

Service Possibilities for CHSS Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

CHSS suggests that departments be more specific about service expectations outlined in RTP policies, including what is expected at various points along the trajectory to tenure and promotion from assistant to associate professor, as well as expectations for promotion from associate to full professor and post-tenure review. This document is an example of the type of guidance departments may elect to provide and is focused only on campus-level service.

Departments may wish to articulate how they expect on and off-campus service commitments to be balanced. For example, 50% may be dedicated to campus service and 50% distributed between the profession and community more broadly. While recognizing that on-campus service is vital for shared governance throughout the university, faculty frequently engage in CSU system-wide service, service to professional associations, and service to various communities outside of the university or profession.

The purpose of this document is to inform faculty of the various types of service opportunities on campus, along with a suggested amount of on-campus service expectations. It may be used by department chairs and RTP committees to provide guidance to candidates for tenure and/or promotion. It may also be used by faculty interested in learning about on-campus service opportunities or expanding their service portfolios.

Faculty are encouraged to speak with their department's RTP committee and chair about how they can use the information that follows alongside their RTP criteria to make decisions about on-campus service opportunities, including the quality and impact of their contributions to campus and community.

First is an outline that demonstrates a progression of on-campus service each year through tenure and promotion, including promotion to full professor and for post-tenure review. Because each department in CHSS has unique workload responsibilities, departments should adapt this progression with the appropriate amount of suggested service roles to fit their departmental needs and expectations. CHSS recommends that all departments include an example of service progression in their RTP criteria. The details, amount of service, and types of service, however, are up to each department to decide.

Committees are integral for the effective operations of a university, college, and department. A committee—which may alternatively be called a task force, advisory group, etc.—is defined as a group of two or more individuals who voluntarily commit to or are selected to undertake a task to:

- a) Inform and guide a larger group (and/or)
- b) Make decisions on behalf of the group (and/or)
- c) Represent a larger group (and/or)
- d) Collect data to guide an informed decision (and/or)
- e) Constitute any of the above-mentioned combination of responsibilities

The outline provided here uses the word “chair” to indicate leadership on department, college, or university committees. However, leadership can take place at many levels, in different roles, and

in various forms outside of formal leadership positions. CHSS encourages all departments to include a statement about expectations for leadership progression throughout the tenure and promotion process, along with examples of what leadership outside of formal positions constitutes. Departments should also support faculty creativity in taking on a range of leadership responsibilities.

Faculty should be encouraged to provide documentation that tracks and quantifies their service commitments. A tracking sheet like the one below might be a helpful tool for faculty to use as they partake in service opportunities.

Service opportunity	Time commitment (hrs/wks/semester)	Contributions

Faculty should also be encouraged to request that letters documenting their service roles provide specific examples of their informal, invisible, or shared leadership roles and demonstrate the impact and meaning of their contributions. Please refer to the attached sample letters. Qualities of an effective letter of support for contributions to campus and community include:

1. The letter writer should note the committee, task force, or organization for which service was rendered;
2. The specific length of time the candidate performed service activities should be included;
3. Specific types of tasks the candidate engaged in and the outcomes that were produced should be detailed;
4. The quality of work should be addressed;
5. The impact of the service work should be mentioned; and
6. The interpersonal and professional qualities of the candidate might be addressed.

Second is a working overview of on-campus service opportunities/assignments, which is not meant to be an exhaustive list. While many of these opportunities are elected, others are appointed. Faculty are encouraged to speak with their department chair, RTP committee, Academic Senate representative or the CHSS Associate Dean if they are interested in obtaining an appointed position.

Sample Progression of On-Campus Service

Assistant Professor

Year 1 – Year 2

- One or two department committees/services

Year 3 – Year 4

- One or two department-wide committees/services, chair of one of these or an additional committees/services

Year 5 – Year 6

- Two department-wide committees/services, chair of one of these or a third department committees/services
- One college committee/service or one university committee/service

Associate Professor

Year 7 – Year 8

- Two department-wide committees/services, chair of one of these or a third department committee/service
- One college committee/service and one university committee/service

Year 9 – Year 10

- Two department-wide committees/services, chair of one of these or a third department committees/services
- One college committee/service and one university committee/service with a chair position for one of these committees/services, or an additional college or university committee/service

Year 11

- Two department-wide committees/services, chair of one of these or a third department committee/service
- One college committee/service and one university committee/service with a chair position for one of these committees/services, or an additional college or university committee/service

Full Professor/Post Tenure Review

- Two department-wide committees/services, chair of one of these or third department committee/service
- One college committee/service and one university committee/service with a chair position for one of these committees/services, or an additional college or university committee/service

Overview of On-Campus Service Opportunities/Assignments

Department or Program Level Committees & Service Assignments

Undergraduate, Certificate, or Graduate Program Coordinator
Department Chair/School Director
Departmental RTP Committee
Faculty or Administrator Search Committee
Curriculum Committee
Program Review/Assessment Committee
Department/Program Scholarship Committee(s)
Graduate Recruitment/Admissions Committee
Advisor to Student Association/Group/Chapter
Ad Hoc Committees or Task Forces

CHSS College Level Committees & Task Forces

Appointed Positions

Teaching Task Force
Service Task Force
Scholarship Task Force
RTP Committee for another CHSS Department
Faculty Director of CHSS Center or Program

Elected Positions

Elections Committee
Leave with Pay Committee
Research and Professional Development Committee
Student Success Council

University Level Committees & Service Assignments

Academic Freedom Committee
Academic Program Review Committee
Academic Senate Representative
Advisory Board for University Institute or Center
All-University Committee on International Programs
Baccalaureate Requirements Committee
Baccalaureate Requirements Lower Division Certification Committee (LDCC)
Baccalaureate Requirements Upper Division Certification Committee (UDCC)
Center of Equity and Excellence in Teaching and Learning Board (C.E.E.T.L.B.)
Exceptional Assigned Time Award Committee (ETAC)
Experimental College Faculty Advisor
Faculty Director of University Institute or Center
Faculty Director of Other Special Projects/Initiatives

Graduate Council
Honorary Degree Committee
Institute/Center Advisory Boards or Steering Committees (e.g., ICCE, CCI, HEI)
Library Advisory Committee
Online Education Committee
Professional Development Council
Search Committee for Deans/MPPs/Executive Administrators
SF State Foundation Board Member
University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee
University Advancement Activities Advisory Committee
University Committee on Written English Proficiency
University Interdisciplinary Council
University Research Council
University Sabbatical Committee
University Tenure and Promotion Committee

Sample Letters

Dear Dr. Great:

This letter is to thank you for your service as the elected representative from the College of All Things Good to SF State's Professional Development Council (PDC) in AY 2014-2015, when I chaired the PDC. I appreciate your consistent attendance and thoughtful participation in that year's discussions and activities.

I recall that our most notable activities that year were related to finding ways in which the PDC could best contribute to conversations related to the integration of scholarship and teaching on campus. Your contributions to those discussions, especially the additional research you conducted on teacher-scholar models, were quite valuable. Among other things, the research you conducted helped shape the "Integrating Teaching and Scholarship" Affinity Group Meeting at the January 2015 Faculty Retreat.

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to enhancing SF State's environment for positive professional development, including encouraging discourse on a range of engaged teacher-scholar models.

Best regards,

Dear Colleagues,

As you review Professor Pretend's WPAF, I would like to add my strong support for her promotion in the category of service. Professor Pretend served on Pi Council, starting her term before my appointment as Dean of the Division of Pi and continuing for a year thereafter. Our regular meetings through Pi Council gave me the opportunity to work closely with her and to draw personal inspiration from her commitment to graduate education in general and to SFSU students in particular. I am also thankful to her careful and generous guidance to me when I needed help in my new position.

Indeed, Professor Pretend's contribution, far from being a mere checkmark on the list of required university-wide service, was thoughtful, displayed leadership, and was instrumental in increasing the visibility of graduate education. Pretend, in her role on Pi Council, which she had chaired before my tenure, was keen on looking at every policy and program for review through the lens of social justice and within the framework of our shared commitment to student success.

Her belief in the role of graduate education in providing opportunities and in creating a better university for all, graduate and undergraduate alike, led her, in collaboration with my predecessor, Professor Past, to a comprehensive quantitative and qualitative research project. The project culminated in a data-driven report on "Understanding the Roles and Contributions of Pi Students." To this day, the report provides me with useful arguments to make in favor of more resource allocation or simply bringing more attention to graduate education.

I continue to see Professor Pretend in several committees on which I serve, and keep on admiring her commitment to the University, the impact of her contributions, and her constant selfless collegiality. It is a pleasure to know her and work with her.

Regards,

Dear PACE Retention, Tenure, Promotion Committee members,

It is my great pleasure to lend my support to the promotion review of Dr. Fancy. In my twelve years at the Institute of Amazing Work (IAW), I have had the opportunity to work with dozens of faculty who choose engagement work as an important dimension of their academic portfolio. Dr. Fancy has demonstrated a deep commitment to this work and has excelled in both the practice of engaged scholarship and in helping our students, colleagues, and community partners address issues of community need. Dr. Fancy's contribution has bridged the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship, and her work has been essential to the success of IAW.

Dr. Fancy's contribution to IAW and campus has extended well beyond her classroom. In 2012, because of her expertise and recognition by her colleagues of the value of her scholarship, Dr. Fancy was invited to participate in a multi-disciplinary faculty working group to contribute to the strategic planning conversations for our learning program, as well as to develop/identify key learning outcomes that would demonstrate impact, which would be implemented campus-wide for all current and future designated courses. The working group laid the foundational work that will now guide our efforts as we participate in the spring 2021 phase II CSU Chancellor's Office system-wide attributes and learning taxonomy matrix implementation.

Dr. Fancy has been involved in and/or led key initiatives that are at the core of IAW's programming. In our efforts to further engage SF State students in creating long-term, sustainable change in their communities, IAW launched the Fantastic Fellows program to support, train, and develop their commitments to social justice as active agents of change, as well as advance campus dialogue and further viewpoint in diversity and inclusivity. Dr. Fancy not only provided feedback on the development of the Fantastic Fellows program and curriculum, she also led the assessment of the program's inaugural year. Her pilot program assessment report that she provided to IAW in spring 2017 led to significant insights and programmatic changes that have allowed the program to continually thrive and develop.

Additionally, for more than twelve years, Dr. Fancy has continued to work on projects related to IAW's *Local Initiative*, a partnership with the San Francisco Office of the City Administrator. From 2015-2016, Dr. Fancy served as IAW's Principal Investigator for the grant we received from the nonprofit organization, Team Rubicon. Founded in 2010, Team Rubicon deploys military veterans with first responders to rapidly deploy emergency response teams across the United States and around the world to provide immediate relief to those impacted by disasters and humanitarian crises. Dr. Fancy led a team of six SF State graduate students to assist with the implementation of Team Rubicon's vision of their *Resilience Leadership Development Program (RLDP)*. Dr. Fancy's work produced Community Action Plans, a three-year leadership strategic plan, and led to a Community Resilience Summit that was held at SF City Hall. Over 300 local and national community leaders and government officials, including former SF Mayor, Ed Lee, attended the summit.

Finally, Dr. Fancy has been a contributing member of the IAW Faculty & Community Advisory Council. Over the past several years, Dr. Fancy provided recommendations at key moments in IAW's recent history that had far-reaching implications. Most significantly, in 2016, when the

former IAW Faculty Director stepped down to retire, Dr. Fancy participated in discussions facilitated by the Provost about IAW's strategic vision and challenges in the immediate and long (5-10 years) term. Dr. Fancy also provided feedback in the position description and nomination and search process for a new Faculty Director position.

In summary, Dr. Fancy's contributions to the civic engagement and scholarship of the Institute both internally and externally, have only strengthened our impact and I look forward to the continued association with Dr. Fancy.

Sincerely,

Dear RTP Committee:

I am writing in praise of Dr. No's contributions to the Space Department RTP hiring committee, of which I was chair in 2018-19.

The committee that year was charged with eight actions, involving the retention of Drs. A, B, C, D, E, F, G and H. These professors represented three programs housed in the Space Department.

Dr. No was one of four members on the hiring committee and was a valuable asset to the committee in organizing, planning, and writing the committees' recommendations for each candidate. Of the actions, two required substantive reviews (Drs. A and B), and Dr. No was an especially important contributor to writing Dr. B's recommendation.

Dr. No's professionalism on this committee was exemplary, as it has been with other committees on which I have had the pleasure of serving with her. She was quick to reply to emails, was punctual, highly organized, and efficient in advancing the committee's goals. When I know that Dr. No will be on a committee I am involved in, I think, "Aaaah, things will go smoothly, as No's here!"

Dr. No's contributions to the PACE RTP committee is one example of her overall commitment to excellent service at San Francisco State University and should be lauded.

Sincerely,

September 5, 2022

RTP Committee
Department of XXXXX
San Francisco State University
San Francisco, CA 94132

Dear RTP Committee:

I am writing this letter to verify that Dr. Jane Doe, Assistant Professor of Wisdom, served on the university-wide Academic Integrity Committee from fall 2020 through the spring of 2022. Dr. Doe was extremely helpful on our committee. From the initial meeting, she volunteered to chair a sub-committee of our larger committee, and she led a small group of faculty members who ultimately produced a report about how more wisdom could be generated on the SF State campus. Dr. Doe showed a great deal of commitment to teamwork. She not only led a subcommittee, but also served as the primary co-author of the report. She regularly provided our larger committee with updates and helped with the cohesiveness of the entire group. She showed a great deal of initiative and followed through with all the tasks she agreed to complete. She even volunteered to address the SF State Academic Senate about the major findings of the report she and her sub-committee members wrote. Dr. Doe is a warm, engaged, and committed faculty member. The quality of her work is exemplary; she is thorough and her work for our committee has always been thoughtful and of high quality. The impact of her involvement on this committee is top-notch. The Academic Senate even adopted some of the language in her subcommittee's report, which directly influenced university policy.

I am very pleased to write a letter of support for Dr. Doe regarding her service on our committee. I would say that she is in the top 10% of faculty with whom I have worked on service-related activities.

Sincerely,

Dr. Abigail Adams
Professor of Wisdom
SF State University