School of Public Affairs and Civic Engagement (PACE)
Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria
Approved by Faculty Affairs, Spring 2022

PREAMBLE/BACKGROUND
This document provides guidelines for retention, tenure, and promotion in PACE. These guidelines are designed to establish clear expectations for retention, tenure, and promotion for tenure-track/tenured faculty members in PACE 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, (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 the University."

This policy was first developed in 2015 after a decision by PACE faculty to have one set of criteria across all programs, rather than to continue with the legacy policies from our different programs. It was further revised, with wide discussion and participation across the School of PACE, starting in Spring 2020 after the University shut down due to the COVID-19 pandemic, with support provided by Senate Policy #S20-287: Temporary Modification of Academic Senate Policy #S20-241: Policy Resolution on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion.

Teaching in PACE is organized to deliver the following degree programs:
- B.A. in Environmental Studies,
- B.S. in Environmental Studies,
- B.A. in Urban Studies and Planning, Minor in Urban Studies and Planning,
- M.A. in Gerontology, and
- Master of Public Administration.

Faculty research and scholarship in PACE is interdisciplinary and applied in the fields aligned with the degree programs of Environmental Studies, Urban Studies and Planning, Gerontology, and Public Administration.

DOCUMENTATION FOR RTP EVALUATION
Academic Senate Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy #S19-241 encourages faculty to write an evaluative and reflective self-statement introducing and providing context for the candidate's materials contained in the three areas of RTP review. Academic Senate Policy #S19-241 recommends each statement for teaching, professional development, and service not exceed 750 words.

The candidate is responsible for providing the following documentation to the department's Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee:

- an up-to-date *Curriculum Vitae* using the standard faculty CV format (for the *standard faculty CV template*, please see the website for Faculty Affairs,
- supplementary materials along with an index (including copies of course materials and evaluations, publications and funded grants, evidence of professional service), and
- a statement of the candidate's activities from his/her/their perspective that includes reflective and self-evaluative components related to the significance of these activities.

Further guidelines regarding the preparation of these documents for the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) can be found on the Faculty Affairs website.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES
These general principles apply through the entire tenure and promotion process:

- PACE is a collegial body that adheres to the values of excellence and professionalism in teaching, scholarship, and service.
- Probationary faculty shall generally 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; they should consult with the AVP of Faculty Affairs, Dean of the College of Health & Social Sciences, Director of PACE, and the Chair of the PACE RTP committee in making this determination.
- Candidates for promotion to Professor are judged according to more rigorous standards; they are expected to show higher levels of professional, pedagogical and/or service growth and development after achieving the rank of Associate Professor and tenure.
- Professional growth and development can be demonstrated by the candidate 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.
- In times of significant disruptions recognized and officially declared by the Provost or President (including, but not limited to pandemics, earthquakes and wildfires, economic recessions, and City-wide closures of daycares and K-12 schools), which substantially disrupt the normal workload of a faculty member, the RTP Committee will consider the extent of the crisis in preparing their reviews. As different crises would affect candidates' teaching, research agendas, or service in different ways, candidates are responsible for clearly outlining the impact of the crisis on their teaching, research, or service due to the crisis and, if also a factor, the time having to be spent on teaching rather than on professional achievement and growth and/or contributions to campus and community.
- After a new revision of the PACE RTP policy has been approved, faculty entering employment within the University under the old policy have the choice as to which policy they follow.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS
Academic Senate Retention, Tenure and Promotion Policy #S19-241 states: "For teaching faculty, excellence in teaching is required."

Like all faculty, probationary and tenured faculty are expected to be effective teachers in the classroom. This standard means that faculty engage their students and provide an appropriate mixture of both theory and practice. Given the fast pace of the changes within PACE disciplines, it is important to ensure that course structure and materials in the classroom are frequently updated.

PACE values adaptive teaching. Adaptive teaching requires faculty members to actively rethink, restructure, and revise their courses, and retrain according to a different way of teaching in response to student needs, or to a crisis. We recognize that switching to teaching in a different modality, as required in a crisis (for example, having to change to remote teaching after teaching mainly face-to-face), requires time for faculty to develop skills; excellence in teaching during transition semesters after a crisis may look different from pre-crisis times. We recognize that adaptive teaching in such times is a self-reflective process, whereby teachers are having discussions and are actively rethinking, restructuring, and revising their courses. Examples of such adaptations could include: strategic adjustments to course syllabi, assignments, and expectations to ensure the continued achievement of student learning outcomes under a new modality; conversations about expectations regarding technology; recognition of differences/vulnerabilities among students in different environments; deliberation around activities to be incorporated into either asynchronous or synchronous environments; adjustments of the content in courses to be taught to students who might be without appropriate technology and without using excessive amounts of mobile data; taking part in various training opportunities; revising assignments/syllabus/course structure for a new modality; seeking advice from colleagues and experts about adjustments; and, shifting advising forms or modalities. Evidence or self-reflection on these types of content- and process-based changes are valued and recognized as essential efforts to achieve exceptional teaching. We value process, self-reflection, and qualitative comments.

To be recommended for tenure and promotion in PACE, the candidate's overall pattern of teaching evaluations is expected to indicate they are effective teachers. To measure teaching effectiveness in the PACE classroom, the following tools and methods are appropriate[1]:

Review of course materials: Course materials are required in the WPAF and must include the most recent syllabus for each course taught. Other information and materials may consist of student learning outcomes, assessment rubrics, and statements of the pedagogical approach that incorporate adaptive teaching tools and strategies. Materials developed for the

---

[1] **Self-reflection narratives.** Using the format of a self-reflection narrative, faculty can choose to include a discussion of what has worked and not worked, their attempts at innovation, application of different theories of learning and high impact teaching practices, different course structures and teaching techniques, efforts to build community in the classroom, and in-depth discussion of qualitative student evaluations.
Documentation of efforts to improve teaching effectiveness and/or respond to changes to the modality of teaching. Faculty may choose to include a discussion of the pedagogical workshops in which they have participated within and beyond SFSU aimed at improving teaching and/or responding to changes in teaching modality (e.g., resilient course design, trauma-informed teaching, humanizing courses online).

course, such as PowerPoint presentations/lectures, bibliographies, guidebooks, film lists, lab exercises, assignments, examinations, the structure of online courses, videos or other media developed for use in a class, and copies of online course materials could also be included. Course materials contained in the WPAF should demonstrate the candidate's efforts to provide additional resources and clarify expectations for students.

Student evaluations of teaching: Quantitative and qualitative student evaluations of teaching effectiveness (SETEs) for all courses taught are required. Candidates are expected to also provide a summary table of courses taught, SETE ratings earned, number of students enrolled in each class, number of responses, and program mean scores for each semester. An example of the format that could be used when presenting the summary of the numerical ratings is presented in Appendix A.

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, should 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 " highly effective,"
>   1.50-1.99 will be considered "effective,"
>   >=2 will be considered as "needs improvement."

In general, scores better than 2.0 or comparable or better (lower) than the program mean score are considered indicators of effective teaching. Additionally, faculty scores may also be compared to the average scores of their peers within a degree program.

PACE takes a holistic approach to assessing teaching effectiveness and considers several indicators of teaching effectiveness, such as syllabi and other course materials, pedagogical innovations, and peer evaluations of teaching, where the option has been taken by the candidate. The School acknowledges that SETEs are an imperfect evaluation tool that can disadvantage members of certain demographic categories, in particular; and for that reason, the RTP committee will assess all faculty based on several factors, not just on SETE scores. SETE scores might also be greater (i.e., worse) in times of crisis, when faculty are having to move quickly to new modes of instruction (as during the COVID-19 crisis), when they are teaching courses that are normatively more challenging or when they are trying curricular innovations.

Scores should be judged in the context of the subject matter, recognizing that some subjects – especially required and quantitative ones (e.g., research) – can sometimes result in scores greater (worse) than others. Scores should also be judged in the context of any required shifts due to documented extensive illness. In addition, the size and nature of the class will be considered. Academic Technology generates the mean scores for each Program by degree program per semester (e.g., the average of all ENVS, GRN, PA, or USP courses); these will be used for comparative purposes.

Peer teaching evaluations. Peer teaching evaluations are intended as a collegial and helpful tool for instructors to document their pedagogical development at San Francisco State and make improvements as needed. They are useful for assessing the level of an instructor's presentation, organization, and ability to generate student engagement. Peer teaching evaluations are not required in PACE; however, tenure-track faculty are strongly encouraged to seek peer evaluation at least once per academic year.

The Director of the School will schedule classroom evaluations for faculty who request a peer teaching evaluation, which shall consist of class (virtual/ remote delivery or face-to-face) observations and review of course materials. Observations should be arranged in the first month of the semester, and all faculty members should receive at least two weeks' notice between the announcement of observation and the observation itself. Evaluators are expected to stay for the entire class period in courses that meet twice or thrice a week, and at least half of the class period for courses that meet once a week).

Peer evaluation can include observation of face-to-face or remote delivery class sessions and the review of the syllabus, online instructional management system (i.e., iLearn), structure and implementation of Internet-based courses, assignments, reading materials, media created for the course, and other course activities. To facilitate peer evaluations, the observed instructor and reviewer should discuss the course aims, content, assignments, and context of the session to be observed before the observation date. The observed instructor is expected to provide the reviewer with the course syllabus and any other relevant course material (including access to iLearn) before the observation date. Evaluations can take several forms depending on the structure of the course, i.e., class observation, computer lab activity, online module review, etc. However, the forms utilized should be specified by the reviewer on the evaluation form. Evaluators are encouraged to attach to the form a memorandum explaining the scores on the evaluation form and providing relevant additional qualitative feedback.

Advising and maintenance of office hours. 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 to be considered during the evaluation process include new course development, program assessment, 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.

Innovation and non-traditional teaching methods. 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. PACE considers online and remote 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 adversely affected by forays into non-traditional methods of teaching, and these methods should be discussed and considered in the candidate's narrative.

Requirements to make abrupt changes to a modality of teaching, such as in response to COVID-19 and other contingencies/crises, should be recognized as having an impact on teaching and course evaluations; all summative evaluations should take these consequences into account.

Teaching consistency and quality. All candidates seeking tenure and/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's evaluation of the above factors.

Teaching effectiveness and promotion from Associate Professor to Professor.
Candidates for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor are expected to demonstrate continued achievement and pedagogical growth through consistent or improved student evaluation of teaching effectiveness (SETE) scores, curriculum leadership roles, and other curriculum innovations. Candidates for promotion to Professor are also expected to continue to excel in their teaching. Further, they are expected to provide leadership in curricular innovation and development or to engage in mentoring activities to enhance the teaching activities of junior faculty.

PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AND GROWTH
PACE faculty have substantive knowledge and practical skills for problem-solving and capacity-building at local, state, regional, national, and international levels. PACE values applied scholarship responsive to real-world public policy problems or issues. PACE also recognizes that professional growth can be achieved in a variety of ways and will consider alternative methods of scholarship.

PACE expects candidates for tenure and promotion to publish on issues related to their fields and to maintain a robust research agenda. The School requires significant contributions that may be achieved by traditional refereed journal and scholarly book publications, applied research activities, and/or other research outputs such as monographs and technical reports, participation in conferences, and other professional activities. However, applied research output, monographs and technical reports, conference participation, and other professional activities shall not entirely take the place of traditional refereed journals and scholarly book publications.

PACE values both single-authored and co-authored publications; both types of publication count towards professional achievement and growth. Faculty members are encouraged to collaborate and develop peer research networks. Collaborative research and publication (especially projects including students) are valued; in these instances, candidates should elaborate on their role in these publications in the self-statement that accompanies their WPAF. Any publications co-authored with colleagues should describe the specific contributions of each co-author and provide a numerical estimate of the faculty member's contribution (e.g., description of the project followed by specification of ownership of the project or paper idea; equal or a percentage share of the data collection or analysis; leadership or a percentage share in writing the content, etc.). The WPAF should include letters from co-authors attesting to the

candidate's contribution to co-authored work when possible, but in no instance is it appropriate for a co-author to comment on the quality of the candidate's contribution. Such evaluative comments are more appropriately made by RTP Committee members and/or external reviewers. Co- or multi-authored publications are evaluated relative to the contribution of the faculty member; however, PACE recognizes that co- or multi-authored publications, especially when someone is the lead author, may sometimes require more work than a single-authored publication. When those instances are determined to be present, the reviewing Committee may elect to provide an estimate of the total number of publications, including portions of co-authored works.

External review. Candidates may, in consultation with the PACE RTP Committee, opt to have their scholarly outputs evaluated by external reviewers. External reviews may be useful for assessing the level of a candidate's professional achievement and growth. The number and selection of reviewers will be determined by the candidate in consultation with the PACE RTP Committee. Candidates must notify the RTP committee by the beginning of the spring semester prior to the year seeking tenure and promotion to facilitate the external review process.

The candidate, in consultation with the PACE RTP Committee, should identify several individuals who hold a terminal degree, have senior standing in the professional field of the candidate, are currently a faculty member at a comparable, or higher, institution, or from non-academic researchers at relevant institutions, have authentic expertise in a specific domain of research and scholarship of the candidate, and can make an unbiased and objective assessment of the candidate's research and scholarship.

External reviewers may be individuals who have served on panels with a faculty candidate, have been editors of a book or journal to which the candidate has submitted work, may have met the candidate while completing professional service, may be a scholar whose work the faculty candidate has used in their own work, or may have professionally engaged with one another through other, similar ways.

To ensure there is no conflict of interest, however, no external reviewer should be a candidate's:
- Dissertation director, dissertation committee member, or former professor
- Current or past post-doctoral mentor
- Current or former close collaborator (co-author, co-principal investigator, or partner on a research or grant project)
- Close friend or family member
- Close business associate
- Source of funding for the candidate's work
- Co-worker or potential co-worker (currently employed by the same institution, or has an arrangement for future employment or is negotiating for employment at the same institution)
- Employee, employer, trustee, or someone who has a financial interest in the outcome of the tenure or promotion case.

The candidate and the RTP committee are responsible for generating a list of names that meet these criteria. Still, the choice and solicitation of an external reviewer(s) is the

responsibility of the RTP committee. The Chair of the RTP committee will be responsible for contacting the external reviewers. Candidates should not contact potential external reviewers.

Quality of research. Opportunities for publication and forms of presentation of research vary within the fields represented in PACE, and we emphasize quality rather than quantity of work. Additionally, PACE values the contributions of critical and innovative scholarship. Since many in PACE conduct interdisciplinary and applied research and publish in interdisciplinary journals whose value is not fully recognized by impact factor methodologies, 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 the nature of the journals or publications in which a manuscript is published; the degree to which the work engages the community; the contributions of publications to advancing knowledge in the field; editorial board membership; impact on the community or professional field; and indicators of broad reach or recognition in the area of scholarship.

The general expectation for achieving promotion to Associate Professor and tenure is to have:
- A peer-reviewed publication of an original book-length manuscript in a scholarly or university press; or,
- Three peer-reviewed articles in respected journals or peer-reviewed book chapters of a candidate's substantive field (traditional or electronic) that illustrate the professional growth of the faculty candidate in contributing to the discipline and the development of a full research agenda.

A comparable combination of peer-reviewed articles and alternative methods of scholarship is acceptable. Comparable activities are acceptable if the candidate can 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.

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 connect to their more traditional scholarly activities. If a candidate is considering an alternative, comparable demonstration of professional achievement, s/he should consult early in the process with the Chair of the PACE RTP Committee and the Director of PACE.

Comparable scholarly activities which could be justified to be included as partial completion of the requirements include the following categories of publications, for which a faculty candidate may make a case for its inclusion as equivalent to a peer-reviewed article. In each case, the candidate is expected to state the exact nature of their role in the process of research, analysis, writing, and/or editing and disseminating the manuscript in question.

Subsequently, the RTP committee will evaluate the evidence and decide the equivalence of each item. Tenure and promotion cannot be granted solely based upon having publications in the following categories:

- Editing an anthology, books, or journal symposia, where the candidate has taken a leadership and scholarly role in shaping the outcome of the publication could count as one alternative publication, but only if the faculty member is able to justify the scholarly contribution of the efforts. Situations in which the candidate has contributed primarily editing activities, and not scholarly outputs, should be considered professional service.
- Authoring textbooks.
- Editor-reviewed or invited publications. The criteria to be considered are whether or not the process through which the author was asked to contribute had adequate rigor and whether or not the other contributing scholars are reputable scholars in the subfield.
- Authoring for other reputable outlets such as for governmental agencies (e.g., contracted technical reports), research centers, NGOs, professional publications, foundations, or non-peer-reviewed journals.
- White papers or working papers using rigorous research methods, completed and submitted grant proposals, community-engaged research reports, applied research reports, application of research through advisory capacity.

Attendance at professional conferences and engagement in the professional field is expected. However, PACE also supports the faculty's efforts to reduce their air travel because of the effects on climate change. This principle means that PACE will value candidate participation in regional and local conferences, as well as national and international conferences. Similarly, PACE recognizes the benefit of other types of conference participation and presentation (e.g., online conference).

Papers and posters given at conferences are not considered with the same weight as peer-reviewed publications. Still, 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. Presentations made, or webinars given, remotely or at online conferences, are also considered valid professional scholarly activities. Attendance at scholarly and professional conferences during each year under review are viewed as favorable in terms of enhancing the candidate's 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 or posters delivered at major regional, national, or international conferences, or at remotely delivered versions of those conferences.
- Invited presentations at specialized conferences, or remotely delivered versions of those conferences.
- Achieving recognition of professional accomplishment in the form of honors and appointments.
- Receipt of award of applied or basic research grants.

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, and other scholarly activities.

Evaluation in times of crisis or disruption. During times of declared crisis or disruption, the fact that workload in a particular area (teaching, research, or service) has been substantially altered (increased in teaching, delayed/constrained in research), due to factors outside a faculty member's direct control, should be considered during the tenure and promotion review process. This should include accepting a maximum of one research product at stages other than full acceptance, during the tenure and promotion review process. Also, in such cases, the School Director should include a statement in candidates' WPAF file on the nature of the crisis and its impacts on the University across teaching, professional achievement and growth, and service.

During such a declared crisis, it is expected that faculty will maintain the same level of work overall, but broader types of evidence will be incorporated into the RTP Committee review, such as the following:
- If a faculty member experiences delays in peer review, for example, the RTP Committee should review any evidence presented of the stage of the review process of a faculty candidate's manuscript and use that as evidence as faculty progress. This evidence could include screenshots of submission, reviewers' comments, plans for revising, documentation of responses to reviewers'/editors' comments, explanations of the publication's timeline of submission, manuscript revisions, IRB protocols such as interview protocols, and research narratives, etc.
- Documentation of the grant proposal process, including the work accomplished, the delays that have occurred, what the funder says, any delays in a final decision on the grant, should also be considered by the RTP Committee.
- If a conference is canceled, faculty can document the submission, the abstract and/or plan for the conference talk, and the cancellation email, and the RTP Committee will consider this evidence in their review.
- Faculty can include a self-narrative describing how they changed their balance of teaching, service, and professional achievement and growth.
- During the COVID-19 pandemic crisis, for instance, faculty are spending extraordinary amounts of time on their teaching, as opposed to the other areas of faculty responsibilities. These requirements are impacting faculty research, whether the research is field-based or could be done within the faculty member's own space. To accommodate the depth of this crisis and its impact upon faculty research, faculty experiencing impacts from COVID-19 can reduce the number of required publications by one accepted peer-reviewed publication. Faculty requesting such a reduction should include an explanation of what delays occurred and expected impacts, as well as show evidence of progress made in research such as unpublished manuscripts. (See Senate Policy #S20-287: Temporary Modification of Academic Senate Policy #S20-241: Policy Resolution on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion to support this.)

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 area of the field or across several different research areas), and the ability to illustrate their substantial impact upon the discipline clearly. Adequate development can be documented through recognition of scholarly achievements by other scholars, which should be noted and taken into account by PACE.

Further, the research agenda for candidates for Professor should illustrate more cohesion or focus, a maturation or deepening of faculty research or its application within their discipline. More rigorous contributions mean that in addition to the above requirements for advancement to Associate Professor and/or tenure, candidates are expected to have additional peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, or books. The impact of the work could be illustrated by the extent to which a candidate's work is cited, whether the candidate's work has been cited outside of academia, or through the volume of work published in respected academic outlets.

More specifically, candidates seeking promotion to Professor are expected to publish one scholarly book in a scholarly or university press or three additional peer-reviewed articles in major academic journals since achieving the designation of Associate Professor. PACE recognizes alternative modes and dissemination of scholarly activities and will consider arguments from a faculty candidate for substitutions of these alternate modes that could demonstrate the quality and impact of the publications. Candidates may argue for substitutions to this standard. The evaluation of the significance of the contribution hinges on the quality and impact of the publications.

As also stated above in the section for tenure and promotion to Associate, PACE values both single-authored and co-authored publications, both types of publication count towards professional achievement and growth. Faculty members are encouraged to collaborate and develop peer research networks (both intramural and extramural). Collaborative research and publication (including with students and alumni) are highly valued; in these instances, candidates should elaborate on their role in these publications in the self-statement that accompanies their WPAF. Any publications co-authored with colleagues should be given a numerical assessment (e.g., 50 percent out of 100 percent total participation) of the faculty member's contribution. The WPAF should include letters from co-authors attesting to the candidate's specific contribution to co-authored work when possible. Co- or multi-authored publications are evaluated relative to the contribution of the faculty member, though PACE recognizes that co- or multi-authored publications, especially when someone is the lead author, may sometimes require more work than a single-authored publication. When those instances are determined to be present, the reviewing Committee may elect to assign numerical value consistent with (but not greater than) a single-authored publication.

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

Contributions to Campus and Community
Given the applied nature of PACE fields, the faculty emphasizes community service as well as professional service and service to the department/school, program, college, and University.

Community service within one's field of academic expertise may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Service to federal, regional, state, or local governments and organizations
- Professional services and consultations rendered to community organizations, advocacy organizations, NGOs, and public or private sector agencies.
- Contributions to the media, including documentary films, newspapers, radio, and TV.
- Workshops and talks geared toward community groups or educational institutions.
- Significant 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 a discussant or session chair (may also be cross-listed 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
- Editing books or journal symposia, where the candidate has taken a leadership and scholarly role in shaping the outcome of the publication. In each case, the candidate should state the exact nature of their role in the process. Tenure and promotion cannot be granted solely based upon having editing books or symposia. Editing can also be considered professional achievement and growth. Under certain circumstances, these activities may be included in both areas (professional achievement and growth, and 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, chairing, or directing a department/school, program, center, or other division of the University (these are often compensated assignments that are often, but not always, part of one's primary assignment).
- Serving in a special advising role (for example, Major Advisor, Graduate Advisor).
- Serving on a departmental committee (for example, curriculum review, Hiring Committee).
- Mentoring faculty colleagues in WPAF preparation or technical skill development.
- Serving on an active College or University committee.
- Sponsoring and advising a student organization recognized by the University.
- Advising a student publication recognized by the University.
- Writing a grant to support department or student programs or facilities.

PACE expects that all faculty, including probationary, will complete service for their programs and the School. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor should also have served on college level and/or university-wide 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 (including Academic Senate or university-wide special groups) committees. Candidates for Professor are also expected to have moved into leadership roles in at least several of their service activities. The candidate should provide evaluative evidence of these contributions – with emphases on the quality and impact of their service -- 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, detailing specific contributions and quality and impact by the candidate 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 PACE faculty, November 3, 2014.
Revisions approved: May 20, 2015.
Revision approved: February 17, 2016.
Revisions approved: March 16, 2016.
Minor revisions by RTP committee: May 4, 2016
Approved by Provost: May 5, 2016

Revisions approved by PACE faculty: June 22, 2020.
Revisions approved by PACE faculty: November 3, 2020
Revisions approved by PACE faculty:

Appendix A: Format for Numerical Ratings

When presenting the summary of the numerical ratings, candidates should use the following format:

NUMBER AND NAME OF CLASS AND SEMESTER TAUGHT	SCHOOL MEAN	COURSE -BASED MEAN	YOUR OVERALL MEAN	NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS	NUMBER OF ENROLLMENT
	Department/ School of	Department/ School of	Faculty Data	Faculty Data	Department/ School of