



**Department of Special Education  
Criteria for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion**  
Approved by the Provost August 16, 2019 and effective Fall 2019

**I. Mission**

The primary mission of the Graduate College of Education is to develop and maintain rigorous professional preparation in pedagogical and clinical skills required for effective services to individuals of all ages and their families, including those in ethnically and racially diverse communities. All programs are based on excellence in teaching and clinical services, and a commitment to research and scholarship focused on the integration of services to schools and community agencies.

There are six themes reflected in the programs and activities of the Graduate College of Education. They are the following:

- Preparing professional educators and service providers who are sensitive to and effective in working with individuals of all ages who are diverse in culture, language, learning styles, abilities, sensory and physical challenges, ethnicity, and sexual orientation in schools and other community settings;
- Providing an integration of education, habilitation, rehabilitation, and community services;
- Using technology effectively to improve education, habilitation, rehabilitation, and community services;
- Preparing socially committed educational leaders and advocates;
- Contributing to the knowledge base in the profession and particularly in the area of urban education; and
- Supporting faculty in pursuit of individual discipline-focused activities as well as interdisciplinary programmatic planning, teaching, and research.

The Department considers faculty scholarly activity in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Examples of the options for contributions in these areas are provided in the model articulated by Boyer (1990) and McCarthy (2008).

**II. Teaching Effectiveness**

The primary mission of San Francisco State University is teaching, and the Department of Special Education takes that mission seriously. To be considered for tenure or promotion, regardless of qualifications in other categories, candidates must meet the standard of excellence in teaching that is normally expected of faculty and which is required by the University.



Like all faculty, probationary faculty are expected to be effective teachers and supervisors in the special education courses and student teaching/internship sites. This means that they guide and motivate their students to engage the course content, and they provide an appropriate mixture of both theory and practice. Innovations in the classroom are encouraged and fully recognized as important, and sometimes risky efforts. Non-traditional teaching methods are also encouraged and fully recognized as important.

Faculty in the Department of Special Education are expected to teach a variety of courses. Additionally, given the fast pace of the changes within these fields, it is expected that course structure and materials are updated constantly and that pedagogical approaches are up to date.

The evidence for evaluation of teaching includes the following: In order to measure teaching effectiveness, multiple indices are considered including those described below.

### **Student Evaluations**

Student evaluations are collected for every course at the end of each semester. Typically, SETE scores within the 1.5 to 2.0 range on the department/university evaluation form are interpreted as reflecting effective instructional traits and those between 1.0 and 1.5 as reflecting exceptional effectiveness. Typically SETE scores above 2.0 indicate a need for improvement. Qualitative comments are used as evidence in supporting effective teaching. Probationary faculty are required to teach a minimum of two courses each semester.

### **Peer Evaluations**

Two peer reviews of teaching in various courses are expected each academic year for both assistant and associate professors. In such evaluations, members of the RTP Committee or other tenure-track faculty members will visit classes and provide written comments concerning the quality of teaching. Specific areas of evaluation will be the following: a. evidence of preparation and class organization; b. classroom atmosphere; c. student-faculty interactions; d. clarity of lecture or presentation; e. knowledge of subject; and f. review of syllabi and other course materials; g. other evidence of teaching skills deemed relevant by the evaluator.

### **Course Materials**

Internal and/or external review of syllabi for content, appropriate assignments, reading, organization, and timeliness are expected by each faculty member. Faculty members are expected to frequently update their syllabi, learning objectives, student learning outcome And assignments in keeping with the continuing changes in the field. Syllabi should be clearly written, outlining learning objectives and follow other required university policies.



Syllabi and course materials are expected to reflect up-to-date pedagogical approaches in the field.

### **Advising**

All faculty are expected to post weekly office hours (minimum 4 hours per week) and be available to advise students during these hours.

### **III. Professional Achievement and Growth**

#### **A. Research and Publication**

The Department believes strongly in the complementary role of teaching and scholarship. Candidates are expected to develop a research program.

1. **Publication Record.** Traditionally the Department feels that professional achievement and growth is most strongly demonstrated by research, policy, and scholarly publications. In the area of publication, uppermost consideration is given to refereed papers and monographs; second ranking, to non-refereed publications, textbooks, and chapters in books; and third ranking, to technical reports, and published book reviews. Consideration is given to the impact of the place of publication. In publications of multiple authorship, a candidate should clearly communicate to the committee the candidate's role in the work reported. Candidates are strongly encouraged to establish a program of research. Collaborative research that includes participation by San Francisco State University students is encouraged. Interdisciplinary endeavors that cross programs, departments, and campuses are highly valued.
2. **Presentations.** Presentations at professional meetings are expected. The most important activity within this area would be as an invited speaker at a symposium, second would be a presentation at an annual peer reviewed meeting of a national professional organization within the candidate's field. A third level of presentation would be papers given at local colloquia, or invited seminars given on campus or at nearby campuses.
3. **Grants.** The Department expects candidates to apply for internal and external funding of their activities in the areas of research, personnel preparation, and model demonstration. Successful application and receipt of external funding is difficult to achieve and merits the Department's favorable consideration. Since applications receive extensive outside peer review, their success indicates that peers hold the candidate's research, demonstration, or other scholarly endeavors in high regard. Successful applications for internal funding also are considered favorably. Finally, given the difficulty in procuring external funding nationally, the



very effort of developing and submitting grant applications is considered positively.

#### B. Curricular Innovations

The Department recognizes that curricular innovations--such as the development of original academic programs, new courses or course content, new pedagogical approaches or applications of technology, or new areas of instructional expertise--can be of such high quality and generate genuine professional growth that they could merit recognition for their importance to overall departmental curricula and their contribution to the faculty member's field of study.

### IV. Contributions to Campus and Community

#### A. Contributions to Campus

All faculty are expected to contribute to service at the department and college level. This may include, but is not limited to, the following: administrative assignments (other than primary assignment), faculty governance, committee work, special advising assignments (e.g., advising for joint doctoral studies, general education, child and adolescent development, distance learning, student internship, liberal studies, special major), program development, sponsorship of student organizations, and direction of non-instructional activities and projects. All candidates are expected to provide evidence/information about the impact of their service to campus. Candidates are expected to provide information about each service activity including a description of (a) the *nature* of the service, (b) the *effort* required to provide the service (e.g., the average number of hours per semester or academic year), and (c) the *impact* of the service on the campus community. Evidence of impact would be included *when available*. For example, members of the college scholarship committee would describe the potential impact of the scholarship monies on students' ability to afford their graduate studies. Evidence could include quotes from applicant statements as well as the amount of scholarship monies awarded to applicants.

#### B. Contributions to Community

All faculty are expected to contribute to service to the community. Faculty members may use their academic expertise or university status to serve the community at the local, state, national, and/or international levels. As such, this constitutes evidence of the stature a candidate has achieved in the greater academic community. Election to and service in offices in professional societies, honors and recognition bestowed by professional societies, selection and participation on editorial boards and as a referee for manuscripts and grants, active participation in the schools and community through



research and program development, consulting and/or providing technical assistance, or serving on professional development boards all are indicative of the regard a candidate has achieved among on- and off-campus colleagues. While the Department would not weigh these activities as heavily as direct research, demonstration, and publication, it is aware of the significance of the peer recognition and the reality that considerable time and energy can be expended in these efforts.

## **V. Promotion to Full Professor**

Additional considerations for promotion to full professor (since time of tenure and promotion to associate professor) include evidence of outstanding performance and leadership as indicated by contributions and innovations in areas outlined below:

### Teaching Effectiveness

The candidate will be expected to do the following:

- mentor junior faculty;
- lead program assessment; or
- demonstrate leadership in curriculum innovation and development.

### Professional Achievement and Growth:

The candidate will demonstrate scholarly productivity and an established research agenda as demonstrated by the following:

- five (with at least two single- or lead-authored) peer reviewed published scholarly journal articles;

OR

- three (with at least two single- or lead-authored) peer reviewed published scholarly journal articles and two scholarly works such as published monographs, book, book chapters, externally funded grants;

AND

- annual presentations in their area of scholarly interest at professional conferences or meetings

### Contributions to Campus and Community

The candidate will demonstrate leadership in work of importance and relevance to the field (e.g., professional advisory boards, external reviews, editorial journal reviews).

## **IV. External Evaluations for Tenure and Promotion Candidates**



External reviews are included in the WPAF for candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion. They serve as an additional source of information to be considered throughout the evaluation process. Candidates for tenure and promotion should submit to the RTP Committee the names of a minimum of three potential external reviewers who are in the candidate's field and can address the candidate's professional achievement and growth. In addition to the reviewers named by the candidate, the RTP Committee may solicit assessments from other external reviewers. The RTP committee will ultimately be responsible for the selection of two external reviewers.. In order to give reviewers ample time to complete their evaluation, candidates are expected to provide the names of potential reviewers to the RTP Committee Chair *no later than April 30* during the Spring semester preceding the Fall semester in which the candidate's tenure or promotion file is due. The candidate will also provide a package of documentation for each external reviewer, including an updated vita, personal statement of professional achievement, and copies of four relevant publications.

Further requirements for external evaluations include the following (adapted from guidelines posted on [Faculty Affairs website](#)):

- External reviewers are located at comparable institutions of higher education.
- External reviewers are a higher rank than the candidate being reviewed.
- External reviewers are asked to include a description of their relationship to the candidate.
- External reviewers are asked to state potential conflict of interest, if any exists, for completing the review.
- The RTP Committee provide a brief bio sketch or abbreviated C.V. of the external reviewer to be included in the candidate's WPFA supporting materials

## References

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching,

McCarthy, M. (2008). The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education: An overview. In: Rowena Murray (eds). *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*. Berkshire: McGraw/ Hill: Open University Press.