Department of Psychology San Francisco State University

May 9, 2013

Approved by the Provost June 2013

Expectations for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

This document details the expectations for retention, tenure, and promotion in the Department of Psychology consistent with Academic Senate Policy #F11-241.

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 as described below.

The Department's RTP Committee conducts an annual review of probationary faculty. The Department Chair also conducts an annual review of probationary faculty. The purpose of the annual review is to determine if candidates for retention are making sufficient progress toward tenure. If the Committee decides a candidate is not making sufficient progress, but the situation is not sufficiently serious to recommend non-retention, the Committee and the Chair of the Department shall meet with the candidate to devise a plan for improving the candidate's performance to the level required for progress toward tenure. This plan shall be a written, individualized plan that lists specific expectations for improvement including measurable goals and a timeline.

The Department's criteria are intended to be broad enough to encompass faculty from the various sub-disciplines within the department and flexible enough to allow for different paths of professional growth. Indeed, given the diversity of our discipline, the Psychology Department not only expects its faculty to be following differing career lines and exhibiting varied profiles of achievement, but actively encourages diversity in career development.

Successful candidates for tenure or promotion must meet the standard of excellence normally expected of faculty. A candidate's activities while in his or her current rank are of primary relevance to promotion considerations. Candidates for promotion are advised that the Department has higher expectations for promotion to Professor than for promotion to Associate Professor.

Candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion are responsible for providing the Committee with an up-to-date Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) by the closing date as determined by the University RTP Deadline Calendar. The WPAF consists of a candidate's curriculum vitae, copies of all previous reviews and an indexed set of supplementary materials that represent the candidate's accomplishments in teaching effectiveness, professional achievement and growth, and contributions to campus and community. The candidate has primary responsibility for the correct, error-free and sequential organization of the WPAF. It is the responsibility of the departmental RTP

committee to ensure that the candidate is aware of and has access to information and consultation necessary to achieve a suitable WPAF.

Candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion should include in the WPAF a self-statement in each of the areas of teaching effectiveness, professional achievement and growth, and contributions to campus and community that summarizes the candidate's accomplishments. These statements should be no more than 750 words each. The WPAF should also include a list, by each semester under review, of time spent by WTUs (weighted teaching units). The candidate should account for 12 WTUs per semester (This assumes that tenure/tenure track faculty have already received 3 WTUs of the full time 15 WTUs for service to the department and university). The department RTP committee will provide the candidate with a template for this item.

A candidate for tenure or promotion should submit to the Committee the names of at least three potential people outside the university who can objectively and professionally evaluate the quality of the candidate's scholarly work. In addition to those named by the candidate, the Committee may solicit assessments from other professional and objective reviewers as well. It is the responsibility of the Committee to solicit all evaluations from outside reviewers. These evaluations and assessments will be included in the WPAF.

Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

Effective teaching is central to the Department's mission and achieving excellence in teaching is expected as the candidate progresses through retention, tenure and promotion. The Department regards teaching to be a professional activity amenable to improvement over time and expects candidates to engage in activities that enhance their effectiveness as instructors and mentors and to demonstrate this effectiveness in their teaching.

The WPAF should include a complete list of courses taught by semester identified by course number, name and level (undergraduate or graduate) for the period under review. The department RTP committee will provide the candidate a template for this item. The WPAF should also include sample teaching materials (e.g. syllabi, PowerPoint presentations, outlines/descriptions of assignments), which illustrate teaching quality, currency and innovative instructional methods.

The Committee will consider**,** but is not limited to**,** the criteria described below to evaluate a candidate's teaching effectiveness and efforts to improve student learning. (As examples of criteria not listed below, contributions to a wide range of the Department's curricular needs or levels of instruction, or outstanding fulfillment of a particular need, would receive favorable consideration.)

1. Classroom teaching. Candidates are expected to be excellent classroom teachers. Evaluation of a candidate's performance in this area will be based on the following:

a. **Student evaluations of teaching**. Probationary candidates will obtain student evaluations for all courses taught in the college using a standard College of Science and Engineering student evaluation of teaching effectiveness form. The Committee will review these student evaluations (quantitative and qualitative), including students' written comments on the survey, for indications about the quality of a candidate's classroom teaching. The candidate should prepare and include in their WPAF a summary table that includes all courses taught at SFSU in the period under review, enrollment, number of students that submitted evaluations, the corresponding numerical scores for all items, the overall mean score and the department means scores. The Committee will consider letters from students, either solicited or unsolicited, that address a candidate's teaching effectiveness. However, the Committee will not consider anonymous letters.

b. **Peer evaluations of teaching.** The Committee will review letters of evaluation and peer evaluation forms from Department faculty who have observed a candidate's classroom teaching and reviewed course materials including any online activities and materials. Probationary candidates will be evaluated at least once per year by faculty members of higher rank than the candidate's. The Committee will consider letters from other faculty members that address a candidate's teaching effectiveness, but will not consider anonymous letters.

2. Directing student involvement in teaching and research. Connecting students with current teaching and research can attract students to the discipline and enhances the learning experience of both graduate and undergraduate students. In addition, preparing students for a thesis, professional career, or doctoral program often requires study beyond the regular course offerings of the Department. Hence, candidates who chair theses or other culminating experiences, serve on these committees, sponsor teaching and research activities involving students or direct independent study make a significant contribution to our students' education. The Department places a high value on these types of activities.

3. Curricular innovations. The Committee may also consider curricular innovations, such as the development of original academic programs or courses, new and effective pedagogical approaches, and instructional applications of new technologies as evidence of a candidate's teaching effectiveness. Activities in this area may also be appropriate under professional achievement and growth or contributions to campus and community, depending on the nature of the activity.

4. Pedagogical development. The Department regards teaching as a professional activity and expects candidates to develop and grow professionally as teachers to improve their teaching effectiveness. Hence, the Committee may consider activities undertaken by candidates to develop and improve their pedagogical skills as evidence of improving their teaching effectiveness. Such activities might include, but are not limited to, participation in instructional development seminars and workshops, innovations in teaching techniques, and currency in instructional theory and research.

5. Presentations at professional conferences and workshops. Professional conferences and workshops often address topics in psychology education, or science education more generally, such as innovative teaching approaches, alternative assessment practices, and revisions to curricula to address new developments in the discipline. The Committee may consider publications and presentations at professional conferences related to psychology education as evidence of a candidate's professional development and effectiveness in teaching.

Evaluation of Professional Achievement and Growth

All candidates are expected to engage in scholarly activities that enhance their professional achievement and growth. Candidates are expected to develop and sustain an active research program that results in scholarly contributions to the field of Psychology. We expect strong evidence of professional achievement and growth appropriate to the candidate's professional area(s) of expertise. In psychology, professional achievement and growth may be exhibited in a variety of ways, including research, publications, clinics and workshops, presentations to professional societies, grant writing and grant submissions, development of new areas of expertise, attainment of new professional licenses or certification, creative work, curricular and/or programmatic innovation, professional application of expertise to external organizations. Faculty members may choose to collaborate with or provide evaluation of external organizations. These activities must actively involve the use of professional and academic expertise, the application of research to real world issues, and/or broad dissemination and communication of knowledge. The Committee will consider, but is not limited to, the criteria described below to evaluate a candidate's professional achievement and growth.

1. **Research and publications.** Candidates are expected to develop and sustain an active research program at San Francisco State University. The Committee considers papers published or accepted for publication in refereed research journals or books published in established presses, peer-reviewed book chapters, being the primary editor for volume(s) published in established presses, copyrights, patents, or the generation of other forms of intellectual property as strong evidence of a candidate's professional achievement and growth. Considered, but given less weight, will be publication of non-refereed papers, program evaluations and/or technical reports required for accreditation, and unpublished manuscripts. More weight will be given to papers based on research performed while a member of the San Francisco State University faculty. Papers with student coauthors will also be viewed as having more weight than those without. In the case of collaborative work, candidates should make clear their contribution to the research.

2. **Presentations at professional conferences and workshops.** The Committee will consider publications and presentations at professional conferences by the candidate and work presented with students at conferences as evidence of professional achievement and growth. The most significant activity within this area would be as an invited keynote speaker at a national or international symposium or conference; second in importance is the presentation of research papers at an annual meeting of a research society within the candidate's field which have been peer reviewed for acceptance; third in importance is

the presentation of research papers at local colloquia or invited seminars to other departments (on and off campus).

3. Grant funding. The department encourages candidates to actively apply for external grant funding of their professional endeavors. Since grant proposals for external funding of research are often very competitive and typically receive extensive outside professional review, successful external grant funding will be considered as strong evidence of a candidate's professional achievement and growth. All grants are viewed positively. However, more weight is given to grants on which the candidate is Principal Investigator. Positive reviewers' comments on an unfunded proposal may be taken into account. The RTP committee recognizes that writing and submitting grant applications can take an enormous amount of time and may also taken into account grant applications that are not funded. Candidates are also encouraged to take advantage of available internal grants as an avenue to pursue scholarship and external funding.

4. Curricular innovations. The Committee considers curricular innovations such as the development of original academic programs or courses, new and effective pedagogical approaches, or instructional applications of new technologies as evidence of a candidate's professional achievement and growth.

Evaluation of Contributions to Campus and Community

All candidates are expected to contribute to the functioning of the Department by serving on committees and advising students in a collegial manner. Candidates are expected to contribute to the functioning of the College of Science and Engineering, the University, the larger community and the profession through work on appropriate committees or other service. Candidates are expected to maintain high standards of collegiality and conform to the guidelines of professional conduct as established by the American Psychological Association. The Committee will consider, but is not limited to, the criteria described below to evaluate a candidate's particular contributions to campus and community.

1. Service to the profession. Candidates are expected to participate in professional organizations. The Committee may consider activities such as election to offices in professional organizations, service on editorial boards, program reviews and/or accrediting committees, organizing workshops, conferences, and symposia, reviewing manuscripts and grant proposals, and receiving honors or other recognition from professional societies, as evidence of a candidate's service to the profession.

2. Service to the University. The Committee considers activities such as administrative assignments, faculty governance, committee work, special advising assignments, program development, sponsorship of student organizations, or direction of non-instructional projects as evidence of a candidate's service to the University.

3. Service to the department. The Committee considers department service to be a regular and important part of faculty duties. Regular attendance at and service on

departmental committees is a requirement. Increasing activity, responsibility and leadership within the department is expected as candidates progress toward tenure and to promotion.

4. Service to the community. The Committee considers activities in which candidates use their professional expertise to enhance the relations between the community at large and the University or profession as evidence of a candidate's service to the community.