San Francisco State University
College of Education
Department of Elementary Education

Criteria for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

The Department of Elementary Education
Mission Statement

The faculty associated with the Department of Elementary Education at San Francisco State University acknowledges the rich and complex socio-cultural context in which we work. Our credential and graduate programs in Elementary Education are designed to develop an understanding of theory, pedagogy, management and leadership skills necessary for effective practice in linguistically and culturally diverse school settings. The Mission Statement of the Elementary Education Department reflects that commitment:

> *Our program prepares knowledgeable, reflective, professional teachers distinguished by their demonstrated knowledge of pedagogy that provides access to complex dimensions of the curriculum, and equity for culturally, economically and linguistically diverse students learning in dynamic educational contexts. We aspire to prepare teachers who will provide daily opportunities for children to develop intellectually, creatively, and socially and to view themselves as agents of change in their communities.*

Department Profile
The Department of Elementary Education prepares and develops teachers to obtain the Multiple Subjects Credential (MSC) through our Teaching In Diverse Elementary Settings (TIDES) Program. TIDES is the largest credential program in the San Francisco Bay Area. The department also offers a Master of Arts program in Education with four distinct concentrations: Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Language and Literacy, and Mathematics Education. These programs offer advanced training in research, practice and policy. Additionally, through Language and Literacy we offer a California Reading Specialist Credential. Beyond the required course load, EED faculty members collaborate and sustain relationships with surrounding school districts. This collaboration with school principals, site administrators, supervising teachers, and credential students represents a significant aspect of faculty work.

Unique to the College of Education is the responsibility of the faculty to continually review their program, maintain program documentation, revise and design program changes, and evaluate the credential programs according to standards set by accrediting agencies, which include the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) and the National Council for Accreditation on Teacher Education (NCATE).

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

The primary mission of SFSU is teaching, and the Department of Elementary Education takes that mission seriously. To be considered for retention, tenure or promotion, regardless of qualifications in other categories, candidates must meet the standard of excellence in teaching that is normally expected of faculty and that is required by the University.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness may include samples of pedagogical materials, supervision of practicum, advising, directing student research, curriculum design, interdisciplinary teaching, computer technology integration, mentoring, and field research supervision. Instructional innovations in the classroom are encouraged and recognized as important.

Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

1. Narrative -- Faculty is encouraged to provide a self-statement of teaching effectiveness and must articulate the purposes, strengths and the growth of their teaching. The narrative should provide a context for understanding the faculty's accomplishments within the area of teaching effectiveness.

The narrative should include brief statements of one's philosophy of teaching, description of teaching methods, and a self-appraisal of one's development and achievements in teaching, with particular attention given to the impact of one's 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, a similar statement(s) is included for these areas.

2. Scholarly Level of Instruction -- Faculty must demonstrate how they maintain a scholarly level of instruction and commitment to high academic and pedagogic excellence.

Evidence:

- Written course requirements in syllabi, which reflect high quality standards
- Currency of course materials
- Innovative teaching techniques that are reflected in course syllabi and materials. (For example, multimedia, computer technology integration, use of Blackboard or iLearn, integrated curriculum, collaborative teaching with invited experts in a particular field, use of community resources)
- Examples of credential and masters candidates' works and performances that show high quality work
- Development of assessment tools such as rubrics, portfolio, etc. for instructional purposes

3. Student Evaluation -- All faculty will be able to demonstrate effective teaching based on student evaluations. Probationary and tenured faculty are required to provide evidence of teaching effectiveness based on student evaluations administered according to department guidelines. Evaluations with composite mean scores that fall between 1.0 and 2.30 and with generally positive student comments are considered evidence of teaching effectiveness appropriate for retention, tenure and promotion. The department recognizes

that teaching performance can fluctuate for faculty based on programmatic changes and the perceived stress level of teaching candidates. Faculty comments on contextual issues should be included in the teaching narrative and wherever else it would be appropriate.

Evidence:

a. Faculty shall include a table of all courses taught. For each class taught, include the total course enrollment and the number of responses or students who completed evaluations, along with the mean scores for each class. Organize this information by semester, not by courses taught.
b. For retention, tenure, and promotion to Associate Professor, faculty will include ratings from all students in all courses taught. For promotion to Full Professor faculty will include evaluations for two courses each year.
c. Include overall mean scores. For promotion, overall mean scores within the 1.66 – 2.30 range are considered significant, and 1.0 to 1.65 ranges are considered superior.
   Choose a small number of quotes and comments that are representative of arguments being advanced about teaching effectiveness.
d. Student letters attesting to effectiveness in credential advising, and directing theses, field studies, and/or Teacher Research Studies (i.e. being first and/or second reader)
e. Faculty comment and/or respond to student suggestions for improvement are considered important evidence of teaching effectiveness.

4. Peer Evaluation -- All faculty applying for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion will provide Peer Evaluations in their WPAF that indicate strengths and areas to develop.

Evidence:

a. Peer Observation Reports and letters of evaluation from faculty who have observed a faculty teaching will be included. For faculty serving in two different departments, peer letters from both departments may be included.
b. Letters of support and recommendation from department and/or university colleagues and colleagues from other institutions may also be included.
c. For Promotion -- Peer comments on: "Collegial Relationships as a Member of the Faculty" and "How this Faculty Member Fits the Future Plans and Needs of the Department" may be included.

Evaluation:

All faculty are required to produce evidence of effectiveness in each of the sub-categories (narrative, scholarly level of instruction, student evaluation, and peer evaluation).

PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AND GROWTH

The Department of Elementary Education expects all faculty considered for retention, tenure, and promotion to pursue a research and scholarship agenda. Given the Department's overall emphasis on teaching, program development, and work with schools, the Department expects candidates' research and scholarship agenda to pertain to SFSU departmental teaching, creation of programs within the department, and faculty-school teaching and research projects. The department values the generation, dissemination and representation of scholarship in multiple forms and venues identified below.

Faculty must provide a narrative, which is a self-statement of professional achievement and growth. The narrative should provide a context for understanding the faculty's accomplishments with the area of Professional Achievement and Growth.

Research and Publication
Faculty is strongly encouraged to pursue a record of publication and scholarship that increases in depth and breadth of research, practice, and policy work as faculty pass through the various stages of the RTP process. These examples of evidence are not in order of importance. Evidence may include, but are not limited to the following:

A. Single-Author Books (books on teaching and research relevant to candidate's departmental teaching, program development, and school involvement)
B. Refereed Journals (For example: *Educational Researcher, Language Arts, Harvard Educational Review, Young Children, Journal of Research in Science Teaching, Journal of Research in Mathematics Education, Teaching Children Mathematics*, and selected online journals)
C. Co-Authored Books (co-written with a colleague in a particular field)
D. Editor of Edited Volume either a single volume or in a series (in collaboration with colleagues in a particular field)
E. Chapter in a Book (candidate contributes a chapter in an edited volume that pertains to candidate's area of expertise)
F. Article in Non-Refereed Journal (printed and online)
G. Article in Professional Association Publication (For example: American Federation of Teachers Newsletter, California Faculty Association Newsletter)
H. Videotapes and Multimedia Products (Written and created by the candidate and published)
I. Journalism (single author or co-authoring of Op-Ed pieces or articles for local national, or international newspapers, magazines and online periodicals)

The RTP committee will evaluate the quality of the evidence, considering the scope of the project, the significance of impact, the research base and reviews when they are available and provided.

Presentations
Presentations at local, state, national, and/or international professional organizations and associations are expected. Evidence may include, but are not limited to:

A. Local (For example: San Francisco Association for the Education of Young Children, San Mateo/San Francisco Counties Reading Association, Council of Math-Science Education of San Mateo County)

B. State—Peer Reviewed and Non Peer Reviewed (For example: California Association for Bilingual Education, California Association for the Education of Young Children, California Science Teachers Association, Cal Council for Teacher Educators, California Mathematics Council)

C. National—Peer Reviewed (For example: American Educational Research Association, National Association of the Education of Young Children, National Association for Bilingual Education, International Reading Association, National Science Teachers Association, National Council of Teachers of English, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics)

D. International—Peer Reviewed (For example: Annual International Conference on Literacy and Educational Research, International Literacy and Education Research Network Conference on Learning, Hawaii International Conference on Education, International Congress on Mathematics Education, International Conference on the Self-study of Teacher Education Practices)

The RTP committee will evaluate the quality of the evidence, considering a variety of factors including, but not limited to: the scope of the project, the selection process, the audience addressed, and the impact of the contribution as measured through factors such as feedback, recognition, and usage.

Grants
Faculty may write and/or collaborate on educational research, practice, and policy grants pertaining to the candidate's teaching, program development, and work in the schools. Candidates may serve as Principal Investigator or Co-Investigator on the grants. These examples of evidence are not in order of importance. Evidence may include, but are not limited to the following:

A. Research—Descriptive and Interpretive (For example: Grant from the Spencer Foundation to research the writing development of Latino children in a first grade classroom; Grant from the National Science Foundation to develop an earth science course with SFSU Geosciences Department; SFSU Mini-Grant for Faculty Research; SFSU International Program Research Award; College of Education's Dean Award for Faculty Research)

B. Program Development (For example: Creation of credential program for SFSU Elementary Education and SFSU Special Education combined program funded by U.S. Department of Special Education)

C. Work in Schools (For example, SFSU funded grant to promote increased knowledge for San Francisco high school students of career opportunities and higher education opportunities; project funded by San Francisco Foundation to improve literacy for upper-elementary school students; Educating Teachers in Mathematics, a subcontract with the San Francisco Unified School District's-- National Science Foundation Grant)

The RTP committee will evaluate the quality of the evidence, considering the scope of the project, the significance of impact, the research base and evaluations if they are available.

Professional Leadership

All faculty may pursue leadership positions and projects associated with varied aspects of the faculty's teaching, program development, and school involvement. Examples of evidence may include, but are not limited to:

A. Editor, Associate Editor, Co-Editor (refereed journal, non refereed journal, professional association publication)

B. Editorial Board (refereed journal, non refereed journal, professional association publication)

C. Officer in Professional Organization (President, Vice-President, Treasurer, Division Secretary, Executive Committee Member of international, national, state, or local professional organizations)

D. Task Force (international, national, state, or local task force concerning specific educational issues or topic)

E. Panel (local, state, national, or international task force concerning specific educational issue or topic)

F. Professional Conferences (organizer, host, chairperson, discussant)

G. Review of manuscripts for publications (i.e. textbook reviews; children's literature reviews)
Proposals for refereed presentations
Review of a draft of a document (i.e. ELD Standards; Science and Mathematics Content Standards)

H. Mentoring of practitioners, teachers and educators in the field

The RTP will consider the time commitment, the level and significance of impact.

Curricular Innovations

The Department recognizes that curricular innovations – such as development of academic programs, new courses or course content, new pedagogical approaches or applications of technology, or new areas of instructional expertise – can be of such superior quality and generate

professional growth that they could merit recognition of significant or even superior performance.

Examples of evidence may include, but are not limited to:

A. New Programs and New Courses (creation of new programs and/or new courses within the Department, College of Education, or University)

B. Creation and administration of professional development schools and programs

C. Course Revision (significant revision to existing course within the Department, College of Education, University)

D. Development of assessment system for teacher candidates (PACT – Performance Assessment for CA Teachers –this is created in response to SB 2042, with new subject matter standards, new program standards, and new assessment standards; this is also aligned with the CA Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE) standards and CA Curriculum Frameworks)

E. Intra-Departmental and Intra-College Collaboration (collaboration within the Department and/or College to promote curricular change and innovation)

F. Inter-Departmental and Inter-College Collaboration (collaboration across departments and/or colleges to promote curricular change and innovation)

G. Inter-Institution of Higher Education (leadership role in curricular change between SFSU and cooperating community college, CSU, UC, and other institutions – i.e., CSET-CA Subject Examination for Teachers Preparation Course in collaboration with City College of San Francisco)

The RTP Committee will consider the size of the project, the quality of the innovation, and reviews of the innovation.

Creative Works

Examples of evidence may include the descriptions or copies of films, videos, and other multimedia productions created and designed by faculty member for innovative use in courses and programs (i.e., creative, visual and performing arts designs)

Contributions to Campus and Community

For retention and tenure reviews, contributions to campus and community are considered separately while for promotion reviews they are considered together.

A. Contributions to Campus

Examples of evidence may include, but are not limited to:

- Description and documentation of administrative assignments
- Letters documenting participation on faculty governance (i.e., service on the Academic Senate and standing committees of the Senate such as AUTEC – All University Teacher Education Committee)
- Description and documentation of participation on University Task Force such as CUSP – Commission on University Strategic Planning; Writing Task Force)
- Description and documentation of service on or contributions to University Boards such as Alumni Board
- Description and documentation of participation on Search Committees for College or University positions
- Description and documentation of participation on a committee (departmental, college, or university-wide)
- Description and documentation of special advising assignments, sponsorship of student organizations, and/or fund-raising and advocacy of non-instructional activity or project
- Description and documentation of accredited reviews and preparation of CCTC and NCATE documents
- Description and documentation of participation on University advisory committees such as Caesar Chavez Institute and Child and Adolescent Development within the Edelmen Institute
- Description and documentation of activities that sustain and develop graduate programs
- Description and documentation of mentoring new faculty

B. 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. Examples of evidence may include, but are not limited to:

- Description of activities supported by grants that focus on teacher development and service such as BATTI – Bay Area Teacher Training Institute.
- Description of service on community task forces related to the work in education.
- Description of consultancy relationships with schools or educational organizations including service on boards of independent or charter schools
- Description of collaborations with teachers and schools who share responsibility for teacher preparation.

Evaluation in the category of Campus and Community will be based on the number and diversity of contributions as well as the duration, scope, impact and quality of service.

Collegial Relationships (Retention and Tenure only)
The summary of evaluation by the RTP Committee will take into consideration its review of all references to collegial relationships. Examples of evidence may include: Peer Comments on Retention Form, letters from colleagues and students that document professional ethics and principles, and letters from colleagues that document responsibility for working effectively with other colleagues.

/Spring2006