

Criteria and Procedures for Retention, Tenure and Promotion Consumer and Family Studies/Dietetics Department

Approved by CFS/D faculty: 7/17/15

Approved by Dean Alvin Alvarez: 9/1/15

Approved by Provost Rosser 1/20/16

The mission of the Consumer and Family Studies/Dietetics Department is to prepare scholarly professionals who contribute to the well-being of individuals, families, communities and the institutions, industries and businesses which serve them. CFS/D curricula provide liberal and professional education in interior design, apparel design & merchandising, dietetics, nutrition & foodservice management, and child & family sciences. In addition, the Department fulfills California's Educational Master Plan by providing a comprehensive family and consumer sciences curriculum. The mission is aligned with the goals, mission, and strategic goals of SFSU.

The CFS/D Department criteria for Retention, Tenure and Promotion are in compliance with the broader San Francisco State University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) policy related to teaching effectiveness, professional achievement and growth, and contribution to campus and community (Academic Senate Policy F11-241). The purpose of having department criteria is to make explicit the expectations for faculty within the unit based on overall needs while recognizing the unique contributions of each individual faculty member. The criteria and procedures are designed for candidates to successfully navigate the Retention, Tenure and Promotion process as educators and scholars and to be strong contributors to the Department, College, University, and San Francisco Bay Area communities.

Candidate Evaluation Process, Expectations, and Criteria

Process

- Candidates shall provide all documentation as outlined for the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) received from Faculty Affairs upon hire.
- Within the Department, there are two independent levels of review in the RTP process: 1) Review by the RTP committee of evidence in the WPAF, and 2) Review by the Department Chair of evidence in WPAF and RTP Committee report.
- The RTP committee communicates formally at least once a year with all faculty up for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion regarding preparation of their WPAF and more frequently in years when a comprehensive review is required. The purpose of these meetings is to support faculty during their navigation within the RTP process.

Expectations and Criteria

- For each Criteria category of review (Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Achievement and Growth, and Contributions to Campus and Community), candidates are required to submit a self-summary statement, each not to exceed 750 words.
- Retention candidates shall show consistent progress towards fulfilling requirements for Tenure and Promotion.

- Candidates will normally be evaluated for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor at the same time as Tenure upon successful completion of each of the criteria I – III as outlined below.
- Since their last promotion, candidates seeking promotion from Associate Professor to Professor will demonstrate maintenance of a solid and strong record of teaching effectiveness (Criteria I), recognized expertise and leadership evidenced by both published scholarship and service contributing to the body of knowledge in their specific field of study (Criteria II), and leadership in their contributions to campus and community (Criteria III) as outlined below.

I. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Teaching effectiveness for all candidates up for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion is evaluated through the multiple assessment process below.

Peer Observations of Classroom Teaching. Classroom observations are conducted annually by a member of the RTP committee. Requests for additional observations by faculty other than RTP members may be made to the RTP committee Chair. Candidates will confer with the RTP Chair to determine the observation process as well as the appropriate class, date, and time to arrange for observation. A variety of classes are evaluated during the probationary period. Written peer evaluations are submitted to the candidate and RTP Committee.

Syllabi. Class syllabi are expected to show course rigor, currency of subject matter, good organization, clarity of student learning outcomes and expectations, and the course's contributions to degree program objectives and/or university requirements. The faculty member shall include syllabi for all classes taught and discuss their development in the self-summary statement.

Advising. Candidates shall help students navigate campus policies and develop an educational plan that is compatible with their academic and life goals leading to graduation in a timely manner. Candidates shall discuss their mentoring and importance of their student contact to student success in their self-statement.

Student Evaluations. The purpose of class evaluations by students is to give instructors feedback from which they can make changes and improve their teaching. All courses taught by CFS/D faculty shall be evaluated online by students through the San Francisco State University Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE) system as follows:

Qualitative Student Evaluations

The student online evaluation of classes includes an opportunity for students to comment on positive teaching qualities and to give constructive suggestions. These responses offer qualitative data which are also used in the discussion of the quantitative scores in the self-summary statement.

Quantitative Student Evaluations. It is expected that mean scores on Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness will be predominantly 1.00 to 1.99, where 1 is the highest and 5 is

the lowest on the six item university-wide quantitative instrument (section one of the instrument), and will be maintained in all courses taught. Comparisons shall be made to scores from the same course the candidate taught in previous years/semesters. Positive and negative changes shall be acknowledged and explained in the self-summary statement.

It is recognized that courses are diverse. Variables such as subject matter, class size, GE vs. major, elective vs. requirement, lab vs. lecture format, or graduate vs. undergraduate level may affect overall scores. These factors will be taken into consideration when quantitative scores are reviewed and are expected to be explained in the candidate's self-summary statement.

To present the summary of the numerical ratings, candidates are required to use the following formats for courses taught and include on your CV. See details on the Faculty Affairs website: http://facaffairs.sfsu.edu/sites/sites7.sfsu.edu.facaffairs/files/CV_formatF13.pdf

CFS/D Teaching Effectiveness Evaluations Fall 20XX

	# Enrolled in Course	# of Respondents	Overall Mean	*Dept. Mean
Course 1				
Course 2				
Course 3				

*Department means are provided to the candidate via email from SETE.

CFS/D Teaching Effectiveness Evaluations Spring 20XX

	# Enrolled in Course	# of Respondents	Overall Mean	*Dept. Mean
Course 1				
Course 2				
Course 3				

*Department means are provided to the candidate via email from SETE.

CFS/D Teaching Effectiveness Evaluations (Mean Scores) Compared to Previous Years

	Fall I	Spring I	Fall II	Spring II	Fall III	Spring III
Course 1						
Course 2						
Course 3						

For Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, candidates shall follow the above format and demonstrate continuing efforts to improve their teaching. In addition, they must demonstrate leadership in developing departmental teaching more broadly by contributing, for example, in:

- mentoring junior faculty,
- leading program assessment, or
- leading curriculum innovation and development.

II. PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AND GROWTH

The CFS/D Department embraces the vision of the College of Health and Social Sciences on defining scholarship broadly wherein opportunities can vary by individual specialization. The category of Professional Achievement and Growth is evaluated through the assessment process below. Faculty members are encouraged to obtain funding to the extent that such grants are needed to advance their scholarship, their professional agenda, and/or the welfare of the community. The CHSS views funding as a means to support scholarship rather than a goal of scholarship. The RTP committee will base its final assessment of professional achievement and growth on an evaluation of the quality and impact of the candidate's work. In evaluating the quality and impact of a scholarly piece, a range of factors will be considered, including, e.g.: the scholarly reputation of the journal or creative work exhibition, the editor/curator, the editorial board members, and other authors who have published/participated in those venues; acceptance rates; indicators that the work has been widely recognized (e.g., awards); and the number of citations of the candidate's work in other publications, among others. The assessments of the external reviewers will be considered in this overall evaluation.

Documentation. Peer review of one's scholarship is required. Candidates must submit documentation to support the refereed or blind peer review process. They must also submit documentation of the quality and impact of their scholarship as mentioned above. In cases of multiple authorship, candidates shall specify their contributions (as a percentage) within the CV reference and their self-summary statement. Candidates shall provide verification of quality and impact of their scholarship and contribution to the field of study which will be used in the evaluation of each professional achievement and growth portfolio.

External Review. Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion must submit to the RTP committee a list of three external peers of higher academic rank at institutions of equal or higher rank than SF State (and their contact information), which the RTP committee may use, in addition to other peers identified by the committee, to obtain an outside evaluation of the scholarship. The date for submission to the committee shall be decided by the RTP Chair and candidate. The recommendations by the office of Faculty Affairs for conducting this external review will be followed. See details on the Faculty Affairs website:

<http://facaffairs.sfsu.edu/sites/sites7.sfsu.edu/facaffairs/files/outsidereview5-2013.pdf>

For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, it is expected that candidates will have evidence of scholarship, including publications completed or in progress and presentations each year. This may include forms of scholarship such as book reviews, journal article reviews, published critical analysis pieces, curriculum development, published industry newsletters or published white papers, and submitted grant proposals, each of which will assist in developing a robust scholarship portfolio. By the end of the probationary period, #1 and #2 below are required:

1. Five (5) peer reviewed published scholarly journal articles

OR

Three (3) peer reviewed published scholarly journal articles and two (2) scholarly works such as published monographs, book, book chapters, juried creative works, or substantially funded grants,

AND

2. Annual presentations in their area of scholarly interest at professional conferences or meetings.

For Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, candidates are expected to show expertise or national prominence in at least one subject area. They are also expected to produce scholarship at a level that demonstrates growth from the associate professor level which must include scholarly works as a single- or lead author. This growth may be demonstrated in several ways including, e.g.: the development or expansion of theoretical models, use of sophisticated statistical analysis, use of advanced level and creative methodologies, and critical analysis of issues.

Beginning with the closing date of the WPAF for Promotion to Associate Professor, candidates are expected to fulfill #1 and #2 as follows and to provide documented evaluative information of rigor of work as defined above:

1. Five (5) with at least two (2) single- or lead authored peer reviewed published scholarly journal articles

OR

Three (3) with at least two (2) single- or lead authored peer reviewed published scholarly journal articles and two (2) scholarly works such as published monographs, books, book chapters, juried creative works, or substantially funded grants,

AND

2. Annual presentations in their area of scholarly interest at professional conferences or meetings.

III. CONTRIBUTIONS TO CAMPUS AND COMMUNITY

The Department regards service internal to SFSU and collaborative relationships with the broader community at the local, state, national or international level, as central to our mission and values. Contributions to campus and community are evaluated through the assessment process below.

Contributions to Department, College, and Campus

Annual service to the Department is required. Opportunities for service include, among others, serving on committees and serving as a faculty advisor to a student organization.

Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor are required to serve on college level or university committees. *Candidates for Professor* are required to serve on university-wide committees, such as the Academic Senate or university-wide special groups. All candidates shall include in their self-statement: a) the value and outcomes of the committee (e.g., policies, reports, resolutions, etc.), b) the role of the faculty member in delivering those outcomes, and c) whenever possible, the impact of one's service to students, the Department, College, University, Community, or Discipline.

Contributions to Community

Annual service to the Community and/or to the Profession is required. Opportunities for service include, among others, developing partnerships with community entities, serving on professional association committees, reviewing submitted abstracts for professional conferences, conducting accreditation reviews, reviewing textbook manuscripts, and serving on peer-reviewed journal boards.

Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor are required to be active participants in work of importance and relevance to the field. *Candidates for Professor* are required to demonstrate leadership in work of importance and relevance to the field. Candidates shall include in their self-summary statement: a) the value and outcomes of the service (e.g., policies, reports, resolutions, meaningful student participation, etc.), b) the role of the faculty member in delivering those outcomes, and c) whenever possible, the impact of one's service to students, the Department, College, University, Community, or Discipline.

Conclusion

Within the RTP process, it is important for candidates to achieve a balance that highlights their strengths while assuring that those accomplishments are consistent with the mission, policies, and procedures of the Department, College, and University. Candidates are encouraged to integrate their teaching, scholarship, and service. Effective teamwork among faculty members is important to meeting the department's educational, scholarly, professional, and community responsibilities.