

USF College of Education LLEEP Department Tenure and Promotion Guidelines 2020

INTRODUCTION

In this document, procedures for tenure and promotion for tenure-earning and tenured faculty and procedures for instructor promotion are outlined.

Mission: The USF College of Education is a community of faculty, students, and staff focused on transforming lives through the promotion of equity, social justice, and improved outcomes for students and communities particularly those that have been underserved. With boundless energy and the collective power of our community, our research, degree programs, and local and global partnerships are focused on solving the most complex problems of a diverse society and on preparing practitioners to be agents of change. Our community embraces and promotes the values of diversity, equity, and inclusion. Students in our College are active learners who participate in sustained immersive experiences that develop knowledge and skills to advance their communities, conquer persistent problems of practice, and advance knowledge. LLEEP is a multi-campus department and we recognize the principles of equity of assignment, resources and opportunities of faculty across a multi-campus university.

Vision: The USF College of Education envisions itself as a leader in regional, national and international education. Leadership in education encompasses:

- Academic excellence
- Research, creative scholarship, and inquiry that renews the educational process
- Collaboration that serves communities, institutions, and individuals
- Preparation that builds on academic excellence, creative scholarship, clinical practice, and collaboration and that contributes to a just and productive society

Consistent with this mission and vision, the COEDU of USF strives to excel in the selection and development of all faculty members with an emphasis on our shared values of equity, diversity, and inclusion. One aspect of faculty development is the evaluation of faculty members for tenure and promotion. This evaluation process should address both individual and institutional goals, reflect the complexity of faculty work, recognize faculty members' uniqueness, foster their career development, and take place in a spirit of citizenship. These guidelines for tenure and promotion are aligned with the 2020 consolidated USF system and contextualized to the mission and values of the COEDU.

Every tenure-earning faculty member shall undergo a mid-tenure review in year three, and shall undergo review for tenure and promotion in year six. Elected departmental tenure and promotion committee members, the department chair, the elected college tenure and promotion committee, and the College Dean shall all review and rate applicants at both midtenure and tenure and promotion stages. Additionally, Regional Chancellors will provide a formal review in promotion and tenure cases for faculty members on branch campuses “prior to a College Dean completing and forwarding a recommendation to the Provost” (see USF Consolidation Handbook Vol. I, p. 16).

Department Tenure and Promotion Committee Procedures

1. The chair of the committee will oversee the secret departmental vote. The Department votes also will be counted openly in a meeting by members of the tenure and promotion committee and recorded by the chair of the committee.
2. Discussion of tenure and promotion candidates among members of the tenure and promotion committee should be limited to formally scheduled meetings and will be limited to content contained within the applicant's tenure and promotion materials.
3. If a tenure and promotion committee member perceives that there is any reason he or she is not able to objectively participate in tenure and promotion proceedings relative to a specific candidate, that committee member should recuse him/herself from the process for that specific candidate and abstain from the discussion and voting. In that case, the tenure and promotion committee for that candidate will be composed of the remaining members.
4. After members of the tenure and promotion committee deliberate, they will write their recommendations and vote if necessary. In the absence of consensus they may write a majority and minority report.
5. The committee will provide a narrative statement for each application and submit this statement to the Department chair in accordance with College policies. If there are dissenting views among the committee regarding the candidate, the committee may provide both a majority and minority report to the Department chair.
6. The Chair of the committee will submit the narrative recommendations into the FIS system and enter the vote of eligible department faculty.

A. Tenure

1. Expectations of Tenured Faculty

In order for the University to perform its functions effectively, it is essential that faculty members are free to express new ideas and divergent viewpoints in their teaching and research. In the process of teaching and research, there must be freedom to question and challenge accepted "truths." A university must create an atmosphere that encourages faculty members to develop and share different ideas and divergent views and to make inquiries unbounded by present norms. Tenure contributes significantly to the creation of such an atmosphere. At the same time, in providing for "annual reappointment until voluntary resignation, retirement, or removal for 'just cause' or layoff (USF System Regulation USF 10.105), tenure is not an unconditional guarantee of lifelong employment. The granting of tenure is a privilege that carries enormous responsibility within the academic unit (ordinarily referred to as department), the College, the University, and broader academic community. This responsibility includes maintenance of the highest academic standards, continued scholarly productivity, sustained teaching excellence, and ongoing beneficial service carried out in the spirit of University citizenship. The tenure review process includes review by a departmental committee, the Chair of the Department, The COEDU Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Dean. In the documentation of an applicant's work, the committee should take into consideration the applicant's assignment in all three areas of teaching, research, and service.

2. Evaluation for Tenure

Evaluation for tenure involves three components appropriate to the department/unit:

- a) Excellence in teaching or comparable activity designed to promote student learning (including advising, mentoring, and community-engaged instruction);
- b) Excellence in research/creative/scholarly work (including community-engaged scholarship);
- c) Excellence in service to the University, the profession, and the community.

Because the decision projects lifetime performance from the first few years of a faculty member's career, tenure must be awarded only as a result of rigorous assessment over a period of time sufficient to judge the faculty member's documented accomplishments, ability, and probability of sustained future productivity.

A judgment must be made that the faculty member's record represents a pattern indicative of a lifetime of continued accomplishment and productivity with potential for high impact on the field or society. Branch campus faculty with three years of tenure-earning credit on July 1, 2019 (generally those hired in Fall 2016 or earlier) will be considered for tenure under their old regional campus guidelines unless they elect to use the new consolidated guidelines in writing 30 days prior to the beginning of tenure consideration. This is required in Article 15.4.B of the USF UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement. If a candidate chooses to use the older regional guidelines, their new consolidated academic unit's T&P committee and administration will still be responsible to carry out the process. Each recommendation for tenure should be accompanied by a statement of the mission, goals and educational needs of the department and/or college and the importance of the contributions the candidate has made and is expected to make in the future toward achieving the mission and goals and meeting the educational needs of the department/unit and the university. Careful consideration must be given both to the equitability of the candidate's assignment and opportunities in relation to others in the department (especially when a department spans multiple campuses), and to the candidate's ability and willingness to work cooperatively within the department, college, and/or campus.

Integral to the mission and vision of USF is commitment to engagement with its communities. As defined by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, "community engagement describes collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, [international,] global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity." While some faculty engagement may come in the form of public service as such, any of the three categories of faculty activity could entail community engagement, and any could in some way "address critical societal issues and contribute to the public good." Community engagement that is undertaken by faculty to "enhance curriculum, teaching and learning and prepare educated, engaged citizens" may be included and evaluated as part of teaching, and community engagement undertaken to "enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity" may be included as part of a research/creative/scholarly faculty assignment.

- a. **Teaching.** The first component in the tenure decision process is an evaluation of excellence and effectiveness in teaching or comparable activity appropriate for the

department/unit. Teaching effectiveness is understood to be fundamentally grounded in learning outcomes. Each candidate must present a record of effectiveness in teaching. It is therefore vital that substantial and diverse evidence of teaching effectiveness be presented as part of the tenure application.

Effective teaching 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. The COEDU encourages all teaching strategies that enhance student learning, particularly critical thinking, higher-order reasoning, and problem-solving skills, and encourages a wide array of student learning opportunities including community engaged teaching, international experiences, and other diverse modalities and settings. Faculty members eligible for promotion and tenure should demonstrate their accomplishments as teachers and their continual efforts to improve their teaching. Teaching performance is judged by a comprehensive review of the teaching dossier, and it is essential that the chair and dean conduct an appropriate and independent evaluative review.

Research has documented that faculty with under-represented identities (i.e., race, gender, language, religion, sexual orientation, etc.) face challenges and biases with student surveys of teaching performance (sometimes referred to as “evaluations” or “Assessment of Instruction”) reflected both in written comments and in quantitative scores (e.g., Aruguete, Slater, & Mwaikinda, 2017; Mitchell & Martin, 2018). Therefore, it is imperative to have a multi-dimensional evaluation of each faculty member’s teaching that does not solely rely on student surveys. Hence, in addition to course syllabi and student surveys, a candidate may present the following kinds of documentation of teaching effectiveness: instructional materials (such as case studies, labs, discussion prompts, group projects online or face to face), assessment activities and products (such as papers, tests, performances, problem sets), and other material used in connection with courses; new course development, course redesign, and adaptation to new formats and media through incorporation of emerging technologies; professional development activities and efforts at improvement; peer observations and evaluations; student performance on pre- and post- instruction measures if appropriate; exemplary student work and outcomes; records of advising and mentoring; supervision of teaching and research assistants; thesis and dissertation direction; and teaching awards. Variance in candidate portfolios may also be expected depending on the departmental orientation to teaching evidence and practices.

Evaluation of teaching must take into consideration an academic unit’s instructional mission; the candidate’s assignment of duties within department/unit; 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; in clinical settings; workshops; panels; through service learning activities, community engagement and internships; in laboratories; 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 impact of student learning on practice, application, and policy. The individual candidate should take the responsibility to describe and explain the context of teaching activities.

- b. Research/Creative/Scholarly Work.** Scholarship takes many forms, including independently conducted research and/or creative works and collaboratively generated contributions to the knowledge base in respective disciplines. The purpose of research and creative scholarship is the substantive advancement of a field of inquiry or practice, whether by generation of new knowledge or production of new creative works and technologies. The record should provide evidence of excellence. In order to attain tenure, a faculty member is expected to have established an original, coherent, and meaningful program of research with potential for sustained contribution throughout a career.

The peer review process is the best means of judging quality and impact of the candidate's research and creative scholarship. Evaluation at the department/unit level should include an assessment of the quality of the candidate's work and consider discipline-appropriate evidence of the significance of research, as well as the candidate's assignment of duties within the department. In addition, creative scholarly endeavors reflecting the unique roles and responsibilities of the College of Education should be recognized. Developing innovative pedagogical materials (e.g., electronic literature, learning application, assessment tools, etc.) or working to transform an instructional paradigm (e.g., transforming a laboratory school, etc.) are a few examples of creative scholarship pioneered by educational researchers. A candidate may present the following kinds of documentation of a significant research program: all refereed publications, book chapters, books; reviews of books and articles and other publications such as research reporting on grants; records of competitive honors and awards, grants, and fellowships; reviews of grant applications; citations of the candidate's work; presentations; evidence of impact on policy and practice; the quality and significance of journals, series, and presses by which the candidate's work is published or of other venues in which it appears; invited, refereed, or non-refereed status of publications; research awards and acknowledgements; and invitations and commissions. Of note, faculty with under-represented identities can face bias and discrimination with regard to receipt of many of the aforementioned forms of evidence of research, including grants, awards, and other recognitions that depend on visibility, nomination, and voting (e.g., Ginther et al., 2011; Whittaker et al., 2015). Therefore, it is imperative to have a holistic evaluation of each faculty member's research.

The type of documentation may vary among fields and the candidate should describe the context of the work fully. External peer recognition, as demonstrated by a record of funded research should be noted. Letters of peer review, external to the USF System, of the candidate's work should be included in the application. Outside reviewers should be selected carefully and should pose no ethical dilemma to either party. No conflict of interest should be present. For example, a previous relationship of mentor-protégé, a co-author in the role of outside reviewer, evidence of nepotism of any kind, and evidence of any power differential are out of place in the external review process. In addition to

objective peer review, the candidate's chair and dean must conduct independent evaluative reviews.

It is noted that in some areas of scholarship, publications or other products may appear only after lengthy or extensive effort and may appear in a wider range of venues, both of which can be particularly true of community-engaged and/or interdisciplinary work at the local, national and/or international levels. It is also noted that faculty from underrepresented minoritized groups often experience isolation (e.g., fewer opportunities to collaborate with colleagues) and marginalization that can adversely impact self-efficacy, sense of relevance or belonging, and ultimately expression of creativity and talent (see Zambrana et al., 2015). Norms for what is deemed rigorous research can be influenced by various social categories of identity. For example, research specific to one's own demographic group or social identity groups that have been historically marginalized can be undervalued. Such research can also be subject to bias in publishing outlets when topics are deemed too narrow (e.g., focused on underrepresented groups), used non-experimental methods (e.g., qualitative, ethnography), or are potentially controversial in that the status quo is challenged (Louie & Wilson-Ahlstrom, 2018). Community-engaged scholarship may be demonstrated by high-profile products such as reports to local, national, or international agencies and formal presentations, or by other products as designated by the department, as well as by peer review. For collaborative and coauthored scholarship, the evaluation should include consideration of the candidate's role and contribution to the work, consistent with disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary scholarly practice. The body of work of a candidate for tenure must be judged against the appropriate standards within the area of research and creative scholarship, balancing the significance and quality of the contribution with the quantity of publications and other scholarly products. Recommendations for tenure should present a clear and compelling case for the merit of an application in the context of the kind of scholarship in which the candidate's work has been conducted, leading to high confidence in the candidate's prospects for continuing and meaningful contributions.

- c. Service.** The third component to be evaluated includes the categories of service to the University, the professional field or discipline, and engagement with the community. Candidates for tenure must have made substantive contributions in one or more of these areas. Evaluation of administrative and other professional services to the University should go beyond a simple enumeration of committees to include an evaluation of the extent and quality of the services rendered. Public service may include work for professional organizations and local, state, federal or international agencies and institutions. It must relate to the basic mission of the University and capitalize on the faculty member's special professional expertise; the normal service activities associated with good citizenship are not usually evaluated as part of the tenure and promotion process. General standards of public and professional service will vary across units, but service at the program and department/unit levels (e.g., participation with respect to program improvement, accreditation, and department committees) is an expectation of all faculty within the COEDU. Evaluation of service will include an examination of the nature and degree of engagement within the University and in the local, regional, national and global communities. Notably, some important service activities (e.g., mentoring colleagues and/or students for interpersonal, cultural, psychosocial issues; joining an

additional committee to ensure diversity of committee membership) should be recognized as both time-consuming and critical in creating a more inclusive institutional community (e.g., Cobb-Roberts et al., 2017). Additionally, committee representation and mentoring loads are often heavier for faculty of color and other minoritized groups, due to their underrepresentation in higher education (Stanley, 2006).

Service to the community is differentiated from engagement with communities and external organizations that is undertaken in support of teaching (community-engaged instruction) or of research/creative/scholarly work (community-engagement scholarship). Community-engaged service may include faculty collaboration with professionals in their discipline (such as inservice teachers, school mental health professionals, school leaders) to provide technical assistance relevant to one's areas of expertise. Such forms of service to local professionals may yield multiple benefits to the university including potential recruitment of students, funding streams, and initiation of partnerships for subsequent research and teaching purposes.

B. Promotion

1. Evaluation for Promotion

As in the case of tenure, the judgment of readiness for promotion to higher academic rank is based upon a careful evaluation of a candidate's contributions in teaching and student learning (or comparable outcomes appropriate to the department/unit and the candidate's appointment), research/creative/scholarly work, and service. The sections pertinent to evaluation of these factors for the tenure decision apply as well to promotion.

The evaluation refers to written department- and college-level criteria for promotion that have been made available to candidates. Promotion also requires participation as a productive citizen of the University, as this is an integral part of faculty performance and is also evaluated with reference to written criteria.

General standards for consideration of appointment to the ranks of Associate Professor, and Professor (or their equivalents) are as follows. In each category, a candidate's achievements are evaluated in relation to criteria specified by the department/unit for the rank sought as well as the candidate's assignment of duties within the department/unit.

a. Appointment to Assistant Professor

- i. Promise of continued growth in teaching excellence, or in comparable activities appropriate for the department/unit.
- ii. Promise of excellence in independent and/or collaborative research/creative/scholarly work supported by publications or other appropriate evidence.
- iii. Promise of substantive contributions in the area of service and citizenship to the University, profession and/or public.
- iv. The doctorate or the highest degree appropriate to the field from an accredited institution.

b. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

- i. At a level appropriate to experience, a record of excellence in teaching or other comparable activities appropriate for the department/unit as supported by examples that may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Excellence in student assessment of instruction (teaching evaluations);
- Comprehensive professional development;
- Positive peer observations;
- A variety of assessments that show learning gains;
- Civic engagement in teaching; and/or
- Pedagogical artifacts/documents (e.g., syllabi, developed instructional materials, course handouts, examinations).

The candidate's record may also include such activities as participation on thesis and/or dissertation committees and successful direction of the work of master's and doctoral candidates, where applicable.

- ii. A record of excellence in independent and/or collaborative research/creative/scholarly work, supported by substantial, high impact and sustained publications/presentations or their equivalent. Examples may include, but are not limited to the following:
 - Articles in official journals of scholarly associations, preferably at national and/or international levels;
 - Book-length monographs with non-predatory academic publishers;
 - Book series published by non-predatory academic publishers;
 - Book chapters published by non-predatory academic publishers;
 - Academic presentations at the local, state, regional, national, and international level; and/or
 - Refereed and invited presentations (e.g., papers, workshops, poster sessions, keynote).

Evaluation of applied research should consider potential or actual impact on policies and practices. The record should be sufficient to indicate a trajectory, with a high degree of confidence, of continuing productivity in research/creative/scholarly work throughout the individual's career, as defined in the individual's field. The candidate is strongly urged to substantiate achievement of these criteria specific to their record of inquiry.

- iii. Appropriate to rank, a record of contribution of service to the university, profession, and/or public.
- iv. For faculty on tenure-track appointments, advancements to the Associate level is made simultaneously with granting of tenure (with exception of a faculty appointed as associate professor without tenure, i.e., in the case of a new hire at rank).

c. Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

- i. A progressive record of excellence in teaching or other comparable activity appropriate for the department/unit, including a record of such activities as participation on thesis and/or dissertation committees, and ordinarily as major professor for undergraduate research/theses and/or master's and doctoral dissertations, where applicable to the program and/or campus.
- ii. A progressive record of excellence in independent and/or collaborative research/creative/scholarly work of at least national visibility, of demonstrated quality supported by a record of substantial publications or their equivalent. Indicators of national and international visibility may include, but are not limited to the following:
 - Leadership and active involvement in national and/or international organizations;
 - National and/or international publications;

- Collaborations across multiple universities;
 - Invited presenter, editor, and/or keynote speaker;
 - National and/or international collaborations;
 - Scientific committees
 - Editorial boards; and/or
 - Other forms of recognized expertise (e.g., awards, expert witness, legislative testimony, media expertise, program evaluation, state standards commission, visiting scholar).
- iii. Evaluation of applied research should consider potential or actual impact on policies and practices. The record should predict continuing high productivity in research/creative/scholarly work throughout the individual's career, as defined in the individual's field.
 - iv. A progressive record of substantial contribution of service to the University and to the field, professional or community as appropriate to the mission and goals of the department, the college and/or the University. Expectations about the level of meaningful service contributions for candidates for Professor are wider in scope than those that apply to candidates for Associate professor.
 - v. Compelling evidence of significant achievement among peers in one's discipline or professional field at the national and/or international level. Any recommendation for promotion to the rank of Professor must contain evidence of such distinction, as relevant to the department/unit.

C. Reviews and Their Timing

1. Probationary Period

The college has a six year probationary period. Traditionally, candidates for tenure have applied early in the sixth year of appointment of their probationary period (or equivalent, when adjustments or exceptions to the standard have been made), reflecting effectively a five-year record of teaching, research/scholarship/creative productivity, and service. Expectations of progress within the normal time frame will be reflected in established annual and comprehensive review processes, but candidates may apply when ready, as specified in the following section.

2. Timing of Applications

Following an initial period in rank, normally at least two years, a candidate for tenure may apply earlier than the last year of the probationary period or, for promotion, earlier than the normal point for advancement in rank, when there is clear evidence that he or she has fully met the applicable criteria and has received endorsement at both department and college levels; additional merit beyond normal criteria for advancement, specified clearly in unit tenure and promotion documents, should not be required. Following the Collective Bargaining Agreement, if a candidate applies before maximum probationary period, he/she may withdraw from consideration without prejudice at any time prior to the date upon which the application is forwarded to the Provost's Office. Such withdrawal is permitted one time only. Should the candidate choose to continue with the tenure and promotion process through the Provost's Office and be denied, the candidate will not have the option of submitting an application again.

3. Extensions to the Standard Probationary Period

General extensions. Ordinarily, a faculty member in a tenure-earning position will either be awarded tenure at the end of the probationary period or be given one-year notice that further employment will not be offered. However, exceptions to the tenure clock may be considered, such as medical exigencies or parental situations covered by FMLA or ADA legislation or other extenuating circumstances approved by the University or as specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. A tenure earning faculty member under such circumstances may request an extension of his or her probationary period. The request must be made in writing and must be approved by the chair of the department, dean, and the institution's designated senior academic officer overseeing the candidate's unit. Ordinarily, extensions of more than two years beyond the college's designated probationary period will not be permitted.

Tenure upon initial appointment. In rare circumstances, tenure may be awarded upon initial appointment. In determining such an award, the guiding principle will be to follow department and college procedures in an expedited process that will not inordinately delay hiring decisions. Specifically, there must be review of tenure eligibility at all levels, with a recommendation forwarded to the institution's designated senior academic officer overseeing the candidate's department. Approval must be obtained from the senior academic officer prior to making an offer that includes tenure without a probationary period. Procedures for such are specified in the university Tenure & Promotion Guidelines for a Consolidated USF.

4. Review of Progress toward Tenure

It is the responsibility of the department chair or other appropriate administrator and department peer committee, where constituted, to include a progress toward tenure review as part of the annual evaluation for all faculty in the probationary period for tenure. A more rigorous and extensive pre-tenure review will be conducted at the approximate mid-point of the probationary period. The mid-point review will be conducted by the departmental tenure and promotion committee, the department chairperson or other appropriate administrator, the college tenure and promotion committee, and the college dean or the dean's designee. All mid-point reviews, which are similar to tenure reviews except for the use of external letters, shall address the performance of annual assignments including teaching, research/creative/scholarly activity, and service occurring during the preceding tenure-earning years of employment. In addition, all reviews should critically assess overall performance and contributions in light of mid-point expectations. The mid-point review will be based on documentation of performance, including: a current vita; annual evaluations; student and peer ratings/evaluation of teaching; selected examples of teaching materials; products of research/scholarship activity (evidence of productivity); service commitments and accomplishments; and a brief self-evaluation by the faculty member. The mid-point review should generally be based on department criteria expected to be applied for the future tenure review. Of note, faculty might be considered for a change in assignment that might support a higher likelihood of a positive tenure and promotion decision based on the candidate's trajectory within a research or teaching-focused position.

The mid-point review is intended to be informative and encouraging to faculty who are

making solid progress toward tenure; instructional to faculty who may need to improve in selected areas of performance; or where progress is significantly lacking and apparently unlikely, bluntly cautionary about the potential for dismissal.

5. Review of Progress toward Promotion

The annual performance review for a faculty member holding a rank below that of Full Professor should include an evaluation of progress toward promotion. At approximately the mid-point of the typical interval between appointment to Associate Professor level and promotion to Full Professor faculty in the department, the faculty member will ordinarily be given a more comprehensive review of progress toward promotion, to include participation by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Department Chair, and COEDU Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee. The materials provided by the Associate Professor for review should include a current CV and brief descriptions of accomplishments of teaching, research, and service as well as a projection (with timeline) for teaching, scholarly productivity, and service goals from mid-point to anticipated application to Full. The candidate may request additional review by a more senior academic officer, such as the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. A review at this stage is intended to be informative; to be encouraging to faculty who are making solid progress toward promotion, and instructional to faculty who may need to improve in selected areas of performance. Of note, an Associate Professor can elect to opt-out of their department's typical mid-point review toward promotion to Full and request the review procedure to commence in a later year or not at all.

6. External Letters for Tenure and Promotion Applications

The department chair ordinarily will include in the tenure and promotion packet a minimum of three letters (but not exceeding six) from external reviewers who are recognized experts in the individual's field or a related scholarly field inside or outside of academe; ideally, some or all of these will hold senior tenured appointments within at least aspirational peer institutions. The candidate and the department chair will suggest external reviewers, and either may identify a list of reviewers who should be disqualified for professional reasons. The list of potential reviewers is then sent for review and feedback to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and the Dean. As aforementioned, these reviewers should pose no ethical dilemma to either party and should have no significant relationship to the candidate; no conflict of interest should be present. For example, a previous relationship of mentor-protégé, a co-author in the role of outside reviewer, evidence of nepotism of any kind, and evidence of any power differential are out of place in the external review process. The chair and the candidate will jointly select the reviewers. In the event of disagreement, each party will select one-half the number of qualified reviewers to be utilized. The content of all solicited letters that are received from external reviewers should be in the candidate's file prior to the final recommendations by the department Tenure and Promotion Committee.

D. Number & Type of Committees

The number and types of committees are specified in the governance document of the department.

Article 3A of the College of Education Faculty Constitution delineates the membership of the College's Tenure and Promotion Committee.

E. Instructor Promotions

In order to demonstrate appreciation for their many contributions to the mission of the University of South Florida and to encourage continued career development, the University provides a promotional career path for individuals who full-time, non-tenure track teaching positions. This document sets for the promotion process guidelines for full-time, non-tenure track instructional faculty at the university.

Eligibility

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

At the discretion of the academic unit in which the applicant's appointment resides, 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 academic unit in which the 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 their application for promotion at any stage in the process prior to the dean's review. Instructors who have been conferred a rank (e.g., Instructor II, Instructor III) within any academic unit at USF will maintain that rank upon transfer to another academic unit. Subsequent promotion (e.g., from Instructor II to Instructor III) will be subject to the criteria and processes of the new academic unit to which they are assigned.

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

1. 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.
2. 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, one area must be designated as the primary area and ratings assigned accordingly.

3. This evaluation should 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

1. 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, subject to approval of the College Dean.
2. Instructors will be considered for promotion to Instructor III on the basis of meritorious performance. Promotion to Level III recognizes not only continuing progress as an Instructor, but may also consider leadership, innovation, and contribution to teaching, scholarship, community engagement, or institutional success and acclaim. 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, one area must be designated as the primary area and ratings assigned accordingly. In assigning ratings for Level 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 Level II review, based on criteria established by the college/department/unit. Promotion to Level 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.
3. This evaluation should 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.

Unit-Level Criteria And Processes

Academic units with faculty holding the position of Instructor will maintain procedures for processing applications and criteria for promotion within that unit. Criteria for promotion, specifying documented and measurable performance outcomes, must be developed by the units and reviewed every five (5) years. The standards should, at a minimum, include (i) definitions of Excellence of performance and (ii) criteria to be used in determining requests for early promotion, including a list of all supplementary documentation required for submission. 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, department chair, the dean, and the provost or designee.

Each academic unit shall ensure that the criteria and procedures are shared annually with all Instructors at Level I and Level II. The general process is as follows (and can be found along with the promotion application form).

Review Process

Sequence of Review

Specific levels of review are determined by the College. The general sequence of review for relevant levels and unit heads is as follows: The department promotion committee, followed by review by the department chair, then The College Committee. If relevant to the instructor's home campus (St. Petersburg or Sarasota-Manatee), the Regional Chancellor 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 publish a list of Instructors in the college who are eligible to apply for promotion within the typical timeframe. This list should be provided annually by mid-September to all Instructors currently at Level I and Level II.

Application

Applications for promotion shall be initiated by candidates in consultation with their department chair during the fall preceding the promotion process that occurs during the following spring semester. The unit head 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 Dean's office will be responsible for adding student assessment of instruction to the application. Specific contact information for this person will be provided in detail to all candidates. Instructors are encouraged to submit documentation demonstrating other forms of teaching effectiveness including but not limited to peer review of teaching, midcourse student evaluations and subsequent adjustments, development or revision of curriculum and course structure, and innovative practices.

Academic Unit (e.g., department and/or college) Review Committees

Academic unit review committees within the Instructor's academic unit review the application. The committees consist of at least three faculty from the Instructor's academic unit. 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).

Level II and Level III Instructors as well as Associate and Full Professors may review applications for promotion to Level II. Only Level III Instructors, Associate Professors, or Full Professors may review applications for promotion to Level III.

The committees evaluate the application, vote, assign overall ratings for each relevant area of assigned duties, and provide 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 packet and forwarded to the next reviewing entity. 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.

Dean Review

The College Dean reviews all materials and provides a final decision and supporting narrative. A narrative only needs to be provided in cases where promotion is not recommended. The narrative should specify the reasons for that decision and 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

At the college's discretion, Instructor promotion reviews may be conducted as part of the regular tenure and promotion cycle, or may be conducted at a separate time. However, final decisions regarding promotion must be completed before the end of the Spring semester each academic year.

Instructors should notify their chair of their desire to submit an application for promotion by September 30 and submit an application in February. Initial committee (e.g., departmental) review will occur by March 1, where applicable; College Committee review by March 15. All recommendations and reviews will be circulated to the College Dean for a response by April 1.

Decision and Notification

A list of Instructor promotion decisions are 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 Chair/Director, Dean and Human Resources are included in this communication.

References

- Aruguete, M. S., Slater, J., & Mwaikinda, S. R. (2017). The Effects of Professors' Race and Clothing Style on Student Evaluations. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 86(4), 494-502.
- Cobb-Roberts, D., Esnard, T., Unterreiner, A., Agosto, V., Karanxha, Z., Beck, M., & Wu, K. (2017). Race, gender and mentoring in higher education. *Sage Handbook of Mentoring*, 374-388.
- Ginther, D. K., Schaffer, W. T., Schnell, J., Masimore, B., Liu, F., Haak, L. L., & Kington, R. (2011). Race, ethnicity, and NIH research awards. *Science*, 333(6045), 1015-1019.
- Louie, V., & Wilson-Ahlstrom, A. (2018). Moving it forward: The power of mentoring, and how universities can confront institutional barriers facing junior researchers of color. *William T. Grant Foundation*.
- Mitchell, K. M., & Martin, J. (2018). Gender bias in student evaluations. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 51(3), 648-652.
- Stanley, C. A. (2006). Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominantly White colleges and universities. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(4), 701-736.

- Whittaker, J. A., Montgomery, B. L., & Acosta, V. G. M. (2015). Retention of underrepresented minority faculty: Strategic initiatives for institutional value proposition based on perspectives from a range of academic institutions. *Journal of Undergraduate Neuroscience Education, 13*(3), A136.
- Zambrana, R. E., Ray, R., Espino M.M., Castro, C., Cohen, B. D., & Eliason, J. (2015). “Don’t leave us behind”: The importance of mentoring for underrepresented minority faculty. *American Educational Research Journal, 52*, 40–72.