

Criteria and Procedures for Retention, Tenure and Promotion Family, Interiors, Nutrition & Apparel (FINA) Department Effective, Fall 2024

The mission of the Family, Interiors, Nutrition & Apparel (FINA) Department is to provide a transformative student experience which advances understanding of contemporary issues that impact the food, shelter, clothing, and relationship needs of individuals, families, and communities and which leads to career pathways.

The core of each FINA program is to encourage critical thought, diverse ways of understanding, inclusive and equitable pedagogy, and the development of professional practices which will enhance the quality of life for those whom our students will serve.

The FINA Department is accredited by the Council for Accreditation of the American Association of Family & Consumer Sciences whose mission is to ‘elevate the profession by inspiring research, leadership, and service to empower individuals, families and communities.’ The essence of our department is founded on these principals which help guide our teaching, professional development and service, with expected outcomes that positively impact the quality of life for individuals, families and communities.

The FINA Department is dedicated to faculty and works in various ways to ensure faculty success and growth. Among these are our dedication to building community, inter-departmental collaboration, and creating a developmental process for retention, tenure, and promotion. We provide service to faculty in the form of committee support. The Retention, Tenure and Promotion committee is committed to providing faculty support within their professional growth and development as members of the department and San Francisco State University. The FINA 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 S24-241).

The FINA department understands and respects unique faculty attributes and is committed to collectively supporting each individual on their path to tenure and promotion.

The purpose of department RTP criteria is to:

- Provide transparency related to the expectations for faculty to succeed within the department, college, and university.
- Assist in the formal documentation of unique contributions of faculty members.
- Provide a foundation of support for ongoing professional growth.
- Ensure candidates successfully navigate the Retention, Tenure and Promotion process as educators and scholars.

Candidate Evaluation Process, Expectations, and Criteria

Process

- Candidates provide all documentation as outlined for the Working Personnel Action File (eWPAF) received from Faculty Affairs upon hire.
- Within the FINA Department, there are two independent levels of review in the RTP process:
 - 1) Review by the RTP committee of evidence in the eWPAF,
 - 2) Review by the Department Chair of evidence in eWPAF and RTP Committee report.
- The RTP committee meets with all faculty going through Retention Tenure, and Promotion processes regarding preparation of their eWPAFs. The purpose of these meetings is to provide guidance, open dialogue opportunities, and support to faculty during their navigation within the RTP process. (In some cases, the RTP Committee may include faculty from outside the FINA Department).

Expectations and Criteria

- For each category of review (Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Achievement and Growth, and Contributions to Campus and Community), candidates are required to submit a self-summary narrative statement, each not to exceed 750 words.
- These narratives are intended to provide a clear overview for each category. Examples include:

Teaching Effectiveness:

- Teaching philosophy
- Curriculum enhancement and / or development
- SETE Score comments related to both strong scores and those below those expected
- Research areas brought into curricula
- CEETL teaching based course completion
- Professional development that is integrated into the classroom experience for students

Professional Achievement and Growth:

- Summary of research track
- Publication (works completed, under review, in process)
- Presentation (e.g., structured classroom research sharing, conferences)
- Creative works (e.g., garment design, commercial interior design/architecture)
- Impacts of research track on teaching, to the bodies of knowledge within program areas, community engagement, etc.

Service

- Evaluative summary of service to FINA Department, CHSS, SFSU, and the greater community (the need for the service, its impact, who benefits, etc.)
- Retention candidates may demonstrate consistent progress towards fulfilling requirements for Tenure and Promotion utilizing the framework noted directly above.

- 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 consistent and positive 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, means of assessment of each student learning outcome, and the course’s contributions to degree program objectives and/or university requirements. The faculty members shall include syllabi for all classes taught and discuss their development in the narrative 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. Advising includes both undergraduate and graduate students.

Mentorship. Candidates shall discuss their student mentorship and importance of this contact to student success in their narrative. Evidence of this mentorship is encouraged and may provide pathways to scholarship for both the faculty and the students (e.g., paper, poster, project, FCS 685, etc.).

Student Evaluations. The purpose of class evaluations by students is to give instructors feedback from which they can make changes and improve their teaching as well as recognizing faculty strengths. All courses taught by FINA 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. Both positive and negative changes shall be acknowledged and explained in the narrative 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 then explained in the candidate's narrative statement.

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

Candidate Teaching Effectiveness Evaluations Fall 20XX

	# of respondents / class enrollment	OverallMean	*Dept.Mean
Course 1			
Course 2			
Course 3			

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

Candidate Teaching Effectiveness Evaluations Spring 20XX

	# of respondents / class enrollment	OverallMean	*Dept.Mean
Course 1			
Course 2			
Course 3			

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

Candidate 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 a consistently strong record of teaching as evidenced through robust SETE scores and other forms of student success (e.g., community projects and presentations to local non-profit organization, presenting at campus research symposium). 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 FINA 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.

Documentation. Peer review of one's scholarship is required. Candidates are required to submit documentation to support the refereed or masked peer review process. In cases of multiple authorship, candidates shall specify their contributions and engagement within their narrative statement. Additionally, candidate narrative shall provide verification of quality, impact, and contribution of their scholarship to the field of study which will be used in the evaluation of each professional achievement and growth portfolio. Within the self-summary narrative statement, candidates shall discuss areas which can include the following: a journal's reputation, the scholarly reputation of the editor, indicators that the publication has been widely read and recognized, creative work exhibition reputation, and other indicators as they relate to the particular research and presentation area.

External Review. Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion must submit to the RTP committee a list of at least four external peers of higher academic rank 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 external peer should be someone who is able to professionally evaluate candidate work. The date for submission to the committee shall be determined by the RTP Chair and the candidate. The recommendations by the office of Faculty Affairs for conducting this external review will be followed. See details on the Faculty Affairs webpage on RTP resources: <https://facaffairs.sfsu.edu/rtp>

For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, it is expected that candidates will have evidence of scholarship, including publications, manuscripts in progress, creative published or in progress creative works, as well as annual presentations. Scholarship may include book reviews, journal article reviews, published critical analysis pieces, curriculum development, published industry newsletters or published white papers, and submitted grants, 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 journal articles and/or juried creative works,

OR

Three (3) peer reviewed, published scholarly journal articles and two (2) scholarly works such as published monographs, book, book chapters, or substantially funded individual external grants greater than the maximum internal funding amount for the year awarded from recognized pertinent organization

AND

2. Annual or (averaging one per year) presentation in their area of scholarly interest at professional conferences or meetings.

For Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, candidates are expected to produce scholarship at a rigorous level which shall include at least one scholarly work as a single or primary or lead author. Candidates are also expected to show expertise or national prominence in at least one subject area.

Beginning with the closing date of the WPAF for Promotion to Associate Professor, candidates are expected to fulfill #1 and #2 as follows:

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, books, book chapters, juried creative works, or substantially funded grants from one or more recognized pertinent organizations

AND

2. Annual or (averaging one per year) presentations in their area of scholarly interest at professional conferences or meetings.

III. CONTRIBUTIONS TO CAMPUS AND COMMUNITY

The Department regards internal service 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.

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

The following outline demonstrates a progression of on-campus service each year through tenure and promotion, including promotion to full professor and for post-tenure review. 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

Faculty should provide documentation that tracks and quantifies their service commitments. Faculty should request 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. 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.

Contributions to Department, College, and Campus

Annual service to the FINA 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 department level, college level, or university committees.

Candidates for Professor are required to serve on university-wide committees, such as the Academic Senate, Board of Appeals and Review, and Online Education Committee, etc. All candidates shall include in their narrative:

- 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.

Refer to Service Possibilities for CHSS Faculty:

https://chss.sfsu.edu/sites/default/files/documents/Service_Possibilities_for_CHSS_Faculty.pdf

Contributions to the Community and to the Profession

Annual service to the community and to the profession are 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.

Examples of advanced leadership for Associate Professor to Professor would include serving as the chair of a committee, president of a society, editor of a journal, or an associate editor.

Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor are required to provide active service through the opportunities listed above.

Candidates for Professor are required to demonstrate advanced leadership in their service to the field.

All candidates shall include in their narrative 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

Effective collaboration among faculty members is important to meeting the FINA department educational, scholarly, professional, and community responsibilities. 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 FINA Department, College of Health & Social Sciences, and San Francisco State University.