



DATE: July 11, 2019

TO: Chair Department of Sociology
FROM: Committee on Faculty RTP Criteria and Standards
SUBJECT: Department/Unit RTP Criteria and Standards Review

The Committee on Faculty RTP Criteria and Standards thanks you for your submission of RTP Criteria and Standards for the Department of Sociology. The Committee has completed its review of the document and approves the document for use.

A copy of your department's approved RTP Criteria and Standards shall be distributed to all probationary and tenured faculty members in your department. Each probationary faculty unit member will file a copy of the document in Section 3 of his/her Working Personnel Action File.

The Committee will forward your document to Academic Personnel Services where it will be maintained and made available on the web site.

Committee on Faculty RTP Criteria and Standards members: Lisa Bond-Maupin, Yvonne Everett (Chair), Gregg Gold, Benjamin Marschke, Whitney Ogle, Dale Oliver, Sondra Schwetman, Robert Zoellner.

CC: Laura Hahn
Academic Personnel Services

Josh Meisel, Chair
University Faculty Personnel Committee

Department of Sociology
Criteria for Retention, Tenure and Promotion
Approved by all Tenure Track/Tenure Line Faculty in Sociology

This document outlines the evaluation criteria for faculty members in the Department of Sociology. The Department of Sociology is committed to encouraging and helping faculty members in the RTP process succeed in their teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service. We are aware that this is a living document and issues may arise that we did not anticipate. We are also aware that this document serves as a guideline, and exceptions that were not anticipated may arise. If this occurs, the RTP candidate, the IUPC, and the Dean must agree to any exceptions and document the agreement in the WPAF. Along with Appendix J, personnel committees will apply the criteria and related rubrics to the evaluation of information in the faculty member Working Personnel Action File (WPAF).

A record of teaching excellence is expected of all candidates for tenure and/or promotion and combined with required levels of scholarship and service (Table 1) will provide justification for retention, tenure and promotion for tenure-track faculty members.

Table 1: Required Levels of Scholarship/Creative Activity and Service for Tenure & Promotion

Scholarship/Creative Activity	Service	RTP Outcome*
Good	Good	Acceptable
Excellent	Minimum Essential	Acceptable
Minimal Essential	Excellent	Acceptable
Good	Minimum Essential	Unacceptable
Minimum Essential	Good	Unacceptable

*Assumes required “excellence” in teaching has been achieved

Teaching Effectiveness

Consistent with Appendix J of the Faculty Handbook, faculty members in the Department of Sociology will demonstrate evidence of an ongoing commitment to and excellence in teaching. A faculty member in the Department of Sociology should compile the following materials to demonstrate excellence in teaching:

Section II of the Personnel Data Sheet (PDS)

Candidates for tenure and promotion are asked to indicate whether they meet Departmental

Standards for Excellence in Teaching and provide relevant evidence to support their self-rating with specific reference to departmental standards.

As noted in Section II on the PDS template, the faculty member will include a table with course information and a statement of teaching philosophy. In addition, Sociology faculty members will include the following:

- 1) A list (one page or less) of teaching-related strengths and areas of professional development:
 - a. Current strengths
 - b. Resolved weaknesses and/or areas that the faculty member worked to develop in review period
 - c. Remaining weaknesses and/or areas the faculty member is still working to develop

Under each of the above areas, the faculty member will list actions taken (workshops, mentoring) to address problems or strengthen development in the given areas. Indicate where there is evidence in the WPAF of the actions and evaluation. For example: (See Section 7.3 Reading group acknowledgment email and Section 6 Colleague Letter from Jones).

Section 6 of the WPAF

The IUPC will solicit collegial evaluation letters for the faculty member's WPAF that evaluate teaching. These letters must be included in the faculty member's WPAF.

Section 7 of the WPAF

7.1 Student letters.

The IUPC will invite written statements from current and former students and student employees of the candidate. Candidates will provide the IUPC with a list of students and student employees to contact for written statements.

7.2 Anonymous student evaluations for all courses taught in the period under review.

The candidate will follow best practices to help ensure response rates of at least 50 percent. The IUPC recognizes that there may be circumstances in which it is not possible to obtain a 50 percent response rate.

Non-evaluative evidence of teaching and professional development.

Supplemental Evidence

The faculty member will provide a representative sample of course syllabi, class exercises, assignments, and exams that align with the teaching philosophy statement and that provide evidence of faculty member alignment with the Department of Sociology approach to teaching and learning (See Evaluating Teaching below).

Evaluating Teaching – Evidence of Excellence (Directions for Personnel Committees)

The Department of Sociology is committed to learner-centered, active learning, and constructivist teaching that incorporates the principles of Universal Design for Learning. Faculty members will incorporate in their classes teaching practices that align with this pedagogical orientation (e.g. active learning exercises and discussion). They will provide evidence that they engage in ongoing actions that improve their knowledge of student learning, maintain currency in the field and their specializations, and provide effective advising using technologies and systems appropriate to HSU (e.g. create full degree plans for advisees that appropriately sequence coursework). Course evaluations (when possible), activities, observations, and syllabi must provide evidence of integration of active learning across classes. The PDS and supporting documentation must provide evidence of an average of at least 5 hours annually of teaching and learning-related professional development (i.e., events sponsored through the Center for Teaching and Learning, new faculty meetings around teaching, online trainings, development of equity and inclusion skills in relation to teaching and other aspects of being a professor, attendance at teaching related conference sessions, etc.). Any legitimate concerns regarding advising and teaching must have been resolved.

Evidence of teaching excellence in the Department of Sociology will include the achievement and maintenance of student evaluation item mean scores in the range of 4.0 (very good) to 5.0 (excellent). Where there is/was a pattern of lower mean scores (less than 4.0), on a particular question, Section II of the PDS and collegial letters must provide evidence that the problem has been resolved, will likely be resolved, or does not represent a problem. While lower scores may reflect a one “off” semester or a problematic single course, tenure and promotion will not be recommended when there are patterns of low scores and/or inconsistent teaching that indicate the faculty member has not achieved and maintained excellence in teaching.

The faculty members of the Department of Sociology are sensitive to the challenges of teaching controversial subject matter. We also encourage creativity and risk taking in teaching, which can sometimes backfire. We are also aware of the scholarship on teaching and learning that provides evidence that instructor race, class, gender, sexuality, age, and ability often intersect to produce lower mean teaching evaluation scores for groups with the least privilege (e.g., as a group, young women faculty of color score lower than their more senior white male colleagues.). Faculty members who identify course evaluation scores that reflect systemic bias or who tried new teaching practices with poor evaluation results will present the information in Section II of the

PDS. Collegial letters in Section 6 must support this explanation and be grounded in other evidence (teaching observations, discussions, mentoring) that provide evidence of overall teaching excellence.

Scholarship and Creative Activities

We define scholarship using the five interrelated dimensions developed by Ernest Boyer in *Scholarship Reconsidered*: discovery, integration, application, teaching and engagement. Faculty members in the Department of Sociology should compile the listed materials below as evidence of their level of scholarship.

Faculty members will prepare and organize evidence of their scholarship as follows:

Section III of the Personnel Data Sheet (PDS)

Candidates for tenure and promotion are asked to evaluate their Scholarly/Creative activities and indicate whether they meet departmental standards for Minimum Essential, Good, or Excellent. Candidates are also asked to provide relevant evidence to support their self-rating with specific reference to departmental standards.

As noted in Section III on the PDS template, the faculty member will list and briefly describe (see above):

1. Completed scholarly/creative activities
2. In-progress scholarly/creative activities

For each of the scholarly items listed in their PDS, candidates will briefly describe the activity in 3-5 phrases, including the dates of dissemination and collegial/peer review. They will also indicate the location of the non-evaluative and/or evaluative evidence of the scholarship.

Example:

Needs Assessment, Eureka Food Pantry. Collaborated with staff and designed instrument. Directed volunteers in administering survey. Wrote 3-page summary of outcomes and recommendations. Disseminated materials to the pantry staff/directors in order, facilitated discussion of report, findings, and strategies for change. (Section 6 Colleague Letter: Jones [Pantry Executive Director], Eichstedt [Chair] & Supplemental).

Section 6 of the WPAF

The IUPC will solicit critical review letters from colleagues identified by the candidate who can evaluate the quality and significance of the candidate's scholarship and creative activities listed in the PDS. The candidate must provide this list to the IUPC at least three months prior to the candidate's WPAF file submission deadline.

Section 8 of the WPAF

Non-evaluative evidence of scholarship and creative activities: e.g., thank you letters and conference program listings.

Supplemental Evidence

Evidence of scholarship and creative activities should be included in the WPAF as supplemental evidence of scholarly/creative activities. Such evidence might include articles, conference presentations, grant proposals, acceptance letters, table of contents for books/reports, book contracts, media interviews, blog posts, videos, and/or video dissemination information.

Evaluating Scholarship and Creative Activities (Directions for Personnel Committees)

As an applied research and public sociology program, we value traditional social science research, as well as work that translates or applies scholarship and theory for non-academic audiences. Personnel committees will consider quality of work as well as types and volume of work as they make personnel decisions. Appendix J outlines Boyers' criteria that will be applied for peer review of non-traditional scholarship.

Assessing Quality of Scholarship and Creative Activities

Quality of scholarship and creative activities is assessed through collegial/peer review. According to Boyer, "for a scholarly outcome distinct from publications to be designated as scholarship, it must meet three necessary criteria: it must be public, it must be amenable to critical appraisal, and it must be in a form that enables its use by other members of the scholarly community." Additionally, Appendix J requires "collegial/peer review appropriate to the discipline" for all scholarly and creative activities. Traditional peer review processes of journal and book publishing assure quality as work is accepted. While Appendix J is silent on "dissemination," sharing of scholarly work beyond HSU is implied in the peer review processes of "traditional" scholarship. Given the nature of non-traditional scholarship (applied research such as a program evaluation meant for internal use only), the IUPC will provide guidance on the achievement of appropriate dissemination of a given scholarly endeavor.

In cases where scholarship or creative activities are produced outside traditional peer review processes, our faculty will accept as evidence of peer review and appropriate dissemination assessments through one or more of the following:

- 1) a critical review letter from an external academic colleague evaluating the quality of work as stated below;
- 2) an evaluative letter from a staff member of an organization or agency for which the faculty member provided technical assistance or whose agency serves a community group affected by the creative activity of the faculty member;
- 3) recognition of work through an award or honor;

These peer review documents may also serve to note exceptional quality of work. Peer review outside of traditional publishing processes should speak to criteria such as soundness of methodology, organization that supports communication of (research) message, quality of writing, creativity in presentation, contribution to larger body of knowledge, impact or resonance

with given target audience(s), currency, and scope of impact.

The types of activities typically considered as evidence of an ongoing research program have been grouped into categories 1 and 2 below. Appendix J, Section IX.B.5 provides that a candidate being evaluated may submit an activity for evaluation that is not included in the five dimensions of scholarship as put forth in Appendix J, Section IX.B.2. A candidate may make the case in his or her WPAF that an activity not listed in categories 1 and 2 should count as a contribution to scholarship for purposes of evaluation. The candidate's IUPC and Dean will then determine whether or not the activity should be evaluated as part of the candidate's scholarly/creative activities and in which category of activity it will be placed. Additional activities in Category 1 can be used by the candidate to take the place of activities from Category 2, but additional activities from Category 2 cannot be used to offset deficiencies in activities from Category 1.

Category 1:

- a. Journal article*
- b. Book (including monographs, textbooks, edited volumes, edited journal volumes)*
- c. Book Chapter*
- d. Theoretically and/or empirically driven artistic creations (documentary film, play)
- e. Presenting paper at external¹ conference, workshop, or forum where peer review is an explicit part of the process
- f. Serving as a PI or Co-PI on an externally funded research grant proposal in support of original research. Description of investigator role must evidence leadership and writing responsibilities.

* Peer reviewed publications: Online venues are considered as valid as printed venues. Manuscripts that have been accepted for publication for dissemination in writing, or which have a written contract for publication/dissemination by a journal, press, or other venue, with an imminent publication/dissemination date (before the end of the candidate's current appointment or period under review), *and are able to be evaluated for scholarly content*, are to be considered published, even if they are not yet publicly available. If a manuscript/film that has been accepted for publication/production, but not yet been published/released, has been counted at one level of review as a published piece, then it may not count in subsequent personnel reviews (it can only count once as a published piece).

Category 2:

¹ Throughout: "External" means "outside Humboldt State University," whereas "internal" means "within Humboldt State University."

- a. Applied Sociology and discipline-informed consultation and/or technical assistance for community organizations or agencies. For RTP purposes, the technical assistance must generate a product(s) that will be peer-reviewed (e.g. program evaluation, program design, or community action research). *Consulting/Technical Assistance may be counted as a Type III Service activity.*
- b. Book and film reviews (published).
- c. Conference presentation of original work (paper or workshop) or discussant on panel. Venue acceptance is not juried.
- d. Curricular development on a large-scale and program transformation projects. Products disseminated beyond HSU for peer review (e.g. a new major proposal).
- e. Grant proposals: Funded internal (excluding travel grants) and unfunded external. Participation in an external grant proposal as a consultant/advisor (but not co-PI) must be counted in this category.
- f. Public sociology translates sociological knowledge for popular audience understanding and/or use. Public sociology for RTP purposes must generate products that will be peer-reviewed and disseminated beyond HSU (e.g. a series of popular press articles or opinion pieces, high-traffic sustained blogging, series of media interviews).

Self-evaluation of Scholarship and Creative Activities should be provided by the faculty member in the PDS.

Requirements for Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor

Excellent

One book OR at least three peer-reviewed publications (Category 1 Items a-c) during the review period PLUS an additional six distinct activities from Category 1 or 2 during the review period.

Good

Two peer-reviewed publications (Category 1 Items a-c) PLUS an additional five distinct activities from Category 1 or 2 during the review period.

Minimum Essential

One peer-reviewed publication (Category 1 Items a-c) PLUS an additional four distinct activities from Category 1 or 2 during the review period.

Requirements for Promotion to Professor

Excellent

One book OR four Category 1 activities (at least three of which are peer-reviewed publications, Category 1 Items a-c) PLUS an additional six distinct activities from Category 1 or 2 during the review period. Such activities should reflect national and/or international involvement and can be evidenced, for example, through venue, collaboration network, publication reach, and funding sources.

Good

Three Category 1 activities (at least two of which are a peer-reviewed publications, Category 1 Items a-c) PLUS an additional five distinct activities from Category 1 or 2 during the review period. Such activities should reflect national and/or international involvement and can be evidenced, for example, through venue, collaboration network, publication reach, and funding sources.

Minimum Essential

Two Category 1 activities (one of which is a peer-reviewed publication, Category 1 Items a-c) PLUS an additional five distinct activities from Category 1 or 2 during the review period.

Service

Candidates for tenure and promotion are asked to evaluate their Service activities and indicate whether they meet departmental standards for Minimum Essential, Good, or Excellent. Candidates are also asked to provide relevant evidence to support their self-rating with specific reference to departmental standards.

A faculty member in the Department of Sociology should compile the following materials as evidence of their service:

Section IV of the Personnel Data Sheet (PDS)

As noted in Section IV on the PDS template, the faculty member will list and describe:

1. Assigned-time responsibilities
2. Non-assigned time service
3. Leadership positions and responsibilities in professional associations, review boards etc.

In all cases where faculty are presenting activities to count in “service,” the significance and impact of the service must be evaluated and evaluation materials included in the WPAF.

Section 6 of the WPAF

The faculty member must provide collegial letters that evaluate the quality of service listed in the PDS.

Section 9 of the WPAF

Non-evaluative evidence of service: thank you and appointment letters.

Supplemental Evidence

The faculty member will include substantial products produced through service in the supplemental binder.

Evaluating Service (Directions to the Personnel Committees)

Type, quantity, quality, and reach (impact) will be considered when evaluating service contributions . Increasing reach, leadership levels and influence are expected for each level of promotion. To that extent, faculty members requesting promotion to the rank of Professor should evidence not just service, but leadership at the university level and participation in regional and/or (inter) national networks.

III. Service

1. See Appendix J IX.B.3.a-g.

- A. Tenure-track faculty are expected to carry out normal duties, such as regularly attending convocation and commencement and department events (such as department meetings, majors meetings, writing peer evaluations for colleagues and letters of reference for students, and working collaboratively and collegially with colleagues). Candidates who consistently fail to carry out these duties shall not receive a positive recommendation for tenure/promotion. These activities are not classified as “service activities.”
- B. Candidates are expected to demonstrate through description in the PDS and collegial letters that their service was valuable and that their participation was active.
- C. Serving as department chair or in other positions for which reassigned time is allotted will be considered "Type I service" (see below) to the extent that the duties exceeded the reassigned time, as evidenced in the candidate's PDS and in collegial letters.
- D. Service on college and university level projects and committees is recommended, for example (but not limited to) the Campus Dialogue on Race, the Social Justice Summit, and the Sexual Assault Prevention Committee.
- E. We recognize the Cultural Taxation on faculty members of color, and those from other marginalized communities, who provide intensive student mentoring and who are called on to serve on multiple equity committees and institutional change initiatives. It is incumbent on the IUPC to contextualize the candidate’s service and to recognize extraordinary service, where Cultural Taxation is a factor; it is incumbent on the candidate to address potential areas of cultural taxation in the PDS.
- F. Categories for Service Criteria

The Sociology department recognizes three categories of service activities: Type I (lighter or temporary duties), Type II (heavier or more sustained duties), and Type III (duties requiring leadership).

Type I Activities, less time intensive, not necessarily ongoing (1 point per activity per academic year), include :

- a. Excess advising (more than 40 students) not compensated through other means;
- b. Student mentorship that exceeds the expectations of normal teaching and advising workload (e.g. assisting students who have high needs, editing student manuscripts for journal publication, advising on and/or editing material for community presentations, conference posters, or conference papers, as well as professional mentoring).
- c. Talks and presentations to campus and community audiences (e.g. colleagues' classes, campus clubs, campus events, etc.);
- d. Membership on department, college, and university committees that meet rarely or on an

- ad hoc basis (less than three times per semester);
- e. Participation in local events that promote Sociology/CJS related events in local schools (eg., Black History Month, Cesar Chavez Day, Women's History Month);
- f. Serving as a chair or discussant on a scholarly panel;
- g. Serving on a MA thesis/project committee.

Type II Activities are more time intensive, and ongoing (2 points per activity per academic year), include :

- a. Serving on active college or university committees (e.g. ICC, Professional Leave Committee, etc.);
- b. Serving on an IUPC, CPC, UFPC, or a search committee;
- c. Service to other academic departments, the library, or student support services (e.g., the Centers for Academic Excellence);
- d. Sustained participation in professional organizations, task forces, government or non-governmental organizations, or community organizations;
- e. Providing ongoing consulting services to the university, government or community;
- f. Student club advising (with active membership);
- g. Serving as a reviewer for faculty at other universities or colleges.
- h. Reviewing or refereeing journal articles, books, grant proposals, websites, etc. in one's field;
- i. Serving on the editorial committee of a journal or similar;
- j. Mentoring student research or creative activities (separate from serving on MA Committees – See Type I Activities)
- k. Serving as Chair on a MA thesis/project committee.

Type III Activities require a substantial time commitment and leadership (3 points per activity per academic year) and include:

- a. Chairing a search committee;
- b. Service as an officer in professional organizations, task forces, government or non-governmental organizations, unions, academic research institute/center, or community organizations;
- c. Organizing curriculum development;
- d. Organizing professional conferences, colloquia, speaker's series;
- e. Organizing community outreach programs (alternatively this can be counted as Category 2 scholarly activity);
- f. Chairing a college or university committee;
- g. Leading or organizing a community service activity;
- h. Participating in community governance;
- i. Serving as department chair or in another position for which release time is granted, to the extent that the duties of that position exceed release time;

- j. Organizing new co-curricular activities for students, including student conferences, service learning opportunities, and publications.

Requirements for Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor

Excellent

Fulfillment of normal duties listed under III-A above, and accumulation of an average of **seven service points per year, with a minimum of one Type III activity** over the review period.

Good

Fulfillment of normal duties listed under III-A above, and accumulation of an average of **five service points per academic year, with a minimum of three Type II and/or III activities over the review period.**

Minimum Essential

Fulfillment of normal duties listed under III- A above, and accumulation of **five service points per academic year in residence at HSU.**

Requirements for Promotion to Professor

Excellent

Fulfillment of normal duties listed under III-A above, and accumulation of an average of **ten service points per year, with a minimum of two Type III activities** over the review period.

Good

Fulfillment of normal duties listed under III-A above, and accumulation of **an average of seven service points per year, with a minimum of two Type III activities** over the review period.

Minimum Essential

Fulfillment of normal duties listed under III-A above, and accumulation of an average of **seven service points per year, with a minimum of one Type III activity** over the review period.