**A Guide to Standards for Tenure and Promotion in the Department of English Language and Literature**
**(Revised Spring 2016**
**Provost Approved Fall 2017)**

As required by University Policy on Retention, Tenure and Promotion (Policy #S15-241), all faculty members in the Department of English Language and Literature who are being considered for retention, tenure and promotion will be evaluated in three categories: 1) Teaching Effectiveness, 2) Professional Achievement and Growth, and 3) Contributions to Campus and Community. The University Policy also states, "It is the responsibility of the department to establish clearly the department's expectations for retention, tenure and promotion consistent with the University criteria." The departmental Retention, Tenure and Promotions Committee(s),[1] along with the Chair of the department will consider and evaluate all of the achievements of a candidate for retention, tenure and/or promotion according the departmental expectations listed below.

## Documentation

- Resources. Candidates are expected to follow the most recent guidelines set out in the "Preparing for Tenure and Promotion Handbook" available at http://facaffairs.sfsu.edu/retention-tenure-and-promotion-policies-and-resources
- Curriculum Vitae. Following Revised Senate Policy S15-241, candidates are expected to use the most recent curriculum vitae format available at http://facaffairs.sfsu.edu/retention-tenure-and-promotion-policies-and-resources
- Self-Statements. Candidates should provide prefatory self-statements or narratives of no more than 750 words per statement for each of the three sections of the WPAF. The purpose of the self-statements is to frame and contextualize materials in that section, particularly for those at higher levels of review or not within the candidate's discipline. The English department recommends that candidates review examples of self-statements produced by other faculty who have undergone review.

**Early tenure and promotion:** A faculty member may apply for tenure and/or promotion prior to having satisfied the time-bound service requirement, as described in University RTP Policy. To be awarded early tenure or promotion, faculty must demonstrate achievements in all three categories that are outstanding, or in excess of the required record. Compared to regular tenure and promotion, this

[1] In years when there are several candidates to review, the department may elect two committees (RT and P or R and TP).

standard is higher because a candidate applies for tenure or promotion with fewer numbers of courses taught and fewer semesters of service. Following the criteria set forth below, the candidate must show evidence of exceptional performance in teaching effectiveness; professional achievement and growth; and service that engages the world outside SFSU and enhances the reputation of the department and the university.

## Teaching Effectiveness

The primary mission of San Francisco State University is teaching. The English Department takes this mission very seriously, particularly since we aim not only to prepare undergraduates to negotiate the reading and writing tasks assigned to them, but also, in many instances, to educate future secondary and post-secondary teachers who will be working with students who have diverse learning styles and ethnolinguistically diverse backgrounds. To be considered for retention, tenure and/or promotion, candidates are expected to meet a standard of excellence in teaching regardless of their achievements in the other two RTP categories.

The criteria for evaluation of teaching include:

A. Course Materials. Syllabi, bibliographies, reading lists, class projects and assignments, and examinations may serve as evidence of course and class organization, the level at which the course is taught, and the expectations the faculty member sets for student learning. Course materials should demonstrate currency in the faculty member's field of expertise**.. Syllabi should be clearly written and outline learning objectives as well as other required university policies**

B. Peer Class Observations. Classroom visits and reviews by fellow faculty members are vital for assessing the level of candidates' presentation and expectations and his/her style of engagement with students. These peer observation letters also serve as a check on student evaluations, which can be affected by student grades, prejudices and workload. Candidates for tenure and promotion receive at least two observations each year, including one from an RTP committee member or designee; the committee is responsible for arranging these observations. Peer observations should reflect a representative range of courses and semesters spread across the review period. (Probationary faculty members may obtain additional peer evaluations from a variety of colleagues if they wish). Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor should have one classroom peer-observation a year, to be facilitated by the department chair or the RTP committee.

C. Student Evaluations. For all faculty members with teaching assignments, Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness (SETEs) for all classes taught

shall be placed in the WPAF. Students will evaluate all courses each semester. The RTP committee regards these surveys and the accompanying written comments as important because they provide a large representative sample of student reactions. Scores of below 1.5 on the survey questions suggest highly effective teaching. Scores of 2.0 or higher suggest a need for improvement. We expect candidates for tenure and promotion to receive overall mean scores between 1.0 and 2.0. The department values improvement over time and places greater emphasis on the final two years prior to tenure if the earlier teaching evaluations fall outside the recommended range. The candidate is expected to submit their SETEs and a list of courses taught during the review period. The RTP committee, in evaluating the SETE scores as an indicator of teaching effectiveness, can take into consideration any of these relevant factors (class size, GE/major requirement/elective, historically difficult course).

D. Signed Student Comments. Comments from students are taken seriously, but with the understanding that they may represent a smaller sample of student opinion than questionnaires. In this category, the RTP committee values primarily signed and dated letters addressed to the committee or department chair.

E. Curriculum Development. Because scholarship evolves, the department expects that courses will integrate the past and present, whether in material assigned or in intellectual and instructional approaches. The RTP Committee expects a scholarly level of instruction that may also be demonstrated by evidence such as: continuing study, attendance at professional conferences, seminars and workshops, and designing new courses or taking new approaches to existing courses.

F. Supervision. The department expects candidates to supervise: M.A. theses as a first, second, or third reader; Culminating Experience projects and master's examinations; independent study projects; and new teachers (where relevant). Faculty members should create at least a short descriptive list of their supervisions.

G. Advising and Mentoring. The department expects candidates to provide effective advising for students; this may be documented by descriptions of the nature and extent of advising activities in the candidates' self-statements, as well as by letters from students and colleagues.

Although Student Evaluation Scores suggest whether or not a faculty member is an effective teacher, the final determination will be based on RTP Committee evaluations of all of the above factors.

## Professional Achievement and Growth

Members of the Department of English Language and Literature are expected to engage in a pattern of intellectual activity and growth that includes the presentation and publication of original scholarly research in their respective fields. We believe that teaching and scholarship complement each other, and that a faculty member's participation in the larger community of scholars in his/her field through a variety of scholarly and other professional activities both enhances students' learning in the classroom and benefits our shared University community.

Because we are a department made up of several related but distinct disciplines under the rubric of "English Language and Literature," the kinds of professional activity and forms of publication that demonstrate significant scholarship will vary depending upon the faculty member's program within the department (e.g. Composition, English Education, Linguistics, Literature, Technical and Professional Writing, Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages). We evaluate scholarship according to its quality and impact, not according to quantitative measures of productivity alone. Consequently, in weighing a candidate's merit for tenure and/or promotion, the department's RTP committee may adjust the quantitative measures employed in the general guidelines below to take into consideration the depth of research associated with a given project, or a given project's impact on the field. The RTP committee will provide explicit context and justification for such a qualitative determination in consultation with external referees (See section C below). The RTP committee will also take into consideration factors such as the number of courses taught per semester, number of students taught, committee or other service responsibilities, and degree of funded research support or release time when contextualizing his or her publication record.

### A. General Guidelines

The Department of English Language and Literature has established the following general guidelines for assessing professional achievement and growth at each stage of a faculty member's career:

**Retention.** We expect our tenure-track candidates to develop a pattern of scholarly activity and publication during their probationary period that demonstrates clear progress toward meeting the standards for tenure and promotion.

**Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.** We expect our candidates applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor to demonstrate their professional achievement and growth through a combination of various kinds of scholarly publication, including both peer-reviewed and other forms of scholarly publication and presentation (see sections B.1 and B.2 below). The successful candidate will have either:

- A book (published or in press)

OR

- Three peer-reviewed journal articles or essay chapters (in print and/or accepted for publication)

OR

- A combination of peer-reviewed publications (as listed in section B.1) and other forms of scholarly publication and presentation (as listed in section B.2), deemed by the department RTP committee to be the equivalent of three peer-reviewed articles or essays.

**Promotion to Professor.** The department expects that the pattern of intellectual activity and growth established during the probationary period will extend beyond tenure and promotion to Associate. Successful candidates for promotion to Professor should be able to demonstrate a pattern of research and publication that includes a coherent combination of both peer-reviewed and other forms of scholarly activity (see sections B.1 and B.2 below). A candidate should also provide evidence of increased stature, influence, and/or leadership within his or her specific field (see section B.3 below). When evaluating the professional achievement of candidates for promotion to Professor, the department's RTP committee takes into consideration the shorter time frame between ranks when going from Associate to Professor, the increased University and departmental level expectations for service, and the limited research support available to Associates.

## B. Publication

As our discipline continues to grow, we anticipate scholars in the English Department will reflect the dynamism of the field in their research, chart new areas of study, and find new forums for dissemination. We therefore assess professional achievement and growth in the area of publication in accordance with these changes. The significance of a candidate's work will not be determined by the medium of publication alone, but rather by the review process, by the scholarly reputation of the journal or press, by the critical reception of the work, and other such factors.

Evidence of scholarly publication and recognition typically includes (but is not limited to) the following:

### 1. Peer-Reviewed Publications

- Book (in press or published by an academic or other peer-reviewed trade press)
- Journal article or book chapter (either print or online-only publication)
- Editor (or co-editor) of volume or journal special issue
- Critical edition
- Anthology

- Textbook
- Conference proceedings
- Published dictionary, phrasebook, or grammar

**2. Other Forms of Scholarly Publication and Presentation**

- Book manuscript
  - Completed draft
  - Draft sent and under review by publisher and/or series editors
  - Manuscript in preparation per guidelines of peer-reviewer reports
  - Manuscript approved and under contract
- Research guide essay or entry
- State-of-the-field essay
- Encyclopedia essay or entry
- Book review
- Creative work such as fiction, poetry, and essays published in book form or periodicals
- Conference paper (juried or invited)
- Conference poster (juried or invited)
- Participation in collaborative events at professional conferences (e.g. roundtables, seminars, or workshops)
- Essays on the profession for forums such as *The Chronicle of Higher Education*
- Publication of reports and other classroom findings
- Publication of scholarly work in new media such as:
  - The creation or publication of websites in one's field
  - The creation of, or contributions to, digital archives and digital editions for scholarly portals (e.g. *Emory Women Writers Resource Project* or *The Recipes Project*)
  - The creation or moderation of a listserv, wiki, or other similar media in one's field
  - Creation of, or contributions to, a webinar

The candidate applying for tenure and/or promotion should include in the WPAF information about the review process for publications to the extent known (e.g. readers' reports; members of the editorial board of the journal; ratio of articles accepted to articles submitted) to aid the RTP committee in contextualizing the significance of the publication.

**3. Recognition of Scholarship**

The following activities represent the scholarly impact of a candidate's work and recognition awarded to candidates in the field. These forms of recognition

are considered when presented in combination with the above items. No single item or combination of items below will be considered appropriate for tenure and/or promotion in the absence of items from B.1 and B.2.

- Grants, fellowships, stipends, and other competitively awarded research funding
- Invitation to lecture or deliver keynote address
- Invitation to peer-review scholarship in one's field (monographs, edited collections, anthologies, textbooks, and/or journal articles)
- Invitation to work on an editorial board for an academic press or journal
- Invitation to advise editors of a specific publication (e.g. anthology or textbook)
- Reviews, citations, or other marks of scholarly influence
- Awards and prizes

**C. External Reviewers**

As a means of assessing more acutely the discipline-specific research of candidates for tenure and/or promotion, the English Department requires that at least three external reviewers evaluate a candidate's scholarship and its significance in his or her field. The RTP committee, in consultation with the candidate, will prepare a list of at least six potential external reviewers early in the Spring semester before applying for tenure and/or promotion. The RTP Committee Chair and the Department Chair will select three reviewers from this list and send out materials to those scholars who agree to evaluate the candidate's scholarly work.

Guidelines for Choosing External Reviewers

- Reviewers should not have served on the candidate's dissertation committee.
- Reviewers should be of higher academic rank than the candidate being reviewed.
- Reviewers may be from the CSU or comparable institutions and departments.
- The Department recognizes the value of collaborative research and may solicit external reviewers from co-authors, especially if they are best equipped to assess the significance of the candidate's scholarly work in particular subfields. In such situations, the RTP committee will ensure a balance of external reviewers, so that the overwhelming majority of reviews are not from collaborators.
- Editors and publishers, especially from reputed academic presses, may be included on the list of external reviewers.

Guidelines for the Review Process:

- Reviewers will be informed that the candidate has access to all letters and materials in their file.

- Reviewers will be asked to describe their relationship with the candidate and to refuse the invitation to write if they see any potential conflict of interest in reviewing the candidate's application for retention, tenure, and/or promotion.
- Candidates will prepare a file of materials for the RTP committee to forward to the external reviewers early in the Spring semester prior to applying for tenure, and/or promotion.
- The file should include:
    - Personal statement of Professional Achievement & Growth
    - Candidate's current CV
    - A minimum of three selections of the candidate's publications and scholarly output.
- The RTP Chair is responsible for sending out invitations to reviewers, sending candidate's materials to reviewers in a timely fashion, following up on letters, and making arrangements for them to be delivered by the deadline for inclusion in the WPAF.

## Contributions to Campus and Community

### A. Campus Service

Contributions to the campus may include, but are not limited to service on program, department, university or system-wide committees; advising assignments; departmental and/or campus administrative assignments; faculty governance; sponsorship of student organizations; and organizing speaker series, conferences and similar programs that add to the intellectual life of the department, college and campus. Candidates will also be credited for contributions to interdisciplinary programs, General Education, and the like as well as contributions within the English Department itself.

- Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should have made important contributions on departmental committees.
- Candidates for promotion to Professor should exhibit leadership at the College and/or Campus and/or System as well as Department level.

### B. Community and Professional Service

For candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate, primary emphasis is placed on evidence of candidate's service to the department as outlined above. It is expected that candidates for promotion to Professor include significant service to the department, campus and/or system, but also areas of service beyond the department, as outlined below

Contributions to the community include, but are not limited to:

- giving talks for or consulting with community organizations on subjects related to the faculty member's field or to higher education;
- being interviewed by or writing for the media for a general audience on topics connected to the faculty member's field;
- service on community-based educational councils and boards; outreach activities that attract students to the University, or that make the University better known to the community, or that bring the resources of the University to the community.

Professional contributions include, but are not limited to:

- Organizing and chairing a conference panel (juried or invited) based on theoretical or pedagogical research
- Leading a workshop or seminar based on theoretical or pedagogical research
- giving talks for or consulting with community colleges, schools, community organizations, and/or other education-related organizations;
- organizing conferences or workshops
- moderating or giving a formal response to papers on a conference panel;
- serving on committees of professional organizations
- serving as an officer or board member of a scholarly or professional organization; serving on an editorial board; reading manuscripts for academic journals and presses.

Substantive and significant campus, community and professional service may be documented with letters or emails of invitation or thanks or similar documentation that describe the extent and nature of the faculty member's contribution.