Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Learning Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

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.

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

- Academic excellence
- Excellence in 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. Throughout this document, we make reference to how issues relevant to diversity and equity manifest in the specific areas of responsibilities in which faculty are evaluated. These guidelines for tenure and promotion are aligned with the 2020 consolidated USF system and contextualized to the mission and values of the COEDU.

Note regarding USF consolidation: Tenured faculty and continuously employed instructors will retain their current status. Tenure-earning faculty will retain that status (consistent with ongoing evaluation procedures) and will be considered for tenure in their appointed department, school, and/or college. Tenure-earning faculty, initially hired at USF St. Petersburg and USF Sarasota-Manatee with three years of tenure-earning credit on July 1, 2019 (i.e. generally those hired in Fall 2016 or earlier), will be considered for tenure consistent with local (i.e. USF St. Petersburg or USF Sarasota-Manatee) department, school, college, and institutional guidelines in place prior to consolidation. All other tenure-earning faculty members will be evaluated for tenure and promotion following USF's Guidelines (including those yet to be developed by academic departments, schools and colleges), effective July 1, 2020. Note that for faculty at branch campuses going up for tenure or promotion, the appropriate Regional Chancellor will add

Approved May 28, 2020 by Provost's Office
Approved July 1, 2020 by Dean's Office
Approved by CIL Faculty vote June 26, 2020

her/his input to their T&P recommendation prior to it going to the College Dean. (See USF Consolidation Handbook, v. 2,

Note on Corona-virus adjustments for tenure-earning faculty: The University of South Florida recognizes that the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic has brought about major disruptions in the lives of our faculty that may temporarily prevent or interrupt their scholarly productivity and achievements. This problem is especially acute for those faculty members in their probationary period who are working towards tenure. Therefore, the university is making available an extension to the tenure-clock by one academic year, for eligible tenure-earning faculty members.

The leadership of the United Faculty of Florida was consulted and has agreed that requests for an extension due to current circumstances associated with the COVID-19 pandemic can be requested under a provision found in Article 15.2.A of the current USF-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement. The procedure specified there is to submit the request to your Chair/Director (or Dean if there are no Departments/Schools in the College). A recommendation is made to the Dean (of the USF college contemplated with USF consolidation), who forwards a recommendation to the Office of the Provost. A letter granting the extension is issued from the latter office(s). It is understood that such requests will be presumptively approved. This process will also apply to out-of-unit faculty.

The Department of Teaching and Learning is a multi-campus department and we recognizes the principles of equity of assignment, resources, and opportunities of faculty across a multi-campus university.

Mission: The Department of Teaching and Learning is a multi-campus distinguished community of faculty, students, and staff focused on transforming lives through the promotion of equity, social justice, and improved education for students and communities particularly those that have been underserved. T&L faculty and partners engage in innovative research, expert pedagogical practices, and distinctive community engagement targeted at positively improving the lives of children, families, and adults across diverse educational settings.

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 excellence scholarly productivity, sustained teaching excellence, and
ongoing beneficial service carried out in the spirit of University citizenship. The tenure review process includes review by the departmental committee, the Chair of the Department and the COEDU Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee. For branch campus faculty, there will be a review by the Branch Campus Chancellor prior to it going to the College 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. Probationary Period

The College of Education has a six year probationary period. Therefore, faculty normally apply for tenure in the fall of their sixth year of appointment (or equivalent, when adjustments or exceptions to the standard have been made). Expectations of progress within the normal time frame will be reflected in established annual and comprehensive review processes, but candidates may apply when ready.

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. There are multiple situations where a tenure-clock stop is normal practice. For instance, a tenure-clock stop accompanies a parental leave. Also, a tenure-clock stop can be sought pursuant to the Collective Bargaining Agreement, for medical or related reasons (e.g., family) for up to one year. This tenure-clock stop request can be made without an accompanying request for parental or medical leave. The request must be made in writing and be approved by the Chair of the Department, Dean, and Provost. Flexible tenure clocks are a best practice in supporting all faculty. Faculty who receive extensions to the standard probationary period may continue to exhibit productivity but are not required or expected to. There are no increased performance expectations for faculty who have stopped the tenure clock, and the candidate's application should clearly specify the total number of years in rank (excluding time on approved leaves). The Coronavirus extension offered by USF is explained above in Note on Coronavirus Adjustments for Tenure-Earning Faculty.

4. Evaluation for Tenure

Evaluation for tenure involves excellence in
a) Teaching or comparable activity designed to promote student learning (including advising, mentoring, and community-engaged instruction);
b) Research/creative/scholarly work (including community-engaged scholarship);
c) 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 excellence in

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.

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

Teaching effectiveness is understood to be fundamentally grounded in learning outcomes. Each candidate must present a record of effectiveness in teaching. The record 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 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 and the Department of Teaching and Learning 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 should 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 the Department's instructional mission; the candidate's assignment of duties within Department; 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 must provide evidence of excellence in research. 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 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 coauthor 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 nonexperimental 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. The record must provide evidence of excellence in service. 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. Explicit references of the candidates' contribution to the department should also be made. 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).

5. Mid-Tenure Process:

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-Tenure 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. 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 2).

Mid-Tenure Reviews will occur during the Spring semester. All Mid-Tenure Reviews 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-Tenure 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. This process does not include external reviewers. The Mid-Tenure 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-Tenure 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.

The timeline for the Mid-Tenure Review will be published by the College Dean's Office. The Associate Dean will inform the candidate and the Department Chair of the timeline and submission process.

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, or in comparable activities appropriate for the department/unit.

ii. Promise of 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.
v. Note: There is not a career path from Instructor to Assistant Professor.

b. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor
i. A record of excellence in teaching or other comparable activities appropriate for the department/unit, including a record of 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 or their equivalent. Evaluation of applied research should consider potential or actual impact on policies and practices. The record should be sufficient to predict, with a high degree of confidence, continuing productivity in research/creative/scholarly work throughout the individual's career, as defined in the individual's field.
iii. A record of substantial 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 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 as major professor for undergraduate research/theses and/or master's and doctoral candidates, where applicable.
ii. A record of excellence in independent and/or collaborative research/creative/scholarly work or at least national visibility, of demonstrated quality supported by a record of substantial publications or their equivalent.
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.
iii. A 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 significantly higher than those that apply to candidates for Associate professor.
iv. 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.

2. 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.

C. Committee

1. Department Tenure and Promotion Committee Procedures:

1. The Department adheres to the tenure and promotion procedures published by the University and College as well as the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
2. 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 Tenure and Promotion committee and administration will still be responsible to carry out the process.
3. Due to Coronavirus in spring semester 2020, tenure-earning professors at USF were given the opportunity to take an extra year in their probationary period. Additional effort is not be expected from those choosing to add a year to their probationary period due to Coronavirus.
4. Members of the Tenure and Promotion committee will vote by secret ballot on all tenure and promotion applications of their colleagues. These votes will be counted openly in a meeting by members of the Tenure and Promotion committee and recorded by the chair of the committee. The vote of the committee will include electronic means.
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 recommendation for tenure and/or promotion should include a statement of the extent the candidate sought to address the mission and vision of the department/college. It should also include the importance of the contributions the candidate has made and is expected to make in the future towards achieving the mission of the department/college and meeting the educational needs of the department, college, and the university. Commentary is also expected on the role the candidate played in multiple authored manuscript(s).
7. After members of the Tenure and Promotion committee have voted on each candidate for tenure and promotion, the chair of the committee will oversee the secret departmental vote. The vote of the eligible Department faculty will include electronic means and will remain open for at least three days to allow access to all tenured faculty members. 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. The chair of the committee will combine the Department Faculty vote with the committee vote and will submit the totals and other necessary information to FIS. The vote of the committee and the Department will be shared with the candidate through FIS.
8. Discussion of tenure and promotion candidates among members of the Tenure and Promotion committee should be limited to formally scheduled meetings of the tenure and promotion committee and will be limited to content contained within the applicant's tenure and promotion materials.
9. If a Tenure and Promotion committee member perceives that there is any reason they are not able to objectively participate in tenure and promotion proceedings relative to a specific candidate, that committee member should recuse themselves 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 4 rather than 5 members.

Department Procedures for Faculty Voting on Tenure and Promotion

1. All Department faculty members who will be voting on tenure and promotion applications should review applicant portfolios prior to the departmental vote.
2. Only tenured faculty may vote on tenure and promotion applications. For promotion to Full Professor only those who hold the rank of Full Professor should vote.
3. Tenure and Promotion committee members and the Department chair are ineligible to participate in the Department vote.

Procedures for Chair Evaluation of Tenure and Promotion Applications

1. The chair should independently review and evaluate each applicant's materials prior to reading the tenure and promotion committee's report.
2. After the independent review, the chair will take into account the committee's narrative in developing his/her evaluation report.

It should be noted that 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" (USF Consolidation Handbook, vol. 2).

The committee is strongly encouraged to review the Collective Bargaining Agreement and the College of Education Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, and other university publications relative to tenure and promotion prior to attending meetings to discuss candidates.

2. Timeline

The timeline for the application for Tenure and Promotion will be published in Archivum/Faculty Information System. It will include

1. Meetings with the College Associate Dean and Dean
2. Selection of External Reviewers
3. Submission of the Table of Journal Quality to the Department Chair
4. Submission of Application for Tenure and Promotion
5. Tenured Faculty review and vote
6. Department Tenure and Promotion Committee review and vote
7. Department Chair Review
8. College Tenure and Promotion Committee review and vote
9. For Branch Campus faculty, Regional Chancellor Review
10. Dean Review

C. Promotion of Instructors

In order to demonstrate appreciation for their many contributions to the COE and the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Learning and to encourage continued career development, the University of South Florida 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 Department.

Review of Instructors for promotion occurs in the spring semester and follows the applicable USF Career Path for Instructors Promotion Guidelines, adopted by the USF Faculty Senate July 2020 as well as those of the College.

Standards for Instructor Promotion:
Instructor Level I

- Promise of contributing to the departmental/school and College missions in assigned area(s) of duty.
- A minimum of the master's degree in the appropriate area of specialization or other educational credentials as required for University or program accreditation.

Instructor Level II

- Meet the criteria for Instructor Level I.

- Following an initial phase-in of the career path, 5 or more years of experience at Level I will be typically required. In the case of credit granted for years served as a Visiting Instructor, a minimum of two years in-rank as an Instructor at Level 1 will be required.
- This evaluation should be in concert with, but not solely determined by, the last five years of annual evaluations (or total number if being considered early). In addition to annual evaluations, the required comprehensive review should assess the individual's holistic contributions to the program, department and college.
- Excellence in the primary area of assignment must be demonstrated.

Instructor Level III

- 5-years of experience at Instructor Level II. Shorter time periods may be granted at the discretion of the department and College in cases of truly exceptional performance.
- Evidence of excellence in the art, science, and craft of teaching
- Evidence of elevated expertise and growth in and beyond your assigned duties as a Level II Instructor. Examples include, but are not limited to, peer mentoring, receipt of awards aligned with your teaching philosophy and/or professional goals, publishing material in professional outlets, and developing innovations to promote teaching, learning, and student success.

Department Instructor Promotion Committee Procedures

1. The Department adheres to the promotion procedures published by the University and College as well as the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
2. Members of the Instructor Promotion committee will vote by secret ballot on all promotion applications of their colleagues. These votes will be counted openly in a meeting by members of the Instructor Promotion committee and recorded by the chair of the committee. The vote of the committee will include electronic means.
3. The committee will provide a narrative statement for each application and submit this statement to the Department chair in accordance with College policies. The recommendation for instructor promotion should include a statement of the extent the candidate sought to address the mission and vision of the department/college and excel at their respective assignments. It should also include the importance of the contributions the candidate has made and is expected to make in the future towards achieving the mission of the department/college and meeting the educational needs of the department, college, and the university. 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.
4. After members of the Instructor Promotion committee have voted on each candidate for tenure and promotion, the chair of the committee will oversee the secret departmental vote. The vote of the eligible Department faculty will include electronic means and will remain open for at least three days to allow access to all eligible faculty members. The Department votes also will be counted openly in a meeting by members of the Instructor Promotion committee and recorded by the chair of the committee. The chair of the committee will combine the Department Faculty vote with the committee vote and will submit the totals and other necessary information to FIS. The vote of the committee and the Department will be shared with the candidate through FIS.

Approved May 28, 2020 by Provost's Office
Approved July 1, 2020 by Dean's Office
Approved by CIL Faculty vote June 26, 2020

5. Discussion of promotion candidates among members of the Instructor Promotion committee should be limited to formally scheduled meetings of the Instructor Promotion committee and will be limited to content contained within the applicant's tenure and promotion materials.
6. If an Instructor Promotion committee member perceives that there is any reason they are not able to objectively participate in tenure and promotion proceedings relative to a specific candidate, that committee member should recuse themselves 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 3 rather than 4 members.

Department Procedures for Faculty Voting on Instructor Promotion

1. All Department faculty members who will be voting on the Instructor Promotion applications should review applicant portfolios prior to the departmental vote.
2. 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 or Full Professors may review applications for promotion to Level III.
3. Instructor Promotion committee members and the Department chair are ineligible to participate in the Department vote.

Procedures for Chair Evaluation of Instructor Promotion Applications

1. The chair should independently review and evaluate each applicant's materials prior to reading the Instructor Promotion committee's report.
2. After the independent review, the chair will take into account the committee's narrative in developing their evaluation report.

It should be noted that Regional Chancellors will provide a formal review in instructor promotion cases for faculty members on branch campuses prior to a College Dean completing the process of promotion for instructors (USF Consolidation Handbook, vol. 2).

The committee is strongly encouraged to review the Collective Bargaining Agreement and the College of Education Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, and other university publications relative to tenure and promotion prior to attending meetings to discuss candidates.

References

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.
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.

Approved May 28, 2020 by Provost's Office
Approved July 1, 2020 by Dean's Office
Approved by CIL Faculty vote June 26, 2020

Approved May 28, 2020 by Provost's Office
Approved July 1, 2020 by Dean's Office
Approved by CIL Faculty vote June 26, 2020