Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Criteria

Approved by the Provost September 2008

The general guidelines governing retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) decisions are outlined within Academic Senate policy #F06-241. In accordance with the aforementioned policy, a probationary faculty member shall normally be considered for promotion at the same time she/he is considered for tenure, and the review period shall normally consist of the evaluation of five full years of service after appointment/promotion to current rank); however, exceptions may apply with requisite support from the Department Chair and RTP committee chair.

http://www.sfsu.edu/~senate/documents/policies/F06-241.html

In addition, the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies has established specific RTP criteria within the University's three evaluative criteria domains (a) Teaching Effectiveness, (b) Professional Achievement and Growth, and (c) Contributions to Campus and Community.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Teaching Effectiveness is highly valued and shall be an important criterion in establishing eligibility for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. Candidates are required to demonstrate excellence in five criteria constituting teaching effectiveness: (a) currency and relevancy, (b) academic standards, (c) pedagogic standards, and (d) advising, guiding, and motivating. Examples of evidence for each criterion may include, but are not limited to the following:

A. **Currency and Relevancy**
   - ☐ Continuing study related to teaching assignment (CEUs, coursework, certificate)
   - ☐ Attending professional conferences/workshops related to teaching assignment
   - ☐ Committee, task force, and/or board participation related to teaching assignment
   - ☐ Keeping course materials current, relevant, and research based
   - ☐ Participating in course and curriculum revision and development

B. **Academic standards**
   - ☐ Clear and detailed learning outcomes, course requirements, and evaluation procedures
   - ☐ Internal consistency of learning outcomes, course requirements, and evaluation
   - ☐ Ensuring fair and appropriate applications of evaluative standards and grading policy
   - ☐ Student performance
   - ☐ Student ratings, comments, and/or letters

C. **Pedagogic standards**
   - ☐ Self-evaluation (midterm assessment, reflective exercises, teaching philosophy)
   - ☐ Course revisions based on evaluations
   - ☐ Participating in pedagogical seminars, workshops, and/or professional meetings
   - ☐ Using instructional innovations and evaluations of their effectiveness
   - ☐ Organizing a course using a variety of approaches in style and format

D. **Teaching**
   - ☐ Student evaluations
   - ☐ Colleague observations
   - ☐ Other communications related to teaching effectiveness (guest presentations)
   - ☐ Awards or other evidence of recognition in the area of teaching
   - ☐ One-on-one teaching (REC 699 - Independent Study)

E. **Advising, Guiding, and Motivating**
   - ☐ Descriptions of the nature and extent of advising activities
   - ☐ Student letters and interviews

- ☐ Effective supervision on thesis and/or special project advising
- ☐ Feedback given to students
- ☐ Office hours and willingness to confer with students

In addition to demonstrating excellence in the above five criteria, candidates are required to submit the following items to their Working Personnel Action File (WPAF):

A. Teaching Effectiveness Self-statement
The self-statement should: (a) address all five criteria of teaching effectiveness, (b) provide a context for understanding the candidate's evidence, (c) summarize and highlight accomplishments, and (d) not exceed the Academic Senate Policy recommendation of 750 words.

B. Teaching Philosophy
Recognizing that a teaching philosophy is a personal statement, the department recommends that the candidate consider the following elements based on Chism (1998): (a) conceptualization of learning, (b) conceptualization of teaching, (c) goals for students, (d) assessment and evaluation of teaching and learning, and (e) professional growth plan.

C. Course Information
The Department recommends that course information be collected for two courses each semester during the tenure and/or promotion period. The candidate should provide comparison data for both individual course and department information.

D. Student Evaluations
Faculty are required to be evaluated each semester by students in at least two classes typical of their teaching assignment. If evaluations have been collected from more than two classes, the candidate, together with the Chair of the Department RTP committee, will decide which class evaluations are to be added to the WPAF. Any disagreement in this regard will be resolved by the Department's RTP Committee as a whole.

The department is required to provide for full student participation and preserve the anonymity and confidentiality of student participants. Administration of student evaluations of instruction will take place for all faculty within the last three weeks of instruction. The Department Chair is responsible for ensuring that students, while completing the evaluations, are free from influence by the instructor and each other. The Department Chair shall ensure the integrity and security of the data. The instructor will not have access to or any knowledge of the contents of these evaluations until grades have been submitted to the Admissions and Records Office.

While it is expected that an average of 1.75 on a scale of 1 (highest) to 5 (lowest) from the quantitative evaluations will be maintained in major core courses taught and 2.0 on a scale of 1 (highest) to 5 (lowest) on general education and selected elective courses taught, it is also recognized that courses are very diverse. Subject matter, reasons for student enrollment, class size, type of instructional format, units, graduate/undergraduate levels, and other variables may affect overall scores. The department looks for consistency of strong ratings over a period of time. The Committee also studies those individual item markers that speak to areas where a faculty member is particularly strong or those places where the faculty member needs further mentoring and guidance.

E. Colleague Observations
Candidates are expected to have peer faculty observations of their teaching. The observer is required to be a tenured faculty and/or RTP member from with in the department and is to be mutually acceptable to the Department RTP Committee and the candidate. If mutual agreement cannot be reached on an observer from within the Department, then a mutually acceptable observer from outside the Department may be used.

The Chair of the RTP Committee is responsible for assigning a peer reviewer to observe at least one class session for each member of the unit each academic year. Over time, the RTP Chair should assign such evaluations to a variety of peer colleagues, so that there are evaluations of any individual faculty member by several different peers. The faculty member being evaluated is responsible for scheduling and preparing for that visit. Following the class visit, the peer reviewer, if possible, meets with the faculty member about the strengths of the class session and any concerns s/he may have had about it. The peer reviewer then writes a letter for the candidate's file addressing the following areas (see attached observation assessment): The candidate may submit a written response to the evaluation. The candidate may also request subsequent observations by the same or another observer during any given semester. Within two weeks of the observation, copies of all evaluations are to be signed by the candidate prior to being entered into the WPAF. All evaluations and candidates' comments are required to be entered into the WPAF.

These peer observations serve two functions: (a) to validate the comments that students provide about an instructor since quantitative evaluations can be influenced by course components (i.e., class size, instructional demands, class format, grading policy, etc.), and (b) an evaluation of the candidates teaching effectiveness based on the established five criteria.

The candidate being observed and evaluated is required to write a plan for improving their teaching effectiveness based on the feedback. Thus, the goal of the evaluation is both formative and summative. The faculty member who has been evaluated has all normal rights of rebuttal, should that be appropriate.

F. **Selected Course Material**
A representative sample of course material from two courses taught during the candidate's tenure and/or promotion period will be placed in the candidate's WPAF. Course material is required to include the following: (a) syllabi, (b) assignments, (c) presentations (PowerPoint slides, overheads, lecture notes, outlines), (d) evaluation instruments (exams, grading criteria, rubrics), (e) supplemental materials (case studies, class exercises, handouts, reading lists), and (f) sample work from students with feedback.

<div align="center">**WPAF Checklist**</div>

1. Teaching Effectiveness Summary (addressing all five criteria - not to exceed 750 words)
2. Teaching Philosophy
3. Course Information (two courses per semester)
    - ☐ Course number, title, units, and enrollment
    - ☐ Classification (graduate/undergraduate, major, elective, GE)
    - ☐ Format (activity, lecture, lab, seminar)
4. Student Evaluations (two courses per semester)
    - ☐ Individual course means and number of student evaluations
    - ☐ Cumulative course means and number of responses by semester and year
    - ☐ Cumulative Department means and number of responses by semester and year
5. Colleague Observations (one observation per academic year)
    - ☐ Colleague observations
    - ☐ Response to colleague observations
6. Selected Course Material (representative sample of two courses during review period)
    - ☐ Syllabi
    - ☐ Assignments
    - ☐ Presentations (PowerPoint slides, overheads, lecture notes, outline)
    - ☐ Evaluation instruments (exam, grading criteria, rubric)
    - ☐ Supplemental materials (case study, class exercise, handouts, reading list)
    - ☐ Sample work from students with feedback

PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AND GROWTH

Professional achievement and growth (PAG) is highly valued and shall be an important criterion in establishing eligibility for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. PAG will be defined as the active engagement in scholarship that results in contributions to the body of knowledge in the discipline and/or profession of recreation, parks, and tourism. Boyer (1991) identified four kinds of scholarship: (a) Discovery (traditional basic research contributing to the discipline and/or profession), (b) Integration (interdisciplinary research generating new insights and knowledge), (c) Application (research attempting to solve specific societal problems and/or benefiting society), and (d) Teaching (research contributing to the knowledge of pedagogy). More recently, the report of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities (1999) reinforced the importance of integration, application, and teaching scholarship in support of the engaged university. In embracing this broadened view of scholarship, the successful candidate need not excel in pursuing all categories of scholarship, but must offer a reasonable balance in the types of contributions made to the discipline and/or profession of recreation, parks, and tourism, and the University through PAG.

PAG is divided into four distinct criteria that evaluate the preparation and presentation of significant new data and/or critical interpretation of existing research: (a) publications, (b) presentations, (c) grants and sponsored projects, and (d) curricular and/or programmatic innovation. In addition, the Department also 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. Probationary faculty being reviewed for retention during years 2-5 are required to demonstrate significant progress toward achieving the evaluation criteria for Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

Note: The terms, "refereed," "juried," and "peer-reviewed" will be used synonymously throughout this document and will refer to the process of subjecting one's scholarly work to the scrutiny of experts within the manuscript's discipline. This process includes a critical evaluation of the writer's assumptions, methodology, results, and assessing the value of contribution made to the discipline and/or profession.

   Criteria for Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will require candidates to demonstrate an emerging research agenda and effectiveness in generating scholarship directed to the discipline and/or profession of recreation, parks, and tourism. Examples may include, but are not limited to publications in refereed professional journals, significant contribution in grants or research projects, juried presentations at state conferences, and development of new courses.

   Criteria for promotion to Professor will require candidates to demonstrate a significantly higher level of scholarship in the discipline. Examples may include but are not limited to publications in refereed academic journals, principal investigator in externally funded grants, juried presentations at national conferences, and significant curricular innovations. Years in which a candidate serves in an administrative position (e.g., department chair) would not be included in evaluating PAG.

The evaluation criteria of PAG require all faculty to have five publications during the candidate's review period. All five publications are required to be peer reviewed and contribute to the discipline and/or profession of recreation, parks, and tourism. In addition, one of the five publications is to be in the form of a refereed journal article for Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (two refereed journal articles for promotion to Professor). Examples of publications include: (a) whole or parts of a scholarly, edited, and/or textbook, (b) refereed academic or professional journal articles, (c) monograph and/or treatise, (d) paper published in official proceedings, (e) published applied scholarship (i.e., technical report, trade publication), (f) significant review and/or editing of a book and/or article, (g) significant public document and/or annual report, and (h) an accepted, but unpublished manuscript. Published writing may be co-authored and the position in authorship credits is not crucial. Such writing is expected to be of high quality as judged by peers.

In addition to maintaining the above publication record, all faculty are expected to attain one of, or combination of, the following three criteria during the faculty's review period.

A. **Presentations** - examples include: (a) refereed presentation of a scholarly paper to professional societies at the national, regional, and state level, (b) keynote address, (c) invited presentation, (d) workshop, clinic, and/or training seminar, and (e) panel discussant and/or session moderator. *Weight will be given to peer reviewed, refereed, and/or juried paper presentations that contribute significantly to the discipline and/or profession of recreation, parks, and tourism.*

- Tenure and promotion to Associate: 6 presentations (3 juried)
- Promotion to Professor: 9 presentations (6 juried)

B. **Grants and research projects** - examples include: (a) external grant funding, (b) sponsored research projects, (c) program evaluation and/or needs assessment, and (d) active participation and/or consultant to other's research. *Weight will be given to externally funded sponsored grants and/or research projects that contribute to the discipline and/or profession of recreation, parks, and tourism.*

- Tenure and promotion to Associate: 1 sponsored grant or research project
- Promotion to Professor: 2 sponsored grants or research projects

C. **Curricular and/or Programmatic Innovations** - examples include: (a) development of original academic programs, (b) new courses and/or course content, (c) disciplinary and/or pedagogical approaches, (d) applications of technology, and (e) development of new areas of instructional expertise. *Weight will be given for those innovations that are adopted by the discipline and/or profession of recreation, parks, and tourism.*

- Tenure and promotion to Associate: 1 Curricular and/or programmatic innovation
- Promotion to Professor: 2 Curricular and/or programmatic innovations

Evidence
Evidence of PAG must be submitted for items to be considered. Evidence is required to include: (a) a copy of the scholarly work, (b) a letter of acceptance from the sponsoring or reviewing professional organization, and (c) an external, peer reviewed evaluation regarding the significance of the contribution and its impact on the discipline and/or profession.

Recommendation of tenure and/or promotion will focus on the quality of evidence and its impact to the discipline and/or profession. While a publication in a top-tiered academic journal within our discipline is of substantial quality, a peer-reviewed technical report written for a park agency and later adopted as policy would receive equal weight due to the publication's impact to the profession.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO CAMPUS AND COMMUNITY

Contributions to Campus and Community (CCC) is highly valued and shall be an important criterion in establishing eligibility for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. CCC will be defined as the active participation and significant contribution to campus and community.

For a faculty member to be successfully retained, tenured, and promoted at San Francisco State University -- within the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies -- the faculty must meet the recommended evaluation criteria of service at both the University and Community levels.

The requirements for retention, Tenure, and/or promotion to Associate Professor expect all faculty to actively participate and contribute at the Department and College level. In addition to the above expectation, faculty are required to provide evidence of two contributions to campus at the University level

that demonstrate active participation and contribution that impact the campus. Faculty are also required to provide evidence of two contributions to the community that demonstrate active participation and contribution that the community during the candidate's review period. Promotion to Professor requires evidence of an additional contribution (three) at the University and community level.

Contributions to Campus

These may include, but are not limited to the following: administrative assignments, faculty governance, committee work at the department, college, and/or university level, special advising assignments (e.g., general education advising, liberal studies advising, special major advising, etc.), program development, sponsorship of student organizations, and direction of non-instructional activities and projects.

A. Department
- ☐ Active participation on department committees
- ☐ Directing department-wide programs
- ☐ Special advising role during academic year
- ☐ Leadership in implementing course curriculum development/revisions

C. College
- ☐ Active participation on College committees and/or councils
- ☐ Directing College-wide programs
- ☐ Collaborate on university initiative projects (e.g.., Lake Merced Task Force)
- ☐ Department representative on a College task force

D. University
- ☐ Active participation on University committees and/or councils
- ☐ Directing University-wide programs
- ☐ Active participation on interdisciplinary research or creative projects
- ☐ Significant contribution as a faculty advisor to an active student association

Evidence

Submissions to the faculty's WPAF are required to have evidence in the form of written documentation for the following: (a) active participation, and (b) contribution that positively impact the campus

Service Contribution to Community

Individuals may serve the University using their professional expertise to provide service at the community, city, state, and/or national level. Such service must involve active participation at a level that makes a significant contribution to community activities or projects, promotes community change and social justice, and that enhances relations between the University and the community. Emphasis should be placed on those community activities in which the academic expertise of the faculty member is directly applied. Descriptions of community service and faculty member's level of involvement shall be submitted to the department peer review committee.
- ☐ Consulting with community, state, and/or national organizations within field of academic expertise
- ☐ Participation or collaboration with community agency on grant development or creative project
- ☐ Expert witness testimony of grants or community project outcomes
- ☐ Membership, offices held, and activities in professional societies that demonstrate significant contributions to the field
- ☐ Active involvement on boards of directors, task forces, advisory committees, steering committees where professional expertise makes a significant contribution
- ☐ Active involvement in conference/seminar/workshop development committees
- ☐ Collaborative relationships with community groups, public agencies as partners where community knowledge is brought to the classroom and academic skill sets to the community
- ☐ Lectures to the general public or community organizations on areas of expertise
- ☐ Supplying background expertise on topical news to media
- ☐ Documents responses to requests for information and expert advice from the general public, corporations, government agencies
- ☐ Writing or editing documents for community agencies or government organizations

D Develops service-learning opportunities for student professional development and to assist the cornrnunity

Evidence

Submissions to the faculty's WPAF are required to have evidence in the forrn of written documentation for the following: (a) active participation, and (b) contribution that positively irnpact the carnpus