

Department of Criminal Justice Studies Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

Approved by the Office of Faculty Affairs &
Professional Development on August 19, 2020

Preamble

The RTP Guidelines were developed by the Department of Criminal Justice Studies including and 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 Department of Criminal Justice Studies tenure/tenure track faculty member and to allow each member the latitude to have that process reflect individually different interests, specialty areas and professional focus. Formative (process focused) and summative (decision focused) evaluation is an ongoing process in the Department of Criminal Justice Studies for all tenure/tenure track faculty members regardless of rank or level. Input on this process is welcomed by the RTP committee.

The Department of Criminal Justice Studies is an undergraduate program that provides students with a critical understanding of crime, law and justice systems and prepares them for eventual employment and leadership in the range of institutions and organizations that respond to and address crime, law, and community safety. We seek to foster critical thinking, analytical capacity, and information literacy at the undergraduate level. As such, our tenured/tenure track faculty members must embrace and reflect through their accomplishments a strong commitment to equity, social justice, and fostering critical thinking about crime, law and justice systems.

Background

This document provides guidelines for retention, tenure, and promotion in Criminal Justice Studies (CJS). These guidelines are designed to establish clear expectations for retention, tenure, and promotion consistent with the University criteria specified in [Academic Senate Retention, Tenure and Promotion Policy #S19-241](#).

“The criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion are divided into three areas (a) teaching effectiveness and/or primary assignment, (b) professional achievement and growth, and (c) contributions to campus and community. Candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion shall be evaluated on all criteria. For teaching faculty, excellence in teaching is required. For faculty whose primary assignment is other than teaching, excellence in the primary assignment is required. To merit tenure and/or promotion all candidates must meet the standard of excellence normally expected of faculty and required by their department’s RTP criteria.”

Candidates are responsible for maintaining their electronic Working Personal Action File (eWPAF). Candidates should consult academic senate policy, the Faculty Affairs and Professional Development office, and the CJS RTP committee as questions arise.

General Principles

There are several general principles which apply through the entire tenure and promotion process. These are:

- Probationary faculty normally shall be considered for tenure at the same time as promotion. In rare cases, candidates may elect to apply for promotion at an earlier date than tenure, and should consult with the AVP of Faculty Affairs, Dean of the College of Health and Social Sciences, Director of CJS, and the Chair of the CJS RTP committee in making this determination.
- Candidates for promotion to Professor are evaluated according to more rigorous standards and are expected to show higher levels of professional, pedagogical and/or service growth and development after achieving the rank of Associate Professor and tenure. Each section below provides expectations for candidates for Professor separate from candidates for Associate Professor.
- Growth and development can be demonstrated in a number of ways, such as significant research and publication outputs, service leadership positions (internal and external), and/or curriculum innovations, and is expanded upon in greater detail below.
- Candidates already undergoing tenure and promotion review at the time that these criteria are implemented may choose whether to seek tenure and promotion under this or the previous criteria.

Teaching Effectiveness

Academic Senate Retention, Tenure and Promotion Policy #F11-241 states: “For teaching faculty, excellence in teaching is required.” CJS also values collaborative approaches to teaching and efforts to ensure that all faculty excel in supporting student success.

Like all faculty, probationary and tenured faculty are expected to be effective teachers in the classroom. This means that they engage their students and provide an appropriate mixture of support and rigor. It is important to ensure that course structure and materials in the classroom are updated as needed.

Candidates are expected to teach courses that meet departmental needs, including both elective and required courses for the major. Candidates are expected to have proficiency in at least one core lecture (such as CJ 300, 323 or 330). Candidates should expect to teach required courses at least once every two years, or as needed by the department. Candidates should only expect to teach the same elective once every two years. Elective courses should be repeated no more than every two years.

To be recommended for tenure and promotion in CJS, the candidate's overall pattern of teaching evaluations should indicate they are effective teachers. To measure teaching effectiveness in the classroom, the following methods will be used in evaluating a candidate's file:

Review of course materials: Course materials are required in the WPAF and must include the most recent syllabus and a sample of materials from each course taught. Sample materials may include: learning objectives and assessment rubrics, statement of pedagogical approach, bibliographies, guidebooks, film lists, lab exercises, assignments, examinations, lecture materials, and copies of online course materials. Course materials included in the WPAF are expected to demonstrate the candidate's efforts to provide additional resources and clarify expectations for students. CJS values academic freedom and review of course materials should not be used to infringe on candidate's intellectual autonomy. CJS also expects instructors to consider the affordability of their course materials.

Student evaluations of teaching: Quantitative and qualitative student evaluations of teaching effectiveness (SETEs) for all courses taught are required. Candidates are expected to provide a summary table of courses taught, SETE ratings earned, number of students enrolled in each class, number of responses and department mean scores for each semester. Qualitative student evaluations are analyzed for themes and recurring issues in one's teaching and provide an opportunity for professors to respond and adjust pedagogical goals accordingly. RTP reviewers are not concerned with an outlier comment in the qualitative reviews, but rather use qualitative reviews to get a fuller picture of the reasons for a particular quantitative score. Quantitative reviews are judged on a 1-5 scale, with lower scores reflecting more effective teaching. Scores of:

- 1-1.49 will be considered "exceptional,"
- 1.5-2.0 will be considered "highly effective,"
- 2+ will be considered as "needs improvement."

In general scores better than 2 or comparable or better (lower) than the department mean score are considered indicators of effective teaching. Given the high quality of teaching in CJS, exceptional and highly effective teachers may often have higher (worse) scores than the program mean, and in these cases, the overarching guideline of scores better (lower) than 2 will apply and department mean scores cannot be used to negatively evaluate a candidate's teaching effectiveness.

The department recognizes there are a variety of social factors that impact SETE scores, and thus, CJS takes a holistic approach to assessing teaching effectiveness, and considers syllabi, pedagogical innovations, peer evaluations, and other course materials as indicators of teaching effectiveness. CJS values candidates taking efforts to consistently improve their pedagogy. Candidates are also encouraged to include examples of evidence that demonstrate their holistic approach to teaching effectiveness (such as emails from students, etc.) and may wish to address this in their self-statement. Scores should thus be judged in the context the entirety of the candidate's teaching portfolio, recognizing that some subjects – especially required, controversial and quantitative ones – can sometimes result in scores greater (worse) than others. In addition, the size and nature of the class will be considered.

All candidates seeking tenure or promotion are expected to demonstrate consistency and/or improvement in SETE scores and teaching quality. The final determination of teaching performance will be based on the RTP committee evaluation of the above factors.

Review of peer class evaluation reports. Class evaluations (whether of an online, videotaped or in-person session) by fellow faculty members are vital for assessing the level of the instructor's presentation, organization and ability to generate student engagement. Probationary faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion must have at least one peer evaluation each year, two are recommended. Associate professors shall be reviewed at least once every year.

The Chair of the Department will schedule classroom evaluations. Observations should be arranged in the first month of the semester and all faculty members should receive at least two weeks of time between the announcement of an observation and observation. Observers are asked to stay for the entire class in the case of twice or three times/week courses, but to ensure parity, may only stay for half of a class that meets for weekly and whose time is not reduced for other reasons (hybrid, online activities). All classroom evaluators must be tenured faculty. Ideally, every course a faculty member teaches will be evaluated prior to seeking tenure and promotion.

Peer teaching evaluations are intended as a collegial and helpful tool for instructors to document their pedagogical development over time at San Francisco State and make improvements as needed. Peer observations can include: review of syllabus, online instructional management system (i.e. iLearn), classroom visit, review of assignments, review of reading materials, and/or review of course activities. To facilitate evaluations, the observed instructor and reviewer are expected to discuss the course aims, content and assignments and context of the session to be observed prior to the observation date. Course evaluations can take a number of forms depending on the structure of the course—i.e. classroom observation, computer lab activity, online module review, etc. —but the forms utilized should be specified by the reviewer on the evaluation form. The observed instructor is expected to provide the reviewer with the course syllabus and any other relevant course material (including access to iLearn) prior to the observation date.

Advising and maintenance of office hours. Since candidates are expected to engage actively in advising and maintain regularly scheduled office hours of at least one hour per class per week, they are expected to discuss their advising work in the self-statement that accompanies their WPAF.

Review of additional activities. Additional activities are not expected from instructors, but if instructors decide to engage in new course development, substantial course revision/innovation, curriculum development, mentorship of students, and active engagement with students in their research and career development, including their participation in field experiences, these will be considered as elements of teaching effectiveness.

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, as are efforts to challenge and push students to engage with unfamiliar and sometimes uncomfortable material, content and ideas. CJS considers online instruction to be an appropriate

vehicle for learning. Faculty should be supported for taking risks in trying new techniques, schedules, and other innovative and different methods in teaching their courses, including online and hybrid courses and the use of other technologies. No candidate should be negatively evaluated by forays into non-traditional methods of teaching and these methods should be discussed and considered in the candidate's narrative.

CJS also supports collaborative approaches to pedagogical development as examples of teaching effectiveness. Efforts to increase the capacity of all department faculty to provide student-centered, high-impact, and active engagement methods of instruction demonstrate teaching effectiveness. CJS encourages collaboration in the design of courses and instructional materials and encourage faculty to share course materials with colleagues. Examples of this in a candidate's file are further demonstrations of teaching effectiveness. Candidates should include documentation of this collaboration in their files, and when particularly impactful, letters from other instructors who have benefited can also be included.

Teaching effectiveness and promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Candidates for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor are expected to demonstrate continued efforts to improve teaching effectiveness and pedagogical growth, through consistent or improved student evaluation of teaching effectiveness (SETE) scores, and curriculum innovations. Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to continue to excel in their teaching. In addition, they are expected to provide leadership in curricular innovation and development in the department more broadly by:

1. Mentoring and enhancing the teaching activities of junior faculty through classroom observation and sharing of teaching techniques and resources;
2. Mentoring undergraduate students in special projects, theses, presentation, manuscript preparation and other scholarly work;
3. Leading program evaluation and development; and/or
4. Demonstrating leadership in curriculum innovation and development.

The RTP committee will evaluate all of the above factors in making its final determination of teaching effectiveness.

Professional Achievement and Growth

Overview

CJS faculty are often at the forefront of critical approaches to crime, law and justice, and are frequently interdisciplinary scholars who strive to create scholarship that impacts social change. This type of scholarship often does not fit within traditional metrics of scholarship, such as impact factors, "top" disciplinary journals, strictly university presses, or single-authored publications. CJS recognizes that professional growth can be achieved in a variety of ways, and considers alternative methods of scholarship, including collaborative research and writing, non-traditional, non-university publication and creative work outlets, and alternative methods of research (i.e., community participatory research) to be as valuable as traditional methods of scholarship. Further, CJS values the scholarship of teaching and learning and considers

publications and achievement in this realm to satisfy professional achievement and growth. Opportunities for publication and forms of presentation of research vary within the fields represented in CJS, and we emphasize quality rather than quantity of work. Additionally, CJS values the contributions of critical and innovative scholarship. Since many in CJS conduct interdisciplinary and critical research, we recognize that impact factors are not necessarily a good indicator of quality. Instead, we rely on a range of factors to evaluate the quality of published work, including: journal or publication; degree to which work engages the community; contributions of article to advancing knowledge in the field; editorial board members; impact on the community or professional field; indicators of wide reach or recognition; and assessment by external reviewers. Open access publications are supported and if peer-reviewed, do count.

Publication expectations

CJS values both single, co- and multi-authored publications; these types of publication can count equally towards professional achievement and growth. Faculty members are encouraged to collaborate and develop peer and community research networks. Collaborative research and publication (including with students and community members) are valued; in these instances, candidates should elaborate on their role in these publications in the self-statement that accompany their WPAF. CJS recognizes that co- or multi-authored publications, especially when someone is the lead author, may require more work than a single-authored publication, and should be recognized as such.

Candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion may elect to be externally evaluated regarding their professional development and growth by external reviewers chosen in consultation with the CJS RTP Committee. During the year prior to seeking tenure and promotion, the candidate in consultation with the CJS Chair and RTP Committee should identify whether they would like to undergo external review and identify several individuals who have senior standing in the professional field of the candidate, but who have not worked with or collaborated with the candidate closely, to provide an external review of the candidate's professional growth. This is particularly useful to show impact of professional achievements for candidates using alternative methods of scholarship, whose research is in a narrow subfield, or whose quantity of scholarship does not meet traditional metrics. Candidates for Professor must notify the CJS Chair and/or RTP committee by the beginning of the spring semester prior to the year seeking promotion in order to facilitate the external review process. The candidate and the RTP committee are responsible for generating a list of names that meet these criteria, but the choice and solicitation of external reviewers is the responsibility of the Chair and Committee. This should be accomplished in the spring semester of the year prior to application for tenure and/or promotion. The CJS Chair will be responsible for contacting the external reviewers. Candidates should not in any way contact the external reviewers.

The general expectation to achieve promotion to Associate Professor and tenure is:

- The lead, co- or single-authored peer-reviewed publication of an original book-length manuscript; or,
- Three lead, co- or single-authored peer reviewed articles in journals or book chapters.

Predatory publishing is an exploitative business model and cannot be counted towards retention, tenure and promotion.

A comparable combination of peer-reviewed articles, alternative methods of scholarship, and/or professional engagement is acceptable and sufficient to meet the requirements for professional achievement and growth. Comparable activities are acceptable if the candidate is able to document that these activities carry the same professional weight as traditional peer-reviewed publications.

Documentation of alternative methods of scholarship other than traditional peer reviewed journal articles or university/scholarly press published books are expected to show how the scholarship: (1) contributes to moving the field forward; (2) communicates the scholarship to peers through publications and (3) is recognized and reviewed by peers in the field. CJS supports all candidates who engage in community-oriented work and values community-review of scholarship and professional achievement and growth as much as traditional scholarly levels of review. Peer-reviewed publications and publications reviewed by community stakeholders reach different audiences and are equally valuable.

Alternative methods of scholarship may undergo alternative methods of review at the time of publication (e.g., non-blind peer/editor review, applied professional review, or community review). In addition, candidates should include a statement in the WPAF narrative addressing how these alternative activities contribute to moving the field forward, is communicated to peers and impacts the field.

If a candidate is considering an alternative, comparable demonstration of professional achievement, they should consult early in the process with the Chair of the RTP Committee and Department Chair.

Comparable scholarly activities include other types of publications. For the following categories of publications, the candidate should state the exact nature of their role in the process of research, analysis, writing and/or editing and disseminating the manuscript in question. In addition, these materials may be included in the WPAF packet sent out for potential external review.

Subsequently, the RTP committee will evaluate the evidence and decide as to equivalence for each item.

- Editing an anthology, book or journal symposia, where the candidate has taken a leadership and scholarly role in shaping the outcome of the publication. Situations in which the candidate has contributed primarily editing activities, and not scholarly outputs, is considered professional service.
- Editor-reviewed publications.
- Authoring for other outlets such as for governmental agencies (e.g., contracted technical reports), research centers, community organizations and groups, professional publications, foundations, or non-peer reviewed journals.

Engagement with the professional field

Attendance at professional conferences and engagement in the professional field is expected. Papers and posters given at conferences are not considered with the same weight as peer-reviewed publications, but they do lead directly to publications and are therefore crucial to a candidate's professional development and so, should be fully supported by the department. Candidates are encouraged to attend scholarly and professional conferences during each year under review. Organizing panels and other scholarly events are also considered evidence of professional achievement and growth.

Professional engagement in the field is necessary but insufficient, on its own, to allow for the granting of tenure or promotion. Professional engagement includes:

- Conference papers delivered at major national or international conferences.
- Invited presentations at specialized conferences.
- Achieving recognition of professional accomplishment in the form of honors and appointments.
- Receipt of research grants
- Presentations at community organizations or government agencies
- Engagement with media or public scholarship

Evidence of professional achievement and growth will be determined through an evaluation of documentation provided by the candidate to demonstrate professional achievement and growth, including but not limited to publications, other scholarly activities, and review of external letters of evaluation.

Curricular innovations

Because SF State's mission is teaching and the unique needs of CJS students, we value curricular innovations as significant evidence of professional achievement and growth. Curricular innovations that contribute to advancing critical approaches to crime, law and justice are also important ways that candidates can demonstrate their professional achievement and growth. Curricular innovations are demonstrations of professional achievement and growth when they exceed the requisite expectations for demonstrating teaching effectiveness. In cases where curricular innovations are used by candidates to demonstrate professional achievement and growth, the inclusion of such innovations should demonstrate how the impact contributes to moving curriculum in the field forward, is communicated to peers and other scholars, and has demonstrated impact. Development of new courses, course preparation, and other aspects related to the ongoing process of demonstrating teaching effectiveness and growth would not be considered curricular innovations to meet professional achievement and growth. Examples of curricular innovations include significant leadership in areas of departmental curricular

development, such as developing department-wide curriculum for required core courses (such as syllabus and lecture materials that impact multiple instructors), the development of new high-impact practices and programs to contribute to the ongoing success of our students, and efforts to increase departmental capacity for creating, assessing, and ensuring student learning in the program through inclusive and transformative pedagogy.

Professional Achievement and Growth for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

The normal expectation for establishing significance in professional achievement and growth for purposes of promotion to Professor is continued professional growth in the discipline, whether in a more focused fashion or in several different research areas, and the ability to clearly illustrate their substantial impact upon the field and community. Adequate development can be documented through recognition of scholarly achievements by others, which should be noted and considered by CJS.

Further, the research agenda for candidates for Professor should illustrate a continuing extension their scholarly agenda and a continued contribution to the discipline. More rigorous contributions mean that in addition to the above, candidates are expected to have additional scholarly outputs. Impact can be demonstrated by activities that contribute to moving the field forward, is communicated to peers and impacts the field and/or community. Reception and recognition by community members and groups is particularly valued by CJS.

As noted above candidates for Professor are also encouraged to pursue non-traditional methods of scholarship and can also fulfill the expectations for professional achievement and growth through the use of alternative methods of scholarship as documented and noted above. Given CJS support of community-embedded scholarship, candidates for Professor may want to concentrate on making their scholarly work more widely available, accessible, and contingent on collaborative partnerships. This may mean candidates for promotion to Professor primarily publish in more accessible popular formats than traditional peer-reviewed outlets.

The final determination of professional achievement will be based on the RTP committee evaluation of the above factors.

Contributions to Campus and Community

CJS faculty emphasizes community service as well as professional service and service to the department/school, program, college and University. CJS also values creating a collaborative department of mutual support, and recognizes efforts of candidates to create collaborative practices as service to the campus. Efforts such as these often result in direct examples of professional achievement and growth, creating effective teachers in the classroom, and retain, develop and advance the success of faculty and students.

Community service may include, but is not limited to the following:

- Service on the board of directors of local organizations and/or agencies.

- Service on the boards of directors of local non-profit organizations or other service to non-profit organizations
- Major work with a community or nonprofit organization that uses one's professional expertise or brings credit to the university.
- Service to federal, state, or local governments
- Professional services and consultations rendered to community organizations, advocacy organizations, NGOs, and public or private sector agencies.
- Contributions to the media, including newspapers, radio and TV.
- Workshops and talks geared toward community groups or educational institutions.
- Major activities in support of K-12 education within one's field of academic expertise.
- Consulting within one's field of academic expertise.

Professional service may include, but is not limited to the following:

- Service to professional committees, boards, or other units of professional associations, including holding offices in professional societies.
- Service as discussant or session chair (may also be considered as a part of Professional Achievement and Growth).
- Book reviews and publications in professional magazines and newsletters are considered to be part of professional service
- Serving on editorial boards of academic presses and/or journals
- Refereeing manuscripts for professional journals or presses.

Campus service may include, but is not limited to the following:

- Coordinating special programs, heading centers, or other uncompensated special projects at the University.
- Serving in a special advising role (for example, Major Advisor, Graduate Advisor).
- Serving on a departmental committee (for example, curriculum review, hiring committee, etc).
- Mentoring faculty colleagues in WPAF preparation or technical skill development.
- Serving on an active College or University committee.
- Sponsoring a student organization
- Advising a student publication.
- Writing a grant to support department or student programs or facilities.
- Supporting fellow faculty through sharing of scholarly and pedagogical work, manuscript revisions, and organizing and/or participating in forums that read and comment on each other's work, among other examples of mutually supportive engagement.

The RTP committee expects that all faculty, including probationary, will do service to CJS. Candidates for promotion to Professor should also have served on college level or university committees.

Contributions to Campus and Community for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Candidates for Professor must have served on departmental, college and university-wide committees. Candidates for Professor are also expected to have moved into leadership roles. The candidate should provide evidence of these contributions relying, wherever possible, on third parties.

Contributions can be documented in a range of ways, including: chairing committees; helping to develop novel or innovative university initiatives; leading departmental innovations; etc. Letters from other participants, particularly organizational leaders, in these activities shall be used to evaluate university, community and professional service.

The final determination of service contributions will be based on the RTP committee evaluation of the above factors.

Approved by CJS faculty: October 30, 2019 (vote unanimous)

Revisions approved by CJS faculty: December 11, 2019

Revisions approved by CJS faculty: March 11, 2020.

Revisions approved by CJS faculty: August 7, 2020.