Department of Recreation, Parks, Tourism & Holistic Health
(Approved by Faculty Affairs, effective Fall 2023)

The guidelines governing Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) decisions are outlined within the current Academic Senate policy (#S19-241). Additionally, faculty should refer to the CHSS faculty handbook "*Preparing and Evaluating Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Files*" while developing their narrative and other elements of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF).

The Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) process in the Department of Recreation, Parks, Tourism & Holistic Health (RTPHH) is intended to be both formative and summative. It is required that each candidate's RTP committee will schedule and meet with them at least once per fall and spring semester to set goals, develop strategies, identify resources, and review progress.   "Candidate" is defined as any faculty that is not tenured and/or does not have the rank of professor.

The period of review for promotion to associate and tenure includes all teaching at the university level, professional achievement and growth, and service completed since the candidate began in a tenure/tenure track position at San Francisco State University. Candidates who receive service credit as part of the hiring process will have their period of review for tenure altered per the credit received. The period of review for promotion to professor begins at the closure of the WPAF file for promotion to associate professor.

Although it is valued when the candidate's teaching, professional achievement and growth, and service should complement one another, there are several reasons why this might not necessarily be the case. A faculty member may be assigned to teach courses that are not in their area of research. Moreover, they may pursue a breadth of research areas. Furthermore, they may provide service to support shared governance or to meet some other relevant outcome. The candidate's teaching, professional achievement and growth, and service narratives should address this issue.

In addition to a CV, the guidelines below outline what evidence is required and what evidence may be included in the candidate's WPAF. Although the RTP committee may suggest that optional evidence should be included, it is the candidate's choice which optional evidence they include in their WPAF.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS (TE)
Teaching Effectiveness is an important criterion in establishing eligibility for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. Candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion to associate or full professor are all required to demonstrate that their teaching is current, relevant, and has high standards as decided by the department RTP committee.

1. **Criteria**
    a. **Currency**
        i. Course content should be based on current research, industry and discipline standards, practices, and/or perspectives. This does not imply that there is a monolithic standard for what knowledge and practices are

correct; however, it does suggest that faculty should be aware of the current knowledge and practices and help students evaluate this contemporary context. If course material is based on traditional perspectives (e.g., Chinese medicine), such knowledge should reflect both the traditions of these ancient perspectives as well as how they are contemporarily understood.

b. Relevancy

i. Course materials and teaching practices should be relevant to the discipline, profession, and university mission while maintaining academic freedom. This includes providing examples and teaching practices that help students connect the material to their lived experience. The content and practice of instruction should also reflect respect, equity and social justice. Moreover, the teaching should be meaningful for student success (e.g., academic success, professional preparation, overall quality of life).

c. High academic standards

i. Evaluation of student academic performance is an important part of teaching. The candidate's teaching must encourage students to develop over time. That includes encouraging students to step out of their area of comfort and challenging them to engage and perform at a higher standard. To facilitate this faculty must provide students clear learning outcomes, course requirements, examples of quality products based on grading rubrics, and evaluation procedures.

2. Evidence

a. WPAF <u>must</u> include

i. Teaching Effectiveness Narrative

1. Addresses all three areas of teaching effectiveness (current, relevant, and high academic standards)
2. Summarizes and highlights key accomplishments and areas of pedagogical development, such as trainings and consultations.
3. Analyzes and evaluates teaching effectiveness, including areas of strength as well as goals for continued development.
4. Briefly describes candidate's philosophy of teaching

ii. Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE)

1. A table summarizing SETE quantitative information
2. Faculty are expected to maintain a course section average of 2.0 or lower on a scale of 1 (best) to 5 (worst). However, the department recognizes that courses are diverse and several factors (e.g., subject matter, reasons for student enrollment, class size, type of instructional format, number of units, graduate/undergraduate levels, number of times taught) may affect overall SETE scores. The department examines the consistency of ratings over time. For scores above 2.0, the candidate must explain how those evaluations informed their teaching practice, strategies elected to improve scores and evidence of improvement over time, if present.
3. Summarize themes of qualitative information.

iii. Peer observations of teaching effectiveness

1. This is a formal evaluation of teaching effectiveness that includes a review of the candidate teaching one class session and course materials (e.g., syllabus, assignments, iLearn).
2. Candidates will be evaluated at least once per academic year for one course section. The peer reviewer must be of the same or

higher rank and be assigned by the RTP committee. It is recommended that all members of the RTP committee complete at least one teaching observation of the candidate during the period of review. In some cases, the RTP committee may recruit a reviewer outside of the RTP committee and/or outside of the department because of the expertise of that reviewer (e.g., subject, learning mode).

3. Below are standard procedures for peer observations; however, the committee and candidate may agree to modify the process.
   a. Candidates will provide at least three dates at the beginning of the semester when the candidate will be actively teaching the class. The committee will decide and communicate to the candidate which committee member (or alternate observer) will observe the class session on which date. In the case of a class taught asynchronously online, the observer will focus on one week or one section of the course.
   b. The candidate will provide the reviewer a copy of the syllabus, access to the learning management system (LMS; add reviewer to the course iLearn in the "student" role), and any other materials related to the class session.
   c. The reviewer will provide the candidate feedback about course content, organization, presentation, and course materials based on observed class session, syllabus, LMS, and any other relevant class materials. The review may include a summary, but will focus on an evaluation of the perceived strengths and areas for growth regarding the currency of material, academic standards, and relevance of the material being taught.
   d. In addition to the written evaluation, the reviewer will complete any forms required by the department, college or university.
   e. It is recommended that the reviewer meet (either face-to-face or using distance technology) with the candidate before the class session to focus the review and after the class session to discuss the evaluation.

iv. Syllabi
1. At least one syllabus from each unique course taught
2. Normally, the candidate provides the most recent syllabi; however, the candidate may choose to include more than one syllabus for a course and an explanation for how their teaching has changed over time (e.g., content, organization, teaching strategies).

b. Additional evidence that the candidate may choose to include in the WPAF
i. Evidence of teaching development (e.g., conferences/workshops, continuing study, trainings)
ii. Evidence of contributions to developing teaching standards and/or development (e.g., work on course and/or curriculum committee, teaching task force, CEETL)
iii. Evidence of supporting other faculty members' teaching excellence (e.g., leading faculty teaching development)
iv. Course materials
   1. Assignments

2. Presentations, lecture notes, outlines case studies, class exercises, handouts, reading lists, iLearn discussion forums)
3. Evaluation instruments (e.g., exams, grading criteria, rubrics for papers)
4. Sample student work with feedback provided to the student (with students' names redacted)
5. Other communications related to teaching effectiveness (e.g., invited speaker)
   v. Letters describing teaching effectiveness
      1. The candidate may include up to 3 letters related to their teaching effectiveness from CEETL or other representatives (student letters may not be solicited by the candidate).
  vi. Evidence of awards and other achievements
 vii. Other evidence that supports candidate's claims of teaching effectiveness

PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AND GROWTH (PAG)

Professional Achievement and Growth is divided into four distinct criteria: (a) *publications*, (b) *presentations*, (c) *funding*, and (d) *innovations*. Faculty are required to fulfill the criteria for *publications* and fulfill the criteria for one or the equivalent combination of the other criteria for *presentations*, *funding*, and/or *innovations* (e.g., 0% *presentations*, 50% *funding*, 50% *innovations*; or 33% in all three categories).

While a publication in a peer-reviewed academic journal is valued and essential, a peer-reviewed technical report written for an organization with a demonstrated impact (e.g., recommended policy change that was adopted, included in an organizational strategic/master plan) is also valued.

The department recognizes that promotion to professor requires more rigorous standards than promotion to associate professor. Therefore, separate criteria have been established in evaluating both quantity and quality of PAG for tenure and promotion to associate professor and promotion to professor.

Additionally, the department values engagement of students in PAG. Collaborating with students on scholarship is a high impact practice and will be valued in the review process. Similarly, interdisciplinary work is valued in the review process.

The term "peer-reviewed" is used throughout this section to refer to blind reviews made by peers about the author's assumptions, methodology, results, and its contribution to the discipline and/or profession.

1. **Criteria**
   a. **Publications**

	Associate Professor and/or Tenure	Professor
Total	5	6
(Peer-reviewed publications[1])	(4)	(5)

[1]Minimum number of total published or accepted publications that must be peer-reviewed. A minimum of 2 peer-reviewed publications required for promotion to Associate Professor and/or tenure must be peer-reviewed journal articles (3 for Professor).

      i. Publications may include journal articles, official conference proceedings, whole or parts of a scholarly or edited books, technical reports, trade publications, web or newspaper articles, published book reviews, monographs and/or treatise, strategic plans, annual reports, or other written work related to RPTHH.

      ii. Candidates must supply evidence of peer review for all publications other than peer-reviewed journal articles.

      iii. Promotion to professor requires that the candidate is the primary contributor for at least one peer-reviewed publication. The primary contributor may often be the first, last, or sole. author, as ordering conventions may differ. Therefore, the candidate must explain their level of contribution for each publication.

In addition to publications, the candidate <u>must achieve one, or a combination,</u> of the criteria for presentations, funding, and/or innovations.

    b. Presentations

	Associate Professor and/or Tenure	Professor
Total	6	7
(Peer-reviewed presentations)	(3)	(4)

      i. Peer-reviewed presentations and presentations with a demonstrated contribution to the discipline and/or profession of RPTHH (e.g., official letter by organizer or professional peers) are valued, but not required.

      ii. Presentations may include, but are not limited to, presentation of a scholarly paper to professional society at the local, regional, state, national and/or international level; serving as a panel discussant and/or session moderator; providing a keynote address or invited presentation; facilitating a workshop, clinic, or other training.

      iii. Candidates must supply evidence of peer review for all peer-reviewed presentations.

    c. Funding

	Associate Professor and/or Tenure	Professor
Total	1	2

      i. Externally funded grants and/or sponsored research projects (e.g., research contracts) that contribute to the discipline and/or profession of RPTHH are valued; however, internal funding is also valued and meets funding expectations.

      ii. Examples include university and external grants, contracts, or other sponsorship that supports PAG.

    d. Innovations

	Associate Professor and/or Tenure	Professor
Total	1	2

      i. It is sometimes difficult to differentiate what is considered an innovation to the curriculum and/or program versus good teaching or a contribution to the campus. Therefore, only new or significantly redesigned

curriculum, academic program, research institution, or pedagogical innovations may be considered in this category.

      ii. Examples include development of new or significantly revised academic programs, courses, disciplinary and/or pedagogical approaches, and applications of technology (e.g., changing the learning mode of a course).

2. Evidence

    a. WPAF <u>must</u> include

      i. PAG Narrative

         1. States which PAG criteria (e.g., publications and presentation, funding, and/or innovations) the candidate is choosing to be evaluated based on.

         2. Summarizes and highlights key accomplishments and areas of PAG development,

         3. Analyzes and evaluates PAG, including areas of strength, contributions to the field, impact on the profession, as well as goals for continued development.

      ii. Publications

         1. List and description of publications and contribution to each

         2. Copies of publications

         3. Evidence of the peer-review process (for peer-reviewed publications other than journals)

      iii. If including presentations

         1. Letter(s) of acceptance from editors or conference organizers

         2. Conference schedules

         3. Evidence of the peer-review process (for peer-reviewed presentations)

      iv. If including funding

         1. Letters supporting the receipt of or completion of funded PAG

      v. If including innovations

         1. Evidence of curricular innovations

      vi. **Additional evidence that the candidate may choose to include in the WPAF** Copies of presentation abstracts or slides

      vii. Evidence of unfunded grant and other applications for funding

      viii. Evidence of awards and other achievements

      ix. Letters evaluating the quality and impact of PAG contributions

         1. Candidates may choose to add external evaluations of PAG contributions, such letters are not required. Candidates who wish to include these letters should provide the names of three potential external reviewers to their RTP committee at least six months before the closing of the WPAF. Individuals not identified by the candidate will not be included as potential reviewers. The candidate should include a description of how they know this person and describe any potential conflicts of interest. Potential reviewers must be a faculty member at a university other than SF State, and preferably from a comparable university. External reviewers are to be at the same or a higher rank than the

candidate. The committee will conduct all communication with the external reviewers regarding the review including soliciting these letters from one or more of the proposed peer reviewers. The candidate will not be in contact with the reviewer from the point that they are suggested to the committee until the external review is submitted to the committee. Reviews from the same individuals that submitted a previous review are acceptable.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO CAMPUS AND COMMUNITY (CCC)

Contributions to Campus and Community are highly valued and are an important criterion in establishing eligibility for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. It is both critical for all faculty to participate in the shared governance of the university and to provide service outside of the institution. CCC will be determined by service contributions and impact. Service includes a range of contributions including serving with groups (e.g., committees, taskforces, boards) or formal individual contributions (e.g., analysis of data for relevant projects and organizations).

The department recognizes that promotion to professor requires more rigorous standards than promotion to associate professor. Therefore, separate criteria have been established in evaluating both quantity and quality of CCC for tenure and promotion to associate professor and promotion to professor. Serving for multiple terms on the same committee is equivalent to multiple contributions.

Summary of CCC Requirements

		Associate Professor and/or Tenure	Professor[1]
Department		Active Participation	
College	Total	1	2[2]
University	Total		1
External	Total	1	1

[1] Promotion to professor requires faculty to serve as a leader (e.g., chair, coordinator of an existing committee or new initiative) at the college, university, or community levels.
[2] Contributions at the university level can fulfill the requirements for college-level contributions for promotion and tenure.

    1. Criteria
        a. Department
            i. All faculty are expected to actively participate and contribute at the department level for promotion and tenure. This includes regularly attending and contributing to faculty meetings, participating in department events and activities, and potentially serving in department leadership positions (e.g., under/graduate coordinator, department committee chair).
        b. College
            i. Faculty are expected to make at least one contribution at the college level for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor.
            ii. Faculty are expected to make at least two contributions at the college level for promotion to professor.
        c. University
            i. Faculty are not expected to make university-level contributions for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor
            ii. Faculty are expected to make at least one university-level contribution for promotion to professor.

      d. External
- i. Faculty are expected to make at least one contribution to the community, or RPTHH profession or discipline for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor.
- ii. Faculty are expected to make at least one contribution to the community, or RPTHH profession or discipline for promotion to professor.

      e. Collegiality
- i. Faculty are expected to be collegial with students, faculty and staff in the department and across the campus. This includes evidence of supporting other faculty members' teaching, research, and service. It also means not engaging in bullying as described in the college collegiality policy.

2. Evidence

      a. WPAF <u>must include</u>
- i. CCC Narrative
  1. The CCC narrative must explain the candidate's service
  2. The narrative may describe the different themes of service, service contributions, candidate's level and type of involvement, level of remuneration (if applicable) and evaluate the impact of the candidate's roles (e.g., chair, primary author).
  3. The narrative will include an evaluation of the candidate's strengths and areas for growth
  4. Briefly describes candidate's CCC philosophy

      b. Additional evidence that the candidate may choose to include in the WPAF

Letters evaluating the role and impact of service contributions
- i. Evidence of awards and other achievements