

**San Francisco State University
Graduate College of Education
Department of Secondary Education
Criteria for Retention, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-tenure Reviews
Academic Senate Policy F19-241
(Approved by Faculty Affairs, effective Fall 2022)**

Department of Secondary Education Mission Statement

The faculty of the Department of Secondary Education in the Graduate College of Education embraces the rich and complex social and educational contexts in which we work. Our credential, graduate and undergraduate programs are designed to develop the understanding of the theory, subject-based pedagogy, facilitation and leadership skills our students will need to be effective and reflective practitioners in the work of teaching and learning in linguistically and culturally diverse school settings.

The Department of Secondary Education prepares reflective practitioners and leaders with strong grounding in equity and social justice, to work in our public schools to inspire all of their students to learn. Our faculty engages future and current single subject teachers in learning how their students learn their subject area content, and we work with our local schools to provide clinical opportunities for practicing research-based methods for teaching adolescents, who are growing up in our urban communities.

Given our mission, our tenure/tenure track faculty members must embrace and reflect through their own accomplishments a strong commitment to inclusive, culturally responsive teaching that recognizes and builds on the strengths of every student.

These RTP Guidelines were developed by the RTP committee of the Department of Secondary Education and approved by all tenure/tenure track faculty at all ranks and levels in [Spring 2021]. Probationary faculty, at the time of adoption, may opt to use the existing guidelines or to use this revision. The Guidelines are provided in order to create benchmarks or standards that candidates can use to evaluate their progress on all of the many different criteria that are provided in each of the policies. These Guidelines are to be used to give a greater degree of understanding, definition and agreed upon specificity to the criteria in the policies. Faculty are encouraged to meet with their RTP Chair for any needed clarifications.

The RTP Guidelines are intended to make the tenure/tenure track faculty evaluation process relevant to each SED tenure/tenure track faculty member and to allow each member the latitude to have that process reflect individually different interests, specialty areas and professional focus. Formative (process focused) and summative (decision focused) evaluation is an ongoing process in the Department for all tenure/tenure track faculty members regardless of rank or level. Input on this process is welcomed by the RTP committee.

Consideration for Early Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

In accordance with Academic Senate policy, a pre-tenure faculty member may request review for tenure in any pre-tenure year. Substantially accelerated progress in *all three areas* of evaluation is required for early tenure and promotion consideration. Should a candidate wish to be considered for early tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, they must discuss it with their Department chair, RTP chair and RTP committee.

Secondary Education Department Profile

The Department of Secondary Education prepares approximately 100-150 teachers each year to obtain Single Subject Credentials with encouragement to teach in the urban bay area. The department also offers a Master of Arts (<https://grad.sfsu.edu/content/college-education-programs>) program in Education with a concentration in Curriculum & Instruction. This program provides advanced preparation in research, pedagogy and pedagogical content knowledge, and curriculum. In addition, we offer a Minor in Education for undergraduates (<http://bulletin.sfsu.edu/colleges/education/minor-program/>) as well as teach and advise in the Graduate College of Education's Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership (<https://edd.sfsu.edu/>). **Beyond the required four-course** teaching load that faculty in the Graduate College of Education teach each semester, SED faculty members conduct research and collaborate with surrounding school districts. In addition, faculty who are subject area specialists coordinate with their subject area departments in other colleges across the SFSU campus.

Unique to the Graduate College of Education, it is the further responsibility of the faculty to continually review, maintain documentation, evaluate, revise and design program changes in our credential programs according to standards set by accrediting agencies, in particular the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC, <https://www.ctc.ca.gov/>).

The RTP Committee of the Department of Secondary Education will use the following criteria, based on SFSU retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review policies. Each university criterion as it pertains to the Department is described using examples and descriptions of the review process. These criteria, the advice of the SED RTP Committee, and college/university sponsored RTP workshops, are intended to support faculty members in presenting a clear picture of their work for their reviewers.

The criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion are:

1. Evidence of teaching effectiveness
2. Evidence of professional achievement and growth
3. Evidence of contributions to campus and community that reflects a collaborative spirit and engagement in different levels of activities.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Single subject teacher preparation for credentialing by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) is a primary focus of faculty teaching in the Department of Secondary Education. The Department also offers an MA in Education: Curriculum and Instruction, and most students in this program are classroom teachers. Therefore, the Teaching Effectiveness criterion is deemed especially important because our faculty are expected to model high-quality teaching with their students.

Given the importance of teaching performance within the department, faculty are expected to present evidence for each of the following sub-criterion, and the summary evaluation of teaching effectiveness by the RTP Committee will take into consideration evidence submitted for all sub-criteria:

- Scholarly level of instruction,
- Student evaluations,
- Peer evaluations,
- Professional pedagogy development and curriculum innovation,
- MA advising,
- General advising

The RTP Committee also will consider other types of evidence the faculty provides if a rationale is given for why it should be considered as evidence of Teaching Effectiveness.

Teaching Effectiveness Narrative

Faculty should provide a self-statement of teaching effectiveness that articulates the purposes, strengths, and areas of growth within their teaching. The narrative should provide a context for understanding the faculty member's accomplishments within the area of Teaching Effectiveness. The narrative should include brief statements of their philosophy of teaching, description of teaching methods, and a self-appraisal of their development and achievements in teaching, with particular attention given to the impact of their teaching on credential and masters candidates' learning. The narrative should also reflect a commitment to improving teaching. For faculty whose teaching responsibilities include supervision of student teachers or other instructional assignments, similar statements should be included for these areas.

Criteria and Evidence by Sub-categories

1. Scholarly Level of Instruction

Faculty are expected to maintain a scholarly level of instruction and demonstrate commitment to high academic and pedagogic standards.

Evidence:

- Written course requirements, which clearly describe expectations, in syllabi.
- Current research theories and practices described in syllabus, peer reviews, or sample course materials.
- Culturally responsive teaching methods reflected in course syllabi, student or peer reviews and sample materials.
- Use of formative assessment tools, clarity and transparency in evaluation methods in syllabi and course materials, and possibly reflected in student evaluations.
- Flexibility in addressing student concerns and comments and current events, based on peer review, student evaluation comments, and possibly description(s) of adjustments to classwork or assignments.

2. Student Evaluations

The faculty member's Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE, <https://sete.sfsu.edu/>) scores for all classes will be compared to the departmental average for

all class-based courses. Supervision score averages will be compared with the department average for supervision. Tenure-track candidates are required to submit the online Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE) system reports for all of their assigned courses each semester. Both quantitative data and qualitative comments are taken into consideration and reviewed for longitudinal trend data.

For quantitative data, it is expected that mean or median-- scores will be predominantly between 1.0 and 2.0, where 1 is the highest or best score and 5 is the lowest. A consistent pattern of scores of 2.0 or greater suggests a need for improvement.

Evidence of effective teaching includes qualitative comments that describe consistent high levels of student engagement and learning, course and instructional organization, and other attributes that help to support student success reflect excellence in teaching.

It is understood that there may be circumstances in which SETE scores fall outside the acceptable range. Faculty should reflect on this situation in their narrative by providing context for the anomaly. For instance, class size, subject matter, pedagogical experimentation, etc. may affect scores. Candidates should contextualize such situations in their narrative and describe their plans for addressing areas of concern. The department acknowledges that SETEs are an imperfect evaluation tool. In addition, candidates should note any more or less consistent improvement in SETE scores over time for the same course and provide evidence that they have made thoughtful attempts to respond to consistent qualitative criticism that was communicated in SETEs and peer reviews.

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

Name of class, number, semester	SED Mean & Median*	Course-based Mean & Median*	Your overall Mean & Median	Number of Evaluations	Number Enrolled
	(Dept Data)	(Dept. Data)	(Your Data)	(Your Data)	(Class Roster)

*If available

Faculty teaching online or hybrid courses (during pandemic years) will be evaluated according to the Department of Secondary Education peer evaluation and SFSU and CFA policies and standards (Academic Senate RTP Policy, <https://facaffairs.sfsu.edu/retention-tenure-and-promotion-policies-and-resources>).

3. Peer Evaluations

All faculty applying for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion will provide their assigned Peer Evaluations. The RTP Committee will assign peer reviews at least once per year for each tenure and tenure track faculty member. In such evaluations, members of the RTP Committee or other faculty members of equal or higher rank than the person evaluated will visit classes and provide

written comments concerning the quality of teaching. Specific areas of evaluation under Teaching Effectiveness will be:

- knowledge of subject;
- evidence of preparation and class organization;
- classroom atmosphere and student engagement;
- listening to students and flexibility in responding to comments and concerns;
- clarity of presentation;
- other evidence of teaching skills noted by peer reviewers.

4. Professional Pedagogy Development and Curriculum Innovation

Faculty should describe an average of one (or more) per year of the following activities in their narratives and provide evidence of their participation. More than one can be in the same category.

- Participation in Faculty Learning Communities, CEETL workshops and certificate programs, workshops and conferences of their professional organizations (especially those at which the faculty member makes a presentation)
- Co-teaching classes with other SED faculty or faculty from other departments
- Co-teaching in middle or high school classes
- Peer observations of colleagues
- Creation of new courses
- Significant improvement in existing courses
- Development of online course materials, digital presentations, videos and similar course materials that can be used by others.

5. General Student Advising

Faculty are expected to actively advise students in the programs in which they teach. In addition to supporting students' classroom teaching, advising includes advising students of the requirements and expectations of the Single Subject credential program and state mandated performance assessment along with information and advice about MA programs.

The department also recognizes the advising contributions of faculty who serve as second readers on MA field studies. Descriptions of general advising should be included in the narrative. Additional evidence can include:

- Comments in student evaluations.
- Letters/emails from students or cooperating teachers that attest to the nature, quality, and extent of advising activities.
- Letters/emails that attest to participation in department-wide academic advising activities beyond required participation in interviewing applicants to the credential programs.

- A list of the culminating experience projects for which faculty have served as second reader, with a description of their role in advising for each field study.

6. MA Advising

All faculty are expected to serve as advisors and first readers in the department's MA program. This work includes advice as MA students start to work on Advancement to Candidacy (ATC) forms, Culminating Experience Proposals, and Human Subjects submissions, (https://research.sfsu.edu/protocol/submit_protocol/submit_protocol) and IRB revisions before enrolling in the culminating experience course. Faculty should describe their work with MA students in their narrative and include the following evidence:

- List of MA field studies and/or Curriculum Innovation Projects (CIP) including titles, authors and dates

Also considered:

- Description of any awards/recognition for students based on their field studies and/or CIPs.
- Articles written by students, submitted or published based on their field studies and/or CIPs.

For promotion from Associate to Full Professor

For promotion from Associate to Full Professor, candidates are expected to demonstrate continuing efforts to improve their teaching in each of the subcategories above, with the possible exception of student evaluation, where they may have “topped out.” In that case they would be expected to maintain and continue their excellent level of teaching. In addition, they must demonstrate leadership in developing departmental teaching more broadly by contributing, for example, in:

- Mentoring junior faculty through classroom observation and sharing of teaching methods;
- Leading program development and evaluation; or
- Ongoing curriculum innovation and development.

PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AND GROWTH

As indicated in the Teaching Effectiveness section, the faculty in the Department of Secondary Education work with pre-service and in-service teachers. While the main arena of work for the faculty is at the university level, work targeted at secondary audiences (high school and middle school teachers, students, and administrators) is also considered to be important in evaluating professional achievement and growth.

Professional Achievement and Growth Narrative

Faculty must provide a narrative of their professional achievement and growth. The narrative should provide a context for understanding the faculty member's accomplishments and how they interconnect with and support all of their other work in secondary education.

Criteria and Evidence by Sub-categories

The summary evaluation of professional achievement and growth by the RTP Committee will take into consideration the following five sub-criteria. The RTP Committee recognizes the wide variation in areas of expertise across the department and recognizes that individual faculty members may focus most of their work on two or more, but not necessarily all, subcategories. However, at least four publications in the first two subcategories (Refereed Publications and General Publications and Other Creative Work) below are required, with the expectation that at least two of those publications are in the first sub-category (Refereed Publications). Furthermore, evidence in the third category (Refereed Presentations) is expected. The Committee also will consider evidence the candidate provides beyond this listing, if a written rationale is provided for why it should be considered as evidence of professional achievement and growth.

1. Refereed Publications:

Two peer-reviewed publications are expected. As cooperative and interdisciplinary research projects are increasingly encouraged and supported in Secondary Education, an increasing percentage of publications involve multiple authors. The Committee expects that there be at least one article on which the candidate takes leadership as lead author or co-author with the highest percentage contribution among co-authors. In the case of multiple authors, candidates are expected to note a rough estimate of the percentage of their research and publication contribution. The narrative should also include rate of acceptance of submissions (if available).

- Peer-reviewed publications including articles in research and professional journals,
- Peer-reviewed book chapters or books

The committee will consider the level of review and competitiveness of the publication as well as the faculty member's role in authorship to determine whether the faculty member has met the expectation.

2. General Publications and Other Creative Work:

The narrative should describe faculty member's role in the publication or creative work and describe the audience for the product.

- Textbooks (print and *e*-texts) and other materials such as videos and computer-based activities for use by teachers with their students in grades 6-14 or for use by other teacher educators.
- Editor reviewed books or book chapters, articles, video, online resources, or teaching tools designed for K-12 teachers, teacher educators, parents or public.
- Publications of proceedings for peer-reviewed presentations.
- Scholarly reviews or evaluations of materials produced for use with secondary students, teacher educators, or other educators.
- Book reviews.

3. Refereed Presentations:

We expect faculty to present in multiple venues: national, international, state or local and to average about one presentation per year. Formats may include but are not limited to:

- Annual meetings or conferences held by research and/or professional organizations.
- Meetings, workshops or symposia organized by government organizations.
- Special meetings organized to address a specific problem or issue in education.

4. Grant Funding:

The narrative should describe the faculty member's role in the research or development project as Principal Investigator, Co-principal Investigator, or other. Evidence may include:

- Proposals (funded or unfunded) submitted to Federal, State, and Local education research and/or development agencies, private grant foundations or organizations, and University initiatives.
- Interim or final reports.
- Evidence of partnerships with local schools or districts.
- Development of original academic programs, new courses or course content, disciplinary and/or pedagogical approaches, applications of technology implemented across a department or departments.

5. Curricular Innovations

The RTP Committee recognizes curricular innovations beyond those that are funded, including:

- Design of new courses or programs
- Creation and administration of professional development programs
- Development of new assessment systems for use beyond faculty's own courses.

Often the work or parts of the work and projects engaged in by faculty in Secondary Education fit more than one of the Teaching, Professional Growth, and Service categories. Therefore, the candidate should choose in which of the three areas to present their curriculum-related work.

For promotion from Associate to Full Professor

The committee will seek three external evaluations from peers at outside institutions who work in relevant fields of study to evaluate the professor's professional achievement and growth for all candidates who are being considered for promotion from Associate to Full Professor.

The committee expects to see evidence of leadership in the field over the scope of the professor's academic history from Assistant Professor to the present.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO CAMPUS AND COMMUNITY

Candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to show evidence of active participation in service at the departmental, college, university, and community levels.

Contributions to Campus and Community Narrative

Faculty must provide a narrative of their contributions to campus and community. The narrative should provide a context for understanding the faculty member's accomplishments and leadership at various level of academic and professional communities.

Criteria and Evidence by Sub-categories

1. Contributions to Campus

The faculty in the department share responsibilities for their governance and advancement by contributing through campus service. All faculty are expected to participate in the decision-making and administrative processes at all levels. Examples of campus service include, but are not limited to:

- Department committees and assignments
- College committees and assignments
- University committees and assignments
- CSU Committees and assignments
- Other governance activities and administrative services to/for the University
- Inter-departmental and inter-college collaboration on new projects and programs
- Collaboration with other institutions of higher education on new projects

2. Contributions to Community

Faculty may use their academic expertise or university status to serve the community at the local, state, national, and/or international levels. Service to the community is normally provided to two specific groups: the public (e.g., various local, national or international communities, schools, educators, and students) and the professional.

- Service to the Public
Faculty may participate in activities that contribute to the public welfare beyond the university community and call upon the faculty member as scholar, teacher, administrator, or practitioner. Examples of service include but are not limited to:
 - Providing educational / instructional programs and workshops for students, teachers, parents, and education leaders
 - Giving educational presentations or performances
 - Engaging in seminars and conferences that address issues, and concerns that are aimed at either general or specialized audiences
 - Participating in collaborative endeavors with schools and civic agencies

- Assisting neighborhood organizations and programs
- Service to the Profession or Discipline
Faculty may pursue leadership and projects associated with various aspects of their teaching, program development, and school involvement such as:
 - Editor, Associate Editor, Co-Editor books or journals
 - Editorial Board member
 - Task Force or Panel member
 - Consulting with private and public, profit and non-profit organizations by applying academic expertise to enhance their effectiveness
 - Collaborating with local teachers and schools
 - Enhancing the work of a professional society or organization, committee work
 - Serving as an elected officer of a professional society or organization
 - Professional conference coordinator or organizer (Program chair)
 - Review manuscripts for publications

Service Expectations Tenure/ Promotion to Associate

Service for candidates for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor should show evidence of a gradual increase in service as outlined above. At this career stage, it is expected that candidates will show evidence of service at the departmental level as well as the college OR university level.

Service Expectations for Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to Full Professor will be evaluated in terms of evidence of service in light of the candidate's career trajectory. Active participation in department, college, and university committees is expected. There should also be evidence of leadership as part of service, such as university leadership positions, professional association leadership, and community service at local, national, and/or international levels.