

School of Nursing

Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

Approved by the Dean on August 28, 2020
Approved by the Office of Faculty Affairs &
Professional Development on August 28, 2020
Effective Fall 2020

PREAMBLE

The RTP criteria were developed by the RTP Committee of the School of Nursing (SoN) and approved by all tenured/tenure-track faculty at all ranks. The criteria are provided for the SoN faculty to create benchmarks or standards that candidates will use to evaluate their progress on all criteria provided in each of the areas of review (i.e., teaching effectiveness, professional achievement and growth, and contributions to campus and community). These criteria are to be used to give a greater degree of understanding, definition, and agreed-upon specificity regarding the expectations to be successful at retention, tenure, and promotion.

The RTP criteria are intended to make the tenured/tenure-track faculty evaluation process relevant to each SoN tenured/tenure-track faculty member and to allow each member the latitude to have that process individually reflect different interests, specialty areas, and professional foci. Formative (process-focused) and summative (decision-focused) evaluation is an ongoing process in the SoN for all tenured/tenure-track faculty members regardless of rank. Input on this process is welcomed by the RTP Committee.

The SoN is a professional nurse education program. We seek to educate culturally humble, ethical, professional nurses at the undergraduate and graduate levels. As such, our tenured/tenure-track faculty members must embrace and reflect a strong commitment to professional nursing education through their accomplishments.

If the RTP criteria enclosed are to be at all successful, they must support traditional, as well as non-traditional, forms of scholarship that improve nursing education. These criteria also seek to foster a commitment to, and recognition of, all actions that facilitate collaboration and community-building within the school, the college, the university, and beyond.

INTRODUCTION

The School of Nursing (SoN) is a professional preparation program designed to educate approximately 320 undergraduate and 148 graduate students over the course of their study to prepare them for direct clinical service in nursing practice in a variety of clinical settings, including hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, and communities. The SoN holds cultural humility, social justice, and community engagement as central values and strives to demonstrate these values in its programs and relationships with the university and communities from the local to the global level.

By following these criteria, working with the RTP Committee in the SoN, and attending college- or university-sponsored RTP workshops, faculty members are better able to enhance their professional portfolios, strengthen their position within the academic community, and better navigate the retention, tenure, and promotion processes.

The criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion are:

1. Evidence of teaching effectiveness
2. Evidence of professional achievement and growth
3. Evidence of contributions to the campus and community that reflects collegiality and engagement in different types of service activities.

I. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

To be awarded tenure and promotion, a candidate must maintain a consistent and excellent level of academic teaching activities in their particular field of instruction and foster a learning environment that supports cultural humility. Teaching strategies must be sensitive to students' diverse learning needs and styles. In addition, the candidate must demonstrate a commitment to high pedagogic and academic standards which include being effective with students in relation to advising, counseling, mentoring, and motivating, and applying evaluation standards that are fair, appropriate, and applicable to students' achievement.

To measure teaching effectiveness in the School of Nursing (SoN), the following criteria will be used:

1. SoN teaching effectiveness scores will be compared to the SoN departmental average for all clinical and theory courses. Candidates applying for tenure and/or promotion are required to submit online Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE) system reports for all their assigned courses each semester.
2. Both quantitative data and qualitative comments are taken into consideration and reviewed for longitudinal trend data. It is expected that mean scores on the survey instrument will be predominantly between 1.0 and 1.99, where 1 is the highest and 5 is the lowest. A consistent pattern of scores of 2.0 or greater suggests a need for improvement. Qualitative comments that describe consistently high levels of student engagement and learning, course and instructional organization, and attributes that help to support student success reflect excellence in teaching. It is recognized that variables such as class size, subject matter, and GE versus major may affect overall scores. These factors will be taken into consideration when quantitative scores are reviewed and are expected to be explained in the candidate's self-statement. The candidate is expected to document and discuss how these factors may have impacted the SETE results, and, if applicable, discuss plans to improve areas of teaching related to the SETE items with scores that need improvement. Qualitative comments from students are analyzed for themes and recurring issues in the candidate's teaching and used to provide context for a particular quantitative score.
3. Peer observations of teaching effectiveness (at least once per year), including currency in the field, are also considered. Hence, teaching effectiveness is assessed through multiple sources of evaluative data. Syllabi and other course materials must be pertinent, sufficient, and provide clear expectations of the student.
4. When presenting the summary of the numerical ratings, candidates should use the following format:

NUMBER AND NAME OF CLASS AND SEMESTER TAUGHT	SCHO OL MEA N	COURS E - BAS ED MEA N	YOUR OVER ALL MEAN	NUM BER OF EVALUAT IONS	NUMBE R OF ENROLLM ENT
	SoN Data	SoN Data	Faculty Data	Faculty Data	SoN Data

A. The assessment of teaching performance and effectiveness will be based on evidence that is systematically collected from students and academic colleagues. To maintain academic currency, a candidate must:

1. Attend at least one yearly clinical, professional, educational workshop, conference, and/or evidence-based seminar that supports and contributes to teaching assignments and enhances currency in the candidate's specialty area, such that classes retain current content and student success is enhanced.
2. Conduct a yearly review and update(s) of course content by integrating evidence-based literature that are reflected in course syllabi and other teaching materials.

B. The commitment to high academic standards by a candidate is demonstrated by:

1. Applying accreditation standards to individualized course requirements that include the integration of the SFSU nursing student learning outcomes (SLO) and conceptual framework into course syllabi;
2. Ensuring that course content and SLO, assignments, planned learning experiences, and methods of evaluation are internally consistent across the program;
3. Developing SLO congruent with the course syllabi, setting, and students; and
4. Facilitating and stimulating student learning and student success through relevant theoretical and clinical assignments.

C. The effectiveness of strategies and methods of instruction will be evaluated by:

1. The quality and impact based on the evidence submitted and supported by Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE).

Peer reviews of a course are initiated annually by tenured faculty appointed by the RTP Committee. Peer reviews of a given course will include a classroom observation as well as a review of all the course materials, syllabi, assignments, grading criteria, iLearn, etc. These course reviews provide complementary data source beyond the comments that students provide about an instructor, since quantitative evaluations can be influenced by class size, instructional demands, class modality, and grading policy. Comments from the peer observation of teaching reports are to be a part of a candidate's evaluation. It is the RTP Committee's responsibility to initiate additional peer-reviews if the faculty member is having difficulty or has achieved mean scores greater than 2.0 from the teaching evaluations.

2. The themes of written comments made by students collected as part of each course evaluation.

D. Other types of evidence to evaluate teaching effectiveness of a candidate include:

1. Clear student learning outcomes, evaluation methods, and grading policies in course syllabi;
2. Student engagement and active learning in various teaching activities;
3. Course assignments that promote critical thinking and ethical principles in nursing;
4. Periodic and timely feedback regarding test scores, presentations, clinical performance, and papers, which monitor and evaluate student performance;
5. Feedback and evidence from students such as student ratings and comments on an ongoing basis to evaluate instructional effectiveness and teaching strategies, which may include unsolicited written commentary made by students about successful pedagogy;
6. Weekly availability to students during in-person office hours, by phone, or by email to facilitate open communication and demonstrate a willingness to consult with students as indicated in qualitative SETE comments.

E. Guiding and motivating students is demonstrated by:

1. Selecting appropriate creative assignments and teaching strategies that help students integrate theory with practice.
2. Encouraging students to think critically and independently to achieve maximum potential.

F. Advising and meeting with students on a routine basis is demonstrated by:

1. Being available for in-person weekly office hours or communicating by email, phone calls, or by arranging individualized appointments in a timely matter.
2. Consulting with students regarding course planning, academic progression and failure, and career planning.
3. Collegially consulting with other faculty to support specific needs for student support to promote success.

G. Applying evaluative standards fairly and appropriately with respect to all students is demonstrated by:

1. Providing and stating clear grading criteria in course syllabi.
2. Ensuring valid, balanced, and reliable evaluation methods.
3. Assigning student grades in a timely and confidential manner according to criteria that are clearly stated in the course syllabi.

- H. Demonstrating pedagogical standards by exhibiting intellectual and academic integrity including clinical, professional competence by self-evaluation is demonstrated by:
1. Recognizing strengths and weaknesses in an academic role and seeking remediation from appropriate resources;
 2. Continuing professional development in a given area of theoretical and clinical expertise by attending continuing education conferences, maintaining currency in clinical skills and clinical practice areas, and participating in research and/or professional activities deemed appropriate;
 3. Participating in innovative curriculum and/or instructional content development that incorporates a variety of teaching techniques and strategies;
 4. Acknowledging constructive criticism from students and peers and developing an action plan to respond to and improve performance.
- I. Faculty teaching online or hybrid courses will be evaluated according to the SoN peer evaluation and SFSU & CFA policies and standards (Academic Senate RTP Policy).

Teaching Effectiveness for Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

Candidates should 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:

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

The RTP Committee will evaluate all of the above factors in its final determination of teaching performance.

II. PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AND GROWTH

The baseline expectation for meeting professional achievement and growth criteria for purposes of tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor is **three or more scholarly publications, at least one of which must be a publication in a peer-reviewed journal**. While the strongest evidence in meeting professional achievement and growth with regard to publications are peer-reviewed journal articles, other publications such as book chapters, books, textbooks, edited anthologies, clearinghouse papers, and edited special issues of journals (see below under “Books”) are also acceptable for the remaining publications.

Professional achievement and growth may also be exhibited in a variety of ways depending upon the interests and the focus of the tenured/tenure-track faculty member. These include research and publications, grant writing, workshops, presentations to professional societies, professional recognition, development of new areas of expertise, attainment of new professional licenses or certifications, as well as creative work and curricular and/or programmatic innovations. It is the candidate's responsibility to point out the significance and impact of all work in the area of professional achievement and growth. There are ways in which this can be achieved such as external reviews of scholarly work, letters from editors verifying the quality and likely impact of the work, and/or the SoN RTP Committee's rigorous assessment of such achievements.

In all cases, criteria for evaluating professional achievement and growth will consider a range of factors, such as quality, impact, merit, advancement of the field, advocacy, pedagogical innovation, diverse methodologies, impact on clinical practice, and/or contribution to the profession of nursing. The WPAF narrative and all related documents should include an evaluative summation of the candidate's scholarship.

A) **Journal Articles.** Published peer-reviewed journal articles focusing on issues related to the candidate's substantive field of study are expected. Authorship may be single or shared, with the candidate playing a lead role in the work if the work is co-authored. Because collaborative research and publications are increasingly the norm in academia, faculty members are encouraged to collaborate and develop peer research networks. When an article has multiple authors, candidates must indicate their individual contribution to the research design, implementation of the project, data collection, data evaluation, and/or writing of the article. Solicited letters from co-authors are welcomed, particularly those that describe the candidate's contribution to co-authored publications, but assessments of the quality of the candidate's scholarship by co-authors is inappropriate and is highly discouraged. It is anticipated that the candidate will choose appropriate outlets for their work, such as reputable and good quality journals.

B) **Books.** Books and book chapters will be given consideration if published by a university or comparable press. The following works may be considered:

1. Editing a book for publication by a university or comparable press;
2. Producing a scholarly manuscript under book contract;
3. Producing a published textbook that has undergone a documented review process that is available to the RTP committee;
4. Publishing work in an edited volume published by a university or comparable press;
5. Editing a special or thematic issue of a scholarly peer-reviewed journal;
6. Publishing book chapters in peer- or editor-reviewed volumes.

C) **Grants.** The SoN views grants as a means to an end and not the end itself. Candidates are encouraged to develop intramural and extramural sources of funding to the extent that such grants are needed to advance a tenured/tenure-track faculty member's scholarship, his/her/their professional agenda, or the well-being of the community. Funding is

expected to result in relevant publications or, when appropriate, contributions to the professional community or the public at large. Grant proposals that are submitted and under review but are currently without funding should be included in the WPAF. Candidates may also include unfunded grant efforts in their WPAF as an indication of professional effort.

D) ***Curricular and/or programmatic innovation.*** This can include, but is not limited to, the development or advancement of SoN curriculum, creation of simulation scenarios, public health programs, national and international health care educational materials, and global initiatives with associated outcomes.

E) ***Presentations.*** It is anticipated that the candidate does 2-5 presentations at professional conferences during the tenure and/or promotion review period. These include keynote addresses, invited lectures, symposia, papers, roundtables, and posters at professional meetings. Presentations at international, national, regional and local associations appropriate to the candidate's specialty area are seen as especially noteworthy when the candidate can show that the work has been peer-reviewed. Serving as a keynote or invited speaker is given special consideration. In the event of joint presentations, the candidate should describe her/his/their role in both preparation and the actual presentation.

F) ***Professional Recognition.*** Achieving a new professional certification or license is noteworthy and faculty are encouraged to stay current in the profession. Recognition in the form of honors given by professional societies and becoming a diplomat in the profession are viewed as important.

Professional Achievement and Growth for Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

The usual expectation for establishing significance in professional achievement and growth for the purpose of promotion to Full Professor is expanding professional growth in the discipline and the ability to clearly illustrate the candidate's substantial impact, leadership, and professional recognition within the discipline. The evaluation of the candidate's impact is described in next paragraph.

The candidates are expected to have additional peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, or books in addition to the works counting toward tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. In addition, the research agenda for candidates for Full Professor should illustrate an advancement in rigor, quality, and productivity of research, applied skills and applications, and contribution to the discipline as listed below (see #a-e). The impact of the work could be evidenced by such measures as cohesion of one's scholarly program, recognition by colleagues, the extent to which a candidate's work is cited, whether the candidate's work has been cited outside of academia, through the evaluation of respected scholars in the field (e.g., external reviews), or through the volume of work published in respected academic outlets. In addition to meeting the expectations discussed for promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to Full Professor includes the following expectations:

- a. The candidate will demonstrate quality and productivity of scholarship activity, and an established research agenda related to the field of nursing scholarship.
- b. The candidate will have at least three (with at least two single- or lead-authored) additional **peer reviewed published scholarly journal articles** since promotion to Associate Professor.
- c. Other forms of scholarship activities, such as published monographs, a book or books, book chapters, or externally funded grants or curricular innovations, may be also be considered for promotion. However, three or more peer-reviewed published journal articles are the baseline expectation.
- d. The candidate may provide evidence of continued efforts to attain external funding.
- e. The candidate should provide evidence of additional peer-reviewed presentations in the area of scholarly interest at professional conferences or meetings (at least five presentations since promotion to Associate Professor). It is recommended that, on average, the candidate presents work at one professional conference per year.

III. CONTRIBUTIONS TO CAMPUS AND COMMUNITY

A. Contributions to the Campus

1. Participate in at least two School of Nursing Committees and Full Faculty Committee each academic year.
2. Participate in at least two college (CHSS) and/or university wide, committees or task forces during the probationary period.
3. Assume a leadership role, such as chairing a major committee or being a lead person on an accreditation report or special project(s) at the School, College, or University level during the probationary period. The accomplishments of the person and/or the committee (during their leadership time) should be outlined and supported by a letter from a fellow committee member documenting the quality and impact of service.
4. Regularly participate in SoN activities (i.e., pinning, career days, graduation ceremonies, campus activities representing the SoN, retreats, workshops, student recruitment activities, faculty interviews).
5. Demonstrate behaviors in the community and campus that include:
 - a. Attends and participates in department/campus wide meetings regularly and punctually as a collegial and contributing team player.
 - b. Volunteers for tasks with excellent follow through and completing work in a timely fashion.
 - c. Demonstrates sharing of ideas, listening actively, confronting conflict constructively, engaging in analysis and problem

- solving, and demonstrating academic and professional respect for colleagues through collegial and effective communication skills.
- d. Serves as a mentor to new tenure-track faculty and clinical faculty.
 - e. Meets and contributes to the long-term success, goals, and teaching needs of the school.
6. Service to the college and campus community, such as participation on *ad hoc* search committees or specific short-term projects, although not required, will add value to the candidate's WPAF.
 7. Candidates must provide evidence of the outcomes, as well as their specific contributions, for all of the service activities, in addition to documenting the quality and impact of the contributions by including letters (e.g., from committee chairs) in the WPAF.

B. Contributions to the Community

1. Serves as a liaison between the University and the community at the local, regional, national, and international level by demonstrating collegiality and engagement in different types of activities. Particularly, participation is expected to include two or more of the following:
 - a. Provides or coordinates service to healthcare organizations in areas of academic or clinical expertise.
 - b. Participates consistently in activities such as journal editing, manuscript peer review, or publication of health education materials.
 - c. Participates as a consultant to a variety of health care organizations such as hospitals, clinics, community centers, or professional societies.
 - d. Contributes significantly to at least one professional organization during the probationary period (e.g., leadership in a professional organization).
2. Faculty must provide evidence of the outcomes, as well as their specific contributions, for all of the service activities, in addition to documenting the quality and impact of the contributions by including letters (e.g., from committee chairs, heads of organizations) in the WPAF.

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

The candidate for full professor must demonstrate a consistent and sustained pattern of exemplary leadership, collegiality, and professional contributions within the school. Their professional contribution must include those to the campus and the community.

Examples of these contributions may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Chairs or is a significant contributor in committees at various levels (university, college, school)
2. Mentors junior faculty and student leaders
3. Demonstrates leadership in writing accreditation reports, chairing a standing committee, and/or taking leadership in curricular evaluation and/or revision.
4. Serves as key officer in a professional organization, receives induction or recognition from a prestigious professional organization, or serves as a program planner of symposia and/or conference.
5. Serves as a board member or key organizer of a significant community service organization.
6. Demonstrates leadership in work of importance and relevance to the field (e.g., professional advisory boards, external reviews, editorial journal reviews).

The RTP committee expects the candidate to provide documentation to signify their contribution in this category, such as letters of acknowledgement and appointment, program planning information, and/or support from knowledgeable colleagues. The quality and impact of the candidate's contributions should be evident in letters of support.

Revisions by RTP committee and SoN Director approved: December 20, 2017; Revisions by RTP committee and SoN Director approved: December 18, 2018; Revisions by RTP committee and SoN Director approved: April 8, 2019; Revisions by RTP committee and SoN Director approved: May 29, 2019; Revisions by RTP committee and SoN Director approved: July 14, 2020; Approved by SON faculty: **July 14th, 2020**; Approved by Alvin Alvarez, CHSS Dean: August 28, 2020