

**RTP Guidelines  
Department of Child and Adolescent Development (ChAD)  
Lurie College of Education  
San José State University**

**Original Approved by the Department's Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty  
on  
September 26, 2017 by a Unanimous Vote of 10-0 (2 members absent)**

**Revised and approved on Dec. 5, 2017**

**These departmental guidelines supplement the University RTP Policy S15-8 Guidelines and are inclusive and not exclusive in nature. They shall not be used to exclude accomplishments from consideration that were unanticipated when the guidelines were created. When candidates submit genuine accomplishments that were not anticipated in the guidelines, the accomplishments will be assessed using the more general language of the policy on Criteria and Standards.**

#### I. Overview of the Department

The department of Child and Adolescent Development (ChAD), one of only two undergraduate programs in the Lurie College of Education, has FTES that typically exceed 450 with approximately 750 majors. ChAD offers a BA through one of three pathways--subject matter preparation for a multiple subject teaching credential program after graduation or preparation for professions that serve children and families in either early child care or community settings. Because the ChAD BA prepares students for a wide range of careers with children and families, the ChAD major covers development from birth to emerging adulthood (approximately age 25). ChAD also offers six GE Courses (3 lower division and 3 upper division) and serves between 1,400 and 1,500 students per year. Several of our courses (both GE and Major) are required courses in other majors. In addition to the BA, ChAD offers a popular minor as well as a small masters (MA) program for students who want to pursue advanced studies in the field for professional or academic purposes.

ChAD faculty are hired with the expectation that they will be able to teach a variety of courses. In addition to their teaching, faculty are expected to make scholarly contributions to advance basic theory related to child and adolescent development and/or practical applications to benefit children and families. Faculty in the department engage in research with children at different ages, with some focusing on adolescents and emerging adults and others focusing on infants and toddlers or children in middle childhood, and faculty often extend their research to include, or even focus on, adults who influence children's lives (e.g., preschool teachers, parents, mentors). Additionally, ChAD faculty conduct research in a range of contexts involving children and their families such as juvenile justice, foster care, preschools, museums, libraries, etc. Regardless of the focus of faculty research, ChAD faculty are expected to produce a coherent body of scholarly research.

Finally, faculty are expected to engage in service to the department (engaging in both work done as a "committee of the whole" as well as on sub-committees), college (with the caveat that there are relatively few committees at the college level to serve on and that even fewer are appropriate or open to junior faculty), and to the university.

#### II. Criteria for Teaching

Due to the large number of students and small number of faculty in the department, successful candidates will demonstrate the ability to teach effectively in a range of courses as indicated by the criteria outlined in policy S15- 8 which assess effective teaching as being indicated by “taking measures to correct any problems,” peer observations that are “supportive,” and, “student evaluations, taking into account the nature, subject, number of times taught and level of classes taught, [that] are generally within the norms by the end of the review period.”

Peer observations are conducted at minimum once per year for tenure track faculty (less frequently for those who are Associate or Full Professors). While evidence of effective teaching includes student evaluations within the norms of the department, college and university, the department recognizes that new courses, new preparations, or certain content topics at times receive lower scores compared to well-established, previously taught courses or courses with more accessible content. Thus the department RTP committee takes these factors into account and assesses the candidate’s performance in light of a general pattern of teaching effectiveness. Candidates who take steps to respond to and improve upon indicators of effectiveness are viewed positively. While the department values curricular flexibility to meet teaching needs, which frequently vary from semester to semester, it also recognizes that there may be times where candidates must specialize in a specific set of courses. Therefore, it is expected that candidates will demonstrate varying levels of breadth and depth of teaching across the years of review depending on departmental and faculty needs.

Additionally, the department values rigor and curricular innovation. When new courses are developed, they are developed either by the curriculum committee or a subcommittee and then reviewed and finalized by the curriculum committee. Faculty serve as course coordinators to ensure consistency and quality in courses taught across multiple sections. When teaching a course, faculty are encouraged to engage in curricular innovation within the basic course structure by developing innovative assignments, use of high impact practices (such as field work, student learning communities, service-learning, capstones, etc.), integration of technology to enhance learning, among other strategies. ChAD faculty and instructors are encouraged to develop rigorous assignments that may include academic research, multiple written assignments, observations or fieldwork, and opportunities for student feedback. While these assignments may take different forms, ChAD courses are typically writing intensive with a significant demand on faculty to spend time, throughout the semester, on grading and providing feedback to students.

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness will be made holistically with an eye toward balancing student evaluations, peer evaluations, curricular innovation, and rigor. The departmental guidelines for teaching follow the University Guidelines. However, given that the departmental expectations and opportunities differ slightly from what may be assumed in the language provided in the university guidelines, we provide examples for the levels of “baseline” and “good” within the context of this department.

	<b>Teaching</b>
Unsatisfactory	“The candidate has not documented teaching accomplishments that meet the baseline level as described below.”
Baseline	“The candidate has taught assigned courses that are well crafted and appropriate for the catalogue description. The candidate has taken measures to correct any problems identified earlier in either direct observations or prior performance evaluations. Recent observations are supportive. Student evaluations, taking into account the nature, subject, number of times taught and level of classes taught, are generally within the norms by the end of the review period.”

	<p><i>Example of baseline: Candidate has demonstrated adequate quality of instruction (indicated by steps taken to correct problems, supportive observations, and student evaluations within norm) in assigned courses, teaching in alignment with the course curriculum established by the department (noting there is no departmental expectation that faculty independently design courses). In alignment with the departmental expectation that faculty teach a range of courses, tenure track faculty should demonstrate movement toward breadth in types of courses taught prior to tenure by demonstrating adequate quality of instruction in at least 3 courses prior to tenure and promotion. Tenured faculty should demonstrate continued breadth in teaching over the period under review by demonstrating adequate quality of instruction (updating content and pedagogical approaches, as well as reflecting current research) in at least 3 courses over the period of review.</i></p>
Good	<p>“In addition to the baseline as described above, the candidate has documented a degree of innovation within the teaching assignment. This could mean that the candidate has effectively taught an unusually wide range of courses, or that the candidate has created one or more new courses to fill important curricular needs, or that the candidate has documented the use of high impact practices in teaching. Candidates meeting this level of achievement have at least some student evaluations above the norms, when taken in context of the nature, subject, and level of classes taught.”</p> <p><i>Example of Good: While department expectations include the ability to teach a range of courses, there is a need to balance depth of instructional experience with breadth and other departmental needs. Thus a candidate may be rated as good through multiple pathways including but not limited to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>demonstrating adequate quality of instruction in a moderate range of courses (3+) as well as innovation within those courses (creative assignments, use of high impact teaching practices, or informal data collection to evaluate effectiveness of teaching strategies); OR</i></li> <li>• <i>demonstrating adequate quality of instruction in an unusually wide range of courses (5+); OR</i></li> <li>• <i>creation of one or more new courses to fill important curricular needs.</i></li> </ul>
Excellent	<p>“In addition to a good performance as described above, the candidate has either engaged in a higher level of curricular innovation than described above, or documented widespread positive impacts for student success, or achieved both student and peer evaluations that are consistently above the norms when taken in context of the nature, subject, and level of classes taught. Excellent teachers may have received recognition or awards for their teaching, they may have mentored other teachers, or they may have created curriculum that is adopted at other institutions.”</p>

### III. Criteria for Scholarly, Artistic and/or Professional Achievement

The department expects that faculty will maintain active scholarship and professional activity related to the field of Child and Adolescent Development, which covers infancy through emerging adulthood. Faculty in the department engage in research with children at different ages, with some focusing on adolescents and emerging adults and others focusing on infants and toddlers or children in middle childhood, and faculty often extend their research to include, or even focus on, adults who influence children’s lives (e.g., preschool teachers, parents, or mentors). Additionally, ChAD faculty conduct research in a range of contexts involving children and their families such as juvenile justice, foster care, preschools, museums, libraries, etc.

In line with existing University policy, the department expects that tenured faculty should have developed a consistent and coherent body of research, though this expectation is balanced with the recognition that areas of scholarship will evolve and change over the course of a career. Indicators of scholarly productivity may include (but are not limited to) conference presentations, book chapters, books, edited volumes, contributions to encyclopedia or handbooks, successful grant applications, and/or peer reviewed publications. In line with the field of Child and Adolescent Development, the department values research that meets the standards of peer review. This may include a range of scholarly works such as quantitative or qualitative empirical studies, meta-analyses, theoretical work, edited book chapters, etc. in which there is evidence of a rigorous peer review process. Peer reviewed publications will be weighted more heavily in evaluations of scholarly productivity than other forms of scholarship. Conference presentations that have passed through peer review are also valued as an indicator of progress toward (but not in lieu of) peer reviewed publications.

Within the field of Child and Adolescent Development, co-authoring is common. Depending on the journal and the context of the project, the order of authorship takes on different meanings. Therefore, candidates are expected to explain their contributions to a co-authored paper within their dossier. Within this field, both basic and applied research are valued. While it is expected that scholarship in the department will enhance the field's understanding of the basic mechanisms of development, contexts of development, and/or strategies that enhance the development of children and families, this work often intersects with other fields of study. The department welcomes scholarship through interdisciplinary partnerships and recognizes that publications may be placed in a range of disciplinary areas (for example journals of social work, psychology, cognitive science, communications, technology, etc.).

The main criterion for evaluation of scholarly, artistic, and professional activity is the quality of the work and contribution to the field. This may be indicated by the number of successful publications but may also be indicated by fewer publications but in highly competitive journals (based on available indicators such as acceptance rate, impact factor or journal ranking), among other indicators. The department recognizes that there are multiple pathways to the development of a body of research that meets the University RTP policy guidelines within the ChAD context described above.

#### **IV. Evaluation of Service**

The department values faculty service at all levels including service to students, department, college, university, and community. However, the opportunities and need for service vary by level and are described below.

Service to students includes a limited number of official opportunities such as mentoring honors students, chairing a Master's Thesis committee, or involving students as Research Assistants or Instructional Assistants, but more frequently involves idiosyncratic forms of service to fill identified needs in the department (such as developing resources to meet the needs of the department, college, or university) as well as informal service to students (career advising, letters of recommendation, etc.). Service to the department is an important part of faculty duties and includes active service on all committees of the whole as well as participation in department subcommittees.

Faculty are expected to also engage in service at the college and/or university level. The department recognizes that there are limited opportunities for college service given the small size of the college. Thus while candidates are encouraged to branch out in their service beyond the department, they are encouraged to serve at the level (college or university) and area that best aligns with their interests and areas of expertise. This may also include participation in ad hoc college or university committees.

Finally, while service to the community is valued and encouraged when it aligns well with the candidate's interests and expertise, these forms of service are not required and are not meant to replace service to students, department or college. Service to the profession within Child and Adolescent Development is also valued, but given the limited opportunities for participation in professional associations, it is not required and should not replace service to students, department, college, and university.

The departmental guidelines for service align fully with the current University RTP policy to be interpreted in the context of departmental expectations outlined above. At all levels, where possible, candidates should provide documentation of service activities to illustrate their contributions.