was published during the preceding review, or its equivalent in articles, essays and chapters as described above, and to have demonstrated a sustained record of scholarly achievement. Emphasis will be on the scholar's original contribution to the field as determined by external reviewers, published reviews and other similar forms of evaluation.
4. **Electronic publications:** Electronic publication will be seen as equivalent to ink and paper publication. It is the peer review process and the scholarly value and reputation of the journal or outlet in question that matters more than the format.
5. **Work in other languages:** Works in other languages will be deemed of equal value to works in English.
6. **Co-authoring:** Co-authored books, edited collections and articles will be counted as the equivalent of individually authored works if both contributors did equal work. Articles authored by more than two contributors will normally be counted as "half" worth.
7. **Substitutions:** Scholarly activities listed below may be substituted for the journal articles, essays, book chapters, etc listed above and, if so, will be considered equivalent to one of these. If substitution is used for awarding tenure or promotion, the department will make explicit the substitution and the reasoning behind the substitution. **It is understood that such a substitution is exceptional and the activity in question must be substantial value and impact as evaluated by the department. Work in this category include:**
 - Other articles (such as anthologies, chapters of books, law review articles, articles for popular audiences derived from one's specialization).
 - Articles for popular audiences refer to publications in quality magazines such as the *Atlantic*, *Nation*, *New Republic*, etc.
 - Edited and translated works, works in foreign languages (suitably reviewed)
 - Applied Research, such as studies or reports prepared for public or private entities.
 - Unpublished manuscripts that may be reviewed and commented on by appropriate authorities in the field.
 - Presentations of research at professional meetings.
 - Book reviews.
 - Data analysis, legal briefs of scholarly merit and other related forms of scholarship.
 - Other creative and scholarly works.
 - Peer reviewed manuscripts under contract but not yet in production,

- Book reviews and review essays in scholarly journals or scholarly internet sites.
- Serving as senior editor of a journal or encyclopedia
- Encyclopedia entries
- Oral and written presentations of research at professional meetings and to other scholarly audiences
- Contributions to websites that engage in political science scholarship
- Electronic contributions to scholarly enterprises
- Recognition of professional achievement in the form of honors, appointments, and grants
- Grant writing for federal and other funding for individual's scholarly research and for the establishment of such programs as summer institutes.
- Presentations of research at peer-reviewed professional conferences.

8. External letters: The Department requires that reputable scholars in the field assess the candidate's professional achievement. The candidate may propose up to six outside reviewers. The RTP committee, in consultation with the chair will winnow that number down to at least three outside reviewers and both the candidate and the RTP committee have the right to veto any one outside reviewer they deem to be inappropriate. Reviewers may not be the candidate's dissertation chair or committee member or have a close, extensive collaborative relationship with the candidate nor can they be close colleagues within SFSU, nor relatives. Reviewers must have 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 will be informed that candidates will have access to their letters. Candidates will provide the RTP committee with a current CV and the main articles or books they are presenting for tenure (they are free to submit more as well). The RTP chair will begin the invitation process, track the process of securing the letters, answer questions from reviewers, receive review letters and place them in the candidate's WPAF.

III. Service to campus and community: Service is vital to the department's capacity to carry out its mission; to university governance; to the growth and development of the profession, and to the broader mission of the university to use knowledge in service to humanity. Candidates for promotion are required to serve on appropriate departmental committees, and are encouraged to serve on college and university wide committees. Service on committees of the various professional associations and reviewing books and manuscripts for presses and journals is generally expected of academics. Candidates are expected to document the contribution and impact of their service to the campus and to their disciplinary community.

- IV. Service within the department:** Service within the department, such as attending faculty meetings, service on committees and assistance in various administrative tasks.
- V. Service to the professional community:** In terms of community and professional service, evidence of service might include chairing or commenting at sessions of professional organizations, helping with local arrangements for a professional meeting, serving on professional committees or as elected officials in professional societies. Also included would be participation on editorial boards or in refereeing journal articles and book manuscripts and services provided as a consultant. Presentations to non-political scientists on topics related to one's field would also be counted as would work as an editor of a journal or work in refereeing journals, participation in editing online scholarly forums and the like. Service might also be provided by working in various civic or political groups, by providing expert commentary to the news media and by public lectures.
- 1. Promotion to Associate:** For promotion to Associate, at minimum candidates should have made important contributions to departmental committees.
 - 2. Promotion to Full:** For promotion to Full professor, candidates should display leadership at the departmental level and contribute to shared governance on College and University wide committees,
- VI. Shared Appointments:** Faculty holding joint appointments shall be reviewed by tenured faculty from each department in which the individual holds an appointment.

Post-Tenure Review

By the first day of instruction in the fall semester in the final year of the five-year cycle, the Department will be informed by the Office of Faculty Affairs and Professional Development of all tenured faculty to be reviewed that year. The department shall inform the tenured faculty no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the fall semester to prepare for the review, which will take place during the spring semester. The entire review process should be completed during the spring semester.

Post-tenure reviews will be conducted by a Post-Tenure Review Committee, which will be composed according to the guidelines set forth in Senate Policy S14-122. The process will be the same for both associate and full professors.

Professors shall provide the Committee with (1) a curriculum vitae or Faculty Activity Report; (2) all available teaching evaluations, if any, for the 5-year period being reviewed; and (3) a short (half-page maximum) description of at least one "professional activity" determined by the faculty member; (4) a short (half-page maximum) self-statement by the faculty member reflecting on the accomplishments of the past five years and identifying goals for the following five years;

“Professional activities” shall include a professional accomplishment of the past five years related to teaching, scholarship, creative works, or service. Examples include, but are not limited to, a performance; a pedagogy workshop; syllabi or course proposals; published work; a work in progress; a community service project; a presentation or colloquium.

The departmental criteria for post-tenure review are whether the faculty member has continued to make positive contributions to the Department, Campus, Community and/or Profession via Research, Teaching and/or Service.

The Committee, in summarizing reviews, will follow the “Departmental PTR Template.” The contents of the summary report will include (1) The professor’s self statement, as an attachment; (2) the identification of needs and resources to support the faculty member's goals; and (3) feedback from the peer review committee to promote and facilitate the faculty member's ongoing professional development. The final version of this summary shall be developed in consultation with the faculty under review.

The tenured faculty member under review shall be provided with a copy of the peer review report and will have an opportunity to respond. The Committee will then meet with the tenured faculty member under review to discuss the report, recognize faculty contributions, encourage the faculty member to express their interests, and identify areas needing support. The review summary report is due to the tenured faculty under review and to the Chair by the final Friday in April, and the final version of the review will be placed in the faculty member's Personnel Action File.

**Adopted 02/07/03; Revised 02/23/07 Revised 05/09/08 Revised 5/2/16 Revised 5/4/17
Revised 5/11/18 Revised 5/23/18 Revised 8/24/18**