

EFFECTIVE FALL 2026

Department of Applied Human and Environmental Sciences Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

Approved April 2026

This document is designed to provide guidance for evaluation for reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) for tenure-track faculty in the Department of Applied Human and Environmental Sciences (AHES) and for the RTP committees at each level of review.

Due to the interdisciplinary nature of AHES, our faculty possess diverse expertise and interests. Moreover, some of our faculty members are hired for specific positions or they may be asked to serve in administrative positions early during the tenure and promotion process. These duties may result in reassignment time and a reduced teaching load. Therefore, each faculty member will likely have a different mix of responsibilities that requires flexibility in defining criteria for an individual's RTP evaluation. Any plan to invest differentially in the three areas of accomplishment should be discussed with, and approved by, the Department RTP Committee before the plan is implemented. The results of this differential investment should be discussed in the candidate's self-assessment and taken into account by the Department RTP committee in their evaluation.

Evaluation for RTP at SSU is judged on the basis of three areas of accomplishment as outlined in the university RTP policy: teaching effectiveness; research, scholarship, and creative activity; and service to the university and community. The AHES RTP Committee criteria are consistent with these University categories. New and continuing faculty members will be informed of the expectations of the Department at the time of hire and throughout the probationary years in the Department-level RTP Committee evaluation document. If a candidate has allocated far greater effort to one of these categories in a given review cycle, it is incumbent on the candidate to provide a rationale in their self-assessment so the committee can guide the candidate in reaching RTP expectations by time of promotion.

Due to the broad nature of AHES, there may be overlap between teaching, research, and service activities that can be considered for RTP purposes. For example, some faculty will instruct or oversee students as part of a research grant or regulatory contract, or in the course of community-based research. This could be considered a combination of teaching effectiveness, scholarly activity, and community service. It is expected that the candidate will make a clear argument for a single activity appearing in multiple RTP areas of their self-assessment.

1. Department Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness

Candidates in the Department of Applied Human and Environmental Sciences are expected to demonstrate progress toward the following four criteria for teaching effectiveness:

1. **Content and Course Design** - demonstrate expertise in course topic areas; demonstrate effective course design through alignment of course outcomes to program

and/or GE outcomes, and alignment of outcomes to assessments of student learning; demonstrate skillfulness in the design of assessments of student learning.

2. **Engagement and Inclusion** - employ teaching strategies that engage learners; utilize teaching and course design practices that foster diversity, equity, and inclusion.
3. **Effectiveness in Other, Teaching Related Responsibilities** - commitment to mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students (depending on role) as well as engaging students in research, teaching, and/or service, commitment to supervising student interns and graduate students (depending on role)
4. **Demonstration of Reflection and Professional Growth** - reflect on, and implement changes to, teaching practices, taking into account relevant feedback.

The Department RTP Committee shall utilize multiple sources of evidence to evaluate a candidate's progress in the above criteria for teaching effectiveness. The intention of using multiple indices is to provide a comprehensive overview of teaching such that no one measure is over-utilized. The primary sources of evidence include: 1) a current curriculum vitae, 2) self-assessment of teaching, 3) peer observations of teaching, 4) index of evidence (and evidence file), and 5) student perception data, suitably contextualized.

1.1. Sources of Evidence

1. **Curriculum Vitae:** The candidate's CV should include the following: 1) courses taught within the cycle under review, 2) if applicable, listing and description of any new course preparations, 3) a listing and description of professional development efforts such as CTET consultations, workshops, faculty exchanges, and professional conferences, and 4) a list of graduate students and student interns supervised (depending on role). Note changes since last review in CV by making the text bold.
2. **Self-Assessment of Teaching and Other Teaching Responsibilities:** The self-assessment should describe the candidate's current teaching practices and goals for the next cycle. Candidates should evaluate themselves relative to the first three of the above criteria for teaching effectiveness (content and course design; engagement and inclusion; effectiveness of other teaching responsibilities), and they should give an account of their growth as instructors. They should take into account any feedback highlighted in the previous RTP review process/es. This account in and of itself serves as evidence for criterion four, and it can be evaluated for the candidate's ability to reflect on their growth as instructors.
3. **Peer Observations of Teaching:** Peer observations of teaching should focus on the candidate's course content, course design, and practices of engagement and inclusion. As noted in the university RTP policy, candidates for re-appointment shall include observations from one faculty member for periodic reviews and two observations for performance review. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion should include observations from two faculty members. Faculty who serve as peer observers should be agreed upon by the candidate and the RTP committee; unless approved by the Department RTP Committee, peer observers should be tenured faculty of the Department of AHES.
4. **Evidence file:**

Items that must be submitted to the evidence file:

- Syllabi for all courses in the cycle under review (“before and after” syllabi should be included if the candidate made revisions in light of feedback).
- A sample assignment (e.g., exam, essay prompt) from a course that shows how the candidate assesses student learning.

Other items that may be included:

- Evidence of professional development activities - such as certificates, training for online course instruction (e.g., QLT), course redesign efforts, products from CTET training, etc.

5. ***Student Perception Data (qualitative and quantitative ROSE data)***: In alignment with the university RTP policy, ROSE data for two courses per cycle, selected by the candidate in consultation with the Department RTP Chair, shall be included. Candidates for tenure and promotion must include a summary table and analysis of ROSE data from the entire probationary period. Candidates for promotion shall include data starting with the initial date of employment at SSU or the candidate’s last promotion. Research shows that it is common for ratings to be affected by factors unrelated to teaching effectiveness such as the nature of the course content, instructor race, and gender, and a range of other factors. Because of this, the ROSE data shall be primarily utilized in service of criterion three.

Quantitative ROSE data can provide evidence of student perceptions of instructor clarity, organization, active learning, and inclusive teaching. Although the department does not require minimum cutoff scores, a good rule of thumb is that the majority of ratings cluster at the “very effective” range of the scale. If most scores are at the high end of the scale, the candidate is doing fine, even if an occasional two or three students marks them at the low end. New teaching strategies, assignments, or new course preps can impact ROSE ratings, so candidates should describe these contextual factors in their self-assessment. Scores that are chronically below the very effective range likely reflect one or more instructional issues that require attention and support.

Qualitative ROSE data can provide student perceptions of the relevant teaching criteria. Evaluators will disregard comments unrelated to instruction and/or those that suggest bias. Candidates should look for patterns in comments related to teaching criteria and/or their own instructional goals and discuss these in the self-assessment. Frequent comments of concern may reflect instructional issues

1.2. Requirements for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

For tenure and promotion to associate professor, the self-assessment and evidence file shall describe and document the candidate’s increased skill across the criteria of evaluation. Candidates shall note how feedback from prior peer observations and RTP evaluations was addressed and implemented.

Failure to meet department criteria for teaching effectiveness occurs when a candidate shows minimal to no improvement on one or more instructional shortcomings documented in prior cycles by the Department RTP Committee, or the Department RTP Committee identifies significant instructional shortcomings that require remediation.

1.3. Requirements for Promotion to Professor

For promotion to professor, the self-assessment and evidence file should describe and document how the candidate's teaching skillfulness has deepened since promotion to associate professor. They will be evaluated on the criteria cited above: content and course design, engagement and inclusion, and effectiveness in other teaching responsibilities. Failure to meet department criteria for teaching effectiveness occurs when a candidate shows minimal to no improvement on one or more instructional shortcomings documented in prior cycles by the Department RTP Committee, or the Department RTP Committee identifies significant instructional shortcomings that require remediation.

2. Department Criteria for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

Accomplishments in this category may take a variety of forms depending on the candidate's discipline. The Department RTP Committee takes a holistic approach to evaluating scholarly activity, weighing the quality, originality, and impact of the candidate's scholarly contributions. In addition to publication in peer-reviewed academic journals, other types of scholarship by candidates whose field is applied and professional in character will be valued in the RTP process, provided it evidences rigorous data collection and analysis methods and is disseminated publicly so that it furthers the development of knowledge in the discipline and/or improved professional practice.

For both tenure and promotion, we encourage our faculty to contribute to the discipline through activities such as attending and presenting at regional, national, and international meetings in the discipline; providing peer review for scholarly journals and grants in their field of expertise; and serving on and/or leading association committees, executive boards, or editorial boards of discipline-specific journals.

Applied, engaged, and community-based scholarship is vital to expanding our disciplines' audiences, diversifying our ranks, and successfully training our students to think critically about the past and present and to contribute meaningfully to society. This type of scholarship produces a unique combination of tangible and intangible products. Tangible products are often co-authored, frequently inter- or multi-disciplinary, and may be published outside of the candidate's home discipline. Intangible scholarship must be documented in the three sources of evidence described below. The application of such intangible products to tenure and promotion considerations should be documented by the faculty member through thorough accounting of the trajectories of such projects. These forms of scholarship will be evaluated based on the depth of thought, imagination, collaboration, and impact conveyed in the evidence file.

Group A products reflect original work conducted primarily by the candidate. The candidate must be listed as Principal Investigator, first author, or corresponding author; for the latter status, candidates must describe their involvement. Candidates engaged in developing plans, policies and/or legal briefs as part of their scholarship shall provide details on the analysis, review, and

dissemination of the work. For regulatory contracts, candidates must describe how they originated the contract or managed its renewal, and oversaw it successfully.

- Book or monograph published with a peer-reviewed press.
- In-press or published article in a peer-reviewed academic journal with an established impact factor.
- In-press or published, peer-reviewed book chapter.
- Funded competitive (peer-reviewed) external grant from state, national or international agency or private granting organization.
- Successful award/renewal and administration of regulatory contract with public agency
- Publications appropriate to the professional discipline prepared for public agencies or professional organizations (e.g., public policy studies, plans, and ordinances; White Papers; Historic Context statements). These publications shall be internally reviewed by the public agency/professional organization and have public distribution.
- Work in non-print media (i.e., documentary videos, software, podcasts, museum exhibits, websites) that is peer-reviewed or internally reviewed in the candidate's discipline and is publicly distributed.

Group B includes peer-reviewed products to which the candidate contributes, but is not the first/corresponding author or principal investigator. Service on an editorial board for a journal is also included here due to the substantial time investment and the requirement of staying current in a given field.

- In-press or published article in a peer-reviewed academic journal with an established impact factor, in which the candidate is a contributing author.
- In-press or published article in a peer-reviewed academic journal with no impact factor, in which the candidate is first/corresponding author.
- In-press or published, peer-reviewed book chapter, in which the candidate is a contributing author.
- Submitted grant proposals to competitive external granting agencies/organizations, in which the candidate is the Principal Investigator
- Funded competitive grant from local or regional agency, in which the candidate is the Principal Investigator
- Peer-reviewed presentations (paper or poster) at conferences.
- Invited presentations at conferences or university colloquia.
- Service on the editorial board of a journal.

Group C consists of evidence for the less-tangible or intangible products of applied, engaged, and community-based scholarship.

- Collaboration with communities: evidence may include letters of evaluation from community partners that describe constructive relationships with and/or positive impacts on the community; letters of evaluation by other scholars who have worked on similar kinds of initiatives; presentations to/workshops for communities; expert witness testimony or highly visible opinion pieces on behalf of a community; community oral histories or ethnographies; public-facing materials for interpretation and outreach.

- Consultation with organizations: evidence may include letters of evaluation from the organization that describe mentorship of staff; assessments of organizational culture, workforce efficiency, cross-cultural communication, usability analysis, quality assurance, and workplace design; letters of evaluation by other scholars who have worked on similar kinds of initiatives.

Group D primarily includes works in progress leading up to tenure and promotion, such as manuscripts and grant proposals under review. The expectation is that some of these items will become Group A or B products in time for tenure and promotion decisions. Group D also includes products or work that is in support of Group A and B categories, such as an internal grant that leads to a peer-reviewed publication.

- Under-review first/corresponding or contributing authored articles in a peer-reviewed academic journal with an established impact factor
- Under-review competitive (peer-reviewed) external grant.
- In-press or published article in a peer-reviewed academic journal with no impact factor, in which the candidate is a contributing author.
- Work on funded grant proposal activities for which the candidate is not the Primary Investigator.
- Funded competitive internal grant.
- Non-peer-reviewed presentations (paper or poster) at conferences.
- Publications in non-peer-reviewed proceedings of international, national or regional academic conferences.
- Consultancies, products or inventions that relate directly to their research.
- Development and implementation of a professionally-oriented training workshop.
- Participation in professional meetings as a committee member or organizer.
- Service as a reviewer for scholarly journals or membership in review panels for research grants.
- Supervision of student researchers engaged in candidate's research.

2.1. Sources of Evidence

The Department RTP Committee will utilize multiple sources of evidence to evaluate the candidate's scholarship. The primary sources of evidence include: 1) a current curriculum vitae, 2) a self-assessment, and 3) index of evidence (and evidence file).

6. **Curriculum vitae:** Note all changes since the last review by formatting the appropriate text in bold
7. **Self-assessment:** Candidates will document their scholarly plans, proposals, and progress in their self-assessment. This narrative should describe the contributions of their research and its significance to their discipline. The Department RTP Committee will evaluate these documents to determine how and whether they meet the criteria. It is expected that candidates will show in subsequent RTP cycles how they have implemented feedback received.

8. ***Index of Supplemental Evidence (and Evidence File)***: Candidates shall provide a file of evidence that documents the scholarly work described in the CV and self-assessment. Candidates are required to include evidence of scholarly accomplishments that are new since the last RTP cycle in their supplemental evidence file.

2.2. Requirements for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Scholarly products that were in progress or review before hire but completed during the probationary period will be accepted as evidence. In order to meet department expectations for promotion to associate professor, the candidate is expected to complete the following minimal criteria:

Required

- One product from Group A. An additional four products of which two must be from Groups A, B, or C, and the remaining two from any Group.

2.3. Requirements for Tenure and Promotion to Professor

Scholarly products completed after the last tenure/promotion review will be considered as evidence. In order to meet department expectations for promotion to professor, the candidate is expected to complete the following minimal criteria:

- One product from Group A. An additional three products from any Group.

3. Department Criteria for Service to the University and Community

Candidates in the Department of AHES are expected to equitably participate in department, program, college, and university service needs. The Department also values community service work undertaken by its faculty.

3.1. Department and Program-Level Service

Department and program service needs include, but are not limited to::

- Assistance with departmental and program-level tasks
- Service on departmental and program-level committees (e.g., RTP)
- Service as Department Chair
- Service as Program Coordinator
- Development of department and program-level initiatives
- Conduct of curricular assessment activities and program reviews
- Management of specialized teaching facilities
- Club organization/advising
- Coordinating department program reviews and assessment activities
- Maintaining department and/or program webpages

It is also expected that candidates provide effective student advising (starting in their second semester). Evidence of student advising includes:

- Scheduling and attending office hours
- Demonstrating proficiency with relevant program curricula
- Participating in department and program registration advising sessions

3.2. College and University-Level Service

College and university-level service opportunities include, but are not limited to:

- Academic Senate, Senate Committees (e.g. EPC, APARC), and Senate Subcommittees (e.g. AFS, ATISS, GSS)
- University-level administrative committees (e.g., Sustainability Committee)
- College-level administrative committees (e.g., Curriculum Subcommittee, RTP)
- Administration-led taskforces
- University-wide search committees
- Service, coordination, and/or mentorship on college or university-wide programs (e.g. McNair Scholars, SSURI, SASSy)
- Service to university programs (e.g., Center for Teaching and Educational Technology, HUB Cultural Center, etc.)

3.3. Service to the Community

Sonoma State faculty have a long tradition of engagement and service with the broader community, from the local community to larger state, national or world communities. Service outside the campus community can take many forms, but the Department RTP Committee will attach greater value to activities that utilize the candidate's training or skills, have educational value, and/or enhance the reputation of the AHES department, its programs, and the university. Examples of community service may include, but are not limited to, the following

- serving as a board member or similar participation for an external nonprofit, educational, governmental organization
- participation in local/regional nonprofits, agencies, or community organizations
- pro bono or reduced rate consulting, coaching or other professional workspeaker to a community or a professional association

3.4. Sources of Evidence

The Department RTP Committee will utilize multiple sources of evidence to evaluate the candidate's service. The primary sources of evidence include: 1) a current curriculum vitae, 2) a self-assessment, and 3) index of evidence (and evidence file).

1. **Curriculum vitae:** Note all changes since the last review by bolding the appropriate text.
2. **Self-assessment:** Candidates should describe the goals, time commitment, scope,

responsibilities and contributions made in service activities. Candidates for professor should present a narrative that outlines incremental deepening of service since promotion to associate.

3. ***Index of Supplemental Evidence (and Evidence File)***: Candidates shall provide a file of evidence that documents the service described in the CV and self-assessment. Candidates are required to include evidence of service that is new since the last RTP cycle in their supplemental evidence file.

3.5. Requirements for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Department and Program-Level Service: Participation in two department or program service tasks and initiatives per year. Additionally, beginning in the second semester of the first year, provide effective student advising.

College and University-Level Service: Completion of at least three years of service combined on college or university-level committees, subcommittees, task forces, initiatives, etc.

Community Service: Ongoing substantive contributions of one or more forms of community service. Candidates are encouraged to check with their committees for guidance on opportunities outside the list provided above.

3.6. Requirements for Promotion to Professor

Associate professors are expected to show ongoing substantive participation and leadership in department, college, university, and community service. Across the period from associate professor to recommendation for promotion to professor, in order to meet department expectations, the candidate is expected to complete the following minimal criteria:

Department and Program-Level Service: Ongoing yearly participation in two department or program service tasks and initiatives per year. Candidates for Professor must also demonstrate leadership contributions such as serving as Department Chair, Program Coordinator, RTP Chair, and Search Committee Chair. Candidates must also continue providing effective student advising in their respective major, minor, and/or graduate programs.

College and University-Level Service: Candidates for Professor should complete at least three years of service on a college or university-level committee, subcommittee, task force, initiative, etc. Service time as Department Chair exempts a candidate from an equivalent amount of service time required in this section.

Community Service: Ongoing, consistent substantive contributions of one or more forms of community service.

4. Criteria for Early Tenure and/or Early Promotion

Recommendations for early tenure and/or promotion are made only when a candidate's record is exceptional in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Evidence should exceed department criteria for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor for all three evaluation areas.

The Department is unlikely to recommend early tenure for candidates who received service credit upon their appointment to Assistant Professor. One or more years of service credit already allows the candidate to apply for tenure earlier than the 6th probationary year. We find it unlikely that the equivalent of six years of progress in teaching, research and service can be sufficiently demonstrated in four years or fewer. Note: Service credit granted towards promotion to Assistant Professor does not preclude a recommendation of early promotion to Professor as these are separate timelines.