

Muma College of Business Instructor Promotion Guidelines

In order to demonstrate appreciation for their many contributions to the University of South Florida (hereafter also referred to as “the University” or “USF”) and to encourage continued career development, the University provides a promotional career path for individuals who hold full-time, non-tenure track teaching positions. This document sets forth the promotion process guidelines for full-time, non-tenure track instructional faculty in the Muma College of Business, in accordance with the University Guidelines. This policy has been approved by the faculty of the Muma College of Business. Instructor promotion guidelines are published on the Muma College of Business website.

ELIGIBILITY

These guidelines apply to full-time faculty with the job titles of Instructor I and Instructor II.

Up to three years of full-time employment at USF as a Visiting Instructor or prior appointment comparable to that of Instructor may count toward the number of years required for promotion eligibility. Years employed as a Graduate Teaching Assistant or Adjunct do not count toward the number of years required for promotion eligibility, even if the teaching assignment was similar to the assignment of an Instructor. Individuals must have been awarded the appropriate degree associated with the primary duties as defined by the School in which the individual’s appointment resides.

The decision to apply for promotion rests with the individual, and there is no penalty for one’s choice not to apply nor for failure to be granted promotion after applying.

The candidate may withdraw the application for promotion at any stage in the process prior to the College Dean’s review.

In some cases, instructors may be asked or elect to assume significant alternative assignments. In such cases, all areas of assigned duty will be considered in the evaluation for promotion, but in all cases, **excellence in teaching** must be demonstrated.

REQUIREMENTS OF PROMOTION LEVELS

Promotion to Instructor II

Five (5) consecutive years of experience at Instructor I is typically required prior to consideration for promotion to Instructor II. Earlier eligibility may be considered for outstanding candidates. An outstanding candidate is one who has met all requirements for promotion to next level within a shortened time period.

Instructors will be considered for promotion to Instructor II on the basis of meritorious performance. **Excellence** in the principal assigned duty is required. If the applicant has multiple areas of assignment, **substantive contributions** are also required in proportion to the assignment(s). If an individual has equal primary FTE assignments, teaching will be considered as the primary area and ratings assigned accordingly.

The evaluation will be comprehensive and consistent with, but not solely determined by annual evaluations. General procedures for this evaluation are set out below.

Promotion to Instructor III

Five (5) years of experience at Instructor II is typically required prior to consideration for promotion to Instructor III. Earlier eligibility may be considered for outstanding candidates. An outstanding candidate is one who has met all

requirements for promotion to next level within a shortened time period.

Instructors will be considered for promotion to Instructor III on the basis of meritorious performance. Promotion to Instructor III recognizes not only continuing progress as an instructor, but may also consider leadership and contribution to teaching, scholarship, community engagement, or institutional success and acclaim. However, for purposes of promotion, the primary focus of the review must be the contributions made by the candidate in the area of teaching. It is required that at the end of the promotion review process, the conclusion is that **excellence** was demonstrated in the principal assigned duty. If the applicant has multiple areas of assignment, **substantive** contributions are also required in proportion to the assignment(s). If the applicant has equal primary FTE assignments, **teaching** will be designated as the primary area and ratings assigned accordingly. In assigning ratings for Instructor III, evaluating units should assess whether the individual has demonstrated continuous professional development and has achieved significant accomplishments in their primary area of assignment beyond that considered at the Instructor II review, based on criteria established by the college/school.

This evaluation will be comprehensive and consistent with, but not solely determined by, the annual evaluations obtained after reaching Instructor II. General procedures for this evaluation are set out below.

CRITERIA AND PROCESSES

Criteria for promotion outlined in this document are to be reviewed every five (5) years. The criteria should, at a minimum, include (i) definitions of Excellence of performance, (ii) a list of all supplementary documentation required for submission, and (iii) criteria to be used in determining requests for early promotion. Academic unit criteria shall be approved by a majority of the full-time instructors (at all ranks), tenured and tenure-earning faculty in the unit, the unit head (for departments and schools), the college dean, and the provost or designee.

To be promoted all faculty must have maintained faculty qualification for accreditation purposes throughout the period being reviewed for promotion.

Criteria

Teaching

The record of activities leading to promotion must provide evidence of **excellence in teaching**. It is therefore vital that substantial and diverse evidence of teaching effectiveness be presented as part of the application.

Effective teaching—that is, activity that results in learning for those taught—requires a thorough knowledge of the subject; the ability to communicate that knowledge clearly through media appropriate to the subject, discipline, and the needs of students; and the ability to work with, motivate, and serve as a positive role model for students. Teaching performance is best judged by a comprehensive review of the teaching dossier, and it is essential that the Director, Regional Chancellor (as appropriate) and Campus Dean (as appropriate), and College Dean also conduct an appropriate and independent evaluative review.

In addition to course syllabi and student evaluations, a candidate may present the following kinds of documentation of teaching effectiveness: instructional materials (such as case studies, discussion prompts, group projects); assessment activities and products (such as papers, tests, performances, problem sets), and other material used in connection with courses; student performance on pre- and post-instruction measures and other evidence of attainment of learning outcomes; exemplary student work and outcomes; peer observations and evaluations; certifications and other formal evidence of teaching effectiveness; teaching awards; new course development, course redesign, and adaptation to new formats and media through incorporation of emerging technologies; records of advising and mentoring; supervision of teaching and research assistants; thesis direction; and professional development activities and efforts at improvement.

Approaches to teaching and concomitant sources of evidence of teaching effectiveness may vary across disciplines, Schools, and candidates; consequently, variance in candidate dossiers may also be expected.

Evaluation of teaching must take into consideration the School's and College's instructional mission; class size, scope, and sequence within the curriculum; as well as format of delivery and the types of instructional media utilized. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness should consider the wide range of factors that impact student learning and success. Moreover, effective teaching and its impact on learning can take place in a variety of contexts: in campus classrooms; team teaching; online; in the field; workshops; panels; through service learning activities, community engagement and internships; within on- and off-campus communities, in organizations, in education abroad settings, such as field schools, and through mentoring of students, including undergraduate and graduate student research. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness in formats and settings outside the classroom should include consideration of the expected impact of student learning on practice, application, and policy.

Research

Instructors with a research assignment must provide **substantive** evidence of research accomplishments and demonstrate an active research pipeline that allows them to remain academically qualified in their discipline. Evidence of research accomplishments includes quantity and quality of publications in peer-reviewed journals; external grants and fellowships; citations of the candidate's work; evidence of impact on policy and practice; refereed status of publications; and publication awards and acknowledgements among others. An active research pipeline will consist of articles under review at journals, working papers, and projects at the idea and data collection stages.

Service

All faculty are expected to provide **substantive** service. Service includes service to the School, Muma College of Business, University, the professional field or discipline, public service, and engagement with the community. Public service can include work for professional organizations and local, state, federal or international agencies and institutions. Public Service must relate to the basic mission of the Muma College of Business and/or University and capitalize on the faculty member's special professional expertise. Evaluation of service will include an examination of the nature and degree of engagement within the School, College, University and in the local, regional, national and/or global communities. Service to the community is differentiated from engagement with communities and external organizations that is undertaken in support of teaching.

As with teaching, service can take the form of "engaged activities" that further the mission of the College and benefit the public outside the traditional scholarly community. Examples of engaged service include, but are not limited to, advising government officials and testifying before governmental bodies, serving in non-academic professional associations, speaking to non-academic audiences, and assisting not-for-profit organizations with business issues.

REVIEW PROCESS

Sequence of Review

The sequence of review is as follows. The review begins with the School promotion committee, followed by the Director of the School review, then the College committee. If relevant to the instructor's home campus (St. Petersburg or Sarasota-Manatee), the Regional Chancellor and Campus Dean will provide a formal review prior to the review by the College Dean. Finally, the College Dean reviews all materials and provides a final decision.

Notification

The Dean's office will work with the Schools to contact instructors in the College who are eligible to apply for promotion within the typical timeframe. This should be done annually by mid-September for all eligible instructors currently at Level I and Level II.

Application

Applications for promotion shall be initiated by candidates in consultation with their School director during the fall preceding the promotion process that occurs during the following spring semester. All applications for promotion will be submitted through Archivum into the Faculty information System. The Director will inform candidates of the materials they will be expected to provide in support of their applications and provide guidance regarding additional supplementary documents to be submitted with the application. The Schools will be responsible for adding student assessment of instruction to the application. Specific contact information for the person adding student assessment of instruction will be provided to all candidates. Instructors should submit documentation demonstrating other forms of teaching effectiveness including but not limited to the items identified under the teaching criteria. Information should be provided to support substantive accomplishments in research and service assignments as identified under research and service criteria.

School Review Committee and School Director

The review committee within the instructor's School reviews the application. The committee consists of at least three appointed faculty from the School. Instructor representation should be included on each committee. At least one member of each committee should be a faculty member at the same campus as the candidate (i.e., Tampa, St. Petersburg, Sarasota-Manatee). Instructors II and Instructors III as well as Associate and Full Professors may review applications for promotion to Instructor II. Only Instructors III, Associate Professors, and Full Professors may review applications for promotion to Instructor III.

The committee evaluates the application, votes, assigns overall ratings for each relevant area of assigned duties, and provides a recommendation concerning promotion along with a narrative that justifies the assigned ratings. A written evaluation and the results of the vote will be recorded as a part of the review and forwarded to the Director for review.

Where a split evaluation exists, a minority report may accompany the majority recommendation. The applicant shall have the right to review the file following the committee review and attach a brief response to any materials contained therein, including the evaluation section(s) prior to the next stage of review.

After the committee review, the Director will provide a written review of the applicant's application along with a recommendation regarding promotion. The applicant will have the right to review and attach a brief response to the Director's review and recommendation prior to submission to the College Review Committee.

College Review Committee

The College Review Committee, appointed each year, will be composed of two members from each multi-campus School and one member from the single-campus Schools. Single-campus Schools shall affiliate to recommend one member to serve on the committee. Faculty members eligible to serve on the committee include Instructor III, Associate Professor and Full Professor. Each multi-campus School, when possible, shall recommend at least one Instructor III for service on the committee. To ensure representation from all three campuses the following appointment process shall be followed.

- In academic years that start in the fall of an even numbered calendar year (e.g., fall 2020) the Kate Tiedeman School of Business and Finance and the School of Marketing and Innovation shall recommend at least one member from the St. Petersburg campus to serve on the committee.
- In academic years that start in the fall of an odd numbered calendar year (e.g., fall 2021) the Lynn Pippenger School of Accountancy and the School of Information Systems and Management shall recommend at least one member from the St. Petersburg campus to serve on the committee.
- The single-campus Schools of Hospitality and Tourism Management and Risk Management and Insurance shall recommend a member from the Sarasota-Manatee campus.

The committee appoints a chair, evaluates the application, votes, assigns overall ratings for each relevant area of assigned duties, and provides a recommendation concerning promotion along with a narrative that justifies the assigned ratings. A written evaluation and the results of the vote will be recorded as a part of the review and forwarded to Regional Chancellor and Campus Dean (as appropriate), and the Dean for review.

Where a split evaluation exists, a minority report may accompany the majority recommendation. The applicant shall have the right to review the file following the committee review and attach a brief response to any materials contained therein, including the evaluation section(s) prior to the Regional Chancellor's (as appropriate) and Campus Dean's reviews (as appropriate), and Dean's review.

Dean Review

The College Dean reviews all materials and provides a final decision and supporting narrative. The narrative should specify the reasons for that decision and in the event a promotion is not recommended make suggestions for improvement that might result in a positive decision at a later date.

Disputes

In the event that the applicant disagrees with the decision made by the College Dean, a grievance may be sought as detailed in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, but such grievances are restricted to violations of that Agreement.

Timeline

- The College Dean's office will work with the Schools to contact instructors who are eligible to apply for promotion by September 20.
- Instructors should notify their director of their desire to submit an application for promotion by October 31.
- Instructors submit applications by February 1 to the School Review Committee.
- The School Review Committee and the School director provide their recommendations to the College Review Committee by March 1.
- College Review Committee provides its recommendation to the Dean by April 1.

Decision and Notification

A list of Instructor promotion decisions is to be provided by the College to the Office of the Provost by no later than April 15th each year. The Provost's office will notify the instructor of the decision and the associated salary increase before the end of the contract year. The Director, Dean and Human Resources are included in this communication.

Approved by Faculty 12-4-20

Approved by Provost's Office 12-20-20