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This Tenure and Promotion Guidelines document, endorsed by the faculty of School of Hotel and Restaurant Management (SHRM) is intended to outline the standards that will guide the committee members in reviewing the tenure and promotion applicants in the School of Hotel and Restaurant Management. While tenure and promotion document for the University of South Florida Sarasota Manatee is the overall governing document these guidelines are intended to support tenure the SHRM applicants in document preparation and the committee reviewing their applications.

For candidates, this guide describes the breadth of scholarly activities that ‘teaching, research/creative work and service’ comprise and the extent to which evidence of faculty performance should be reflected in a tenure and promotion portfolio. In addition, suggestions for organizing portfolios are given. Careful thought, planning and attention to detail in the presentation of one’s scholarly record are critical to accurately communicate one’s accomplishments and their significance to the numerous colleagues and administrators who will review. All candidates should refer to the University’s Policy Document in relationship to Tenure and Promotion.

For committees, this guide provides working definitions of the dimensions underlying the domains of teaching, research and service. These dimensions indicate potential areas in which faculty may document their professional activities. For each dimension, the criteria that suggest ratings of ‘Outstanding’, ‘Strong’, ‘Satisfactory’, and ‘Unsatisfactory’ performance are delineated. These criteria are intended to provide a common understanding of the scope and rigor of the tenure and promotion review.

Faculty members must have a consistent pattern of positive evaluation in teaching and substantive scholarly contributions judged to be significant and current. Outstanding in research or teaching, strong in the other are required for awarding tenure. Service contributions to the university, profession, and community are also necessary. Participation in the governance of the institution is both a right and obligation of every faculty member.
This university's decision to recommend tenure and the Board of Trustees' decision to grant it must be based on documented, substantial, and continuous contributions in scholarship/research/creative activity and teaching sufficient to forecast a career pattern. The number of publications alone, for instance, is not a sufficient indicator of scholarly contribution. The judgment that must be made in the tenure decision is whether there is a record of scholarly accomplishment that reliably will predict a career of continued scholarly growth and contribution worthy of a significant and diverse university.

Tenure and Promotion Committee members must not interpret the criteria listed in each rating frame as rigid requirements. A candidate may be rated as 'Outstanding' without showing superiority in every dimension within the scoring frame. In addition, it must be recognized that the dimensions presented in the Guide cannot represent all aspects of teaching, research and service that are pertinent to tenure and promotion decisions. Faculty collegiality and collaborative activities are applicable to promotion decisions regarding the rank of Associate Professor.

The last portion of the guide provides recommendations for the organization and presentation of candidates' portfolios. These recommendations are intended to facilitate the comprehensive and accurate communication of the accomplishments and scholarly records of candidates in the areas of teaching, research and other creative activities, and service.

In summary, these guidelines are not intended to prescribe inflexible minimal criteria for tenure and promotion, but rather to communicate expectations to faculty candidates for tenure and promotion and expectations to committees and administrators about our School's common understanding of scholarly productivity.

**REVIEW OF PROGRESS TOWARDS TENURE**

An annual review of each faculty member is required and used to evaluate a faculty member's performance. The evaluation is based on the faculty member's self-generated activity report, evaluations of teaching efforts, and other pertinent data concerning the faculty member's efforts. This annual review is an appropriate time for the dean and an appropriate School committee, when and if there is a committee to assess faculty who are untenured and in tenure-earning positions as to the progress they have made toward being awarded tenure by the university. This evaluation should be in writing with a copy given to the faculty member who may then respond to the assessment of progress toward tenure if he or she chooses. The evaluation should be made in view of the university and college's mission and goals, the faculty member's annual assignment, the faculty member's activity report, and the evaluation of that report.

Within the written assessment of the faculty member's progress toward earning tenure, there should be a very complete and explicit explanation of how the candidate's assessment was derived, whether or not the faculty member is making satisfactory progress towards achieving tenure, and if not, why not. If the candidate is not making satisfactory progress toward being granted tenure, the assessment should indicate those areas that need improvement and provide suggestions as to how the deficiencies may be corrected.
A mid-tenure review usually occurs upon completion of three years in a tenure-earning position at the university, each faculty member is given a particularly thorough and comprehensive review for the purposes of deciding whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress towards tenure; if the performance level is likely to continue in the future; and whether or not the faculty member should be offered a continuing contract or a terminal contract. This evaluation, referred to as the “mid-tenure review,” should be made before the university's deadline for extending terminal contracts expires and also allow enough time for the faculty member to appeal the evaluation if so desired.

Mid-tenure reviews will be performed initially at the academic-unit level and subsequently by the USFSM Tenure and Promotion Committee. Documentation for these reviews shall parallel that of the tenure and promotion process except that outside reviews shall not be requested. The USFSM Tenure and Promotion Committee shall provide a report to the Dean and the Regional Vice Chancellor. The report shall include an analysis of strengths and weaknesses of the case as well as a statement as to whether or not the Committee believes the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion. After the USFSM Tenure and Promotion Committee submits its report, a joint meeting of the candidate and the dean will be held to discuss the candidate's progress toward tenure and/or promotion. Annual reviews, other than the mid-tenure review, shall be carried out solely by the academic unit.

Prior to beginning the formal initiation of the tenure/promotion process, the college dean should request a meeting with the faculty member with regard to his/her progress toward being awarded tenure. At this meeting, the faculty member should be given advice on whether or not to begin the formal tenure/promotion process. The Dean should then give the faculty a written explanation of the faculty’s readiness.

**REVIEW OF PROGRESS TOWARDS FULL PROFESSORSHIP**

The rank of Full Professor reflects a composite of an individual's continuing academic and service contributions and accomplishments within USFSM as well as to her or his respective discipline or profession. Moreover, the rank of Full Professor denotes a status and level of significant achievement among her or his disciplinary peers. With few exceptions, to achieve the rank of Full Professor, the candidate must demonstrate national or international recognition for his/her scholarship. Standards call for true distinction in at least one of the three areas of teaching, scholarly, research, and service, coupled with a record of substantial achievements in each of the other two areas. That is to say, campus-wide and School of Hotel and Restaurant Management standards do not permit appointment to the rank of Full Professor without significant distinction, documented on a career basis, in either the teaching, scholarly research, or service area of responsibility. Regardless of the area of distinction, substantial contributions of a continuing nature in each of the remaining areas are also necessary for the achievement of the rank of Full Professor. While assessments of the individual's contributions and accomplishments are on an entire career basis, more emphasis will be placed on those achievements recognized following the individual's promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and/or during his or her tenure at USFSM.
PROCEDURES FOR SELECTING OUTSIDE REVIEWERS

Faculty applying for tenure or for promotion to Associate or Full Professor are required by School of Hotel and Restaurant Management policy to have their research/scholarship/creative work evaluated by "external" reviewers who are generally recognized for their contributions and stature in the field. These assessments are to be based upon a detailed review of the candidate's curriculum vita and may include a review of the work outlined in the vita but should include all work supplied to the reviewer. Faculty members, in consultation with the chair and dean, will choose what material to forward for review and may include, for example, manuscripts in press and submitted, non-published and in-progress work, as well as conventional publications. These reviews become part of the Tenure/Promotion Application and contribute to the basis upon which reviews and recommendations are made at all levels. The tenure/promotion candidate has the right to examine the outside reviews. The letter of solicitation to the outside reviewer should clearly indicate the candidate's option of seeing the outside evaluation.

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion are expected to follow the external review process described in the promotion and tenure application. Specifically, candidates should recommend at least five reviewers to the School Dean. Recommendations should be accompanied by brief statements supporting the choices. If reviewers are recommended who have had significant previous contact with the candidate, reasons for that choice should be represented in sufficient detail to allay normal concerns about conflict of interest. While previous contact on a professional level does not constitute a conflict of interest, reviewers should not be selected from those with whom the candidate has had familiar or close social relationships or were professors of the candidate. Reviewers should be highly regarded and recognized scholars in the candidate's field and able to evaluate the quality, productivity, and significance of his/her scholarly activity. Reviewers should be from peer or better institutions and should also be tenured faculty members or higher academic ranks. For candidates applying for full professor the reviewers should be full professors.

The dean of the College will select a minimum of four individuals from whom reviews will be solicited. Of the four individuals selected it will be highly recommended that a minimum of three will respondents be reviewed by the tenure and promotion committee. The committee will accept all outside reviews that are received within the time frame of the tenure and promotion review dates.

The candidate will provide copies of a current vita and other materials appropriate for an external review of scholarly research. The dean will forward these materials with an invitation to the reviewers. It is recommended that the dean tentatively solicit reviewers by phone in advance of the formal invitation by letter.
RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK

The Tenure and Promotion Committee will consider faculty members’ complete research/creative work record. In general, yearly publications of high quality are expected. However, the Committee recognizes that many research projects take more than one year to complete. We also recognize that when peer reviewed articles appear in print is largely determined by the journal. As a result, faculty members may have years with multiple publications and other years with few. Faculty can present an explanation to the Committee regarding inconsistencies in publication. In addition, the Committee will consider the quality of the refereed publications. Therefore, faculty members must provide evidence of the quality of the journals that publish their research.

Rationale: The single most important goal of professional activity should be to stay current with the scholarship within the field. Staying current with the literature is also the foundation for all other professional activities. Faculty members must document and explain the various aspects of their ongoing research program to receive a baseline score of “satisfactory”.

Once the requirement for a submitting a document that explains the various aspects of the research program is met, items from the following list may demonstrate evidence of strong or outstanding research:

- completing the writing of a book which contributes to the profession
- publishing in refereed journals
- receiving a book contract
- publishing a new edition of a book
- publishing book chapters
- obtaining a refereed grant
- citations in major reviews and books
- revising manuscript that has been submitted for peer review
- submitting manuscripts for peer review
- publishing non-refereed articles
- manuscripts in preparation
- serving on editorial advisory boards for journals or publishing companies
- constructing reviews of professional literature
- attending workshops on grant-writing, publishing, technology use
- presenting papers at regional, national, and international professional meetings
- being a co-author on student presentations at regional or national meetings
- submission of grant
- guiding collaborative research at a Professional Development School or other setting

Note that this list is not exclusive. We recognize the diversity of the disciplines in which these activities/criteria will be used to evaluate faculty and the diversity of ways that faculty make scholarly contributions to their respective fields. Candidates who believe they have made a
scholarly contribution to the discipline in a manner not listed above, they should include it in their evaluation materials with a justification for why the committee should consider it. Please also note that some of the documents listed above may overlap with other areas such as service or teaching. It is up to the faculty member to explain why the criteria should be considered as relevant to research.

The following categories provide a guide to aid the committee in differentiating between Outstanding, Strong, or Satisfactory.

**OUTSTANDING IN RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK**

*Quality of Scholarship/Dissemination*

The scholarly record suggests *regular substantive contributions* which *consistently* meet the *highest standards of quality* in the field.

Scholarly products are *regularly disseminated* through venues that include publication in the *most respected/relevant journals in the field* and *presentations/adresses at the most respected professional conferences*.

*Coherent Research Program*

The scholarly record reflects a *coherent, organized, coherent and systematic* program of research.

*Productivity over Time*

Scholarly record reflects *high level of productivity* that is *consistent across the time period under evaluation*.

**STRONG IN RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK**

*Quality of Scholarship/Dissemination*

The scholarly record suggests *substantive contributions* which *generally* meet high standards of quality in the field.

*Coherent Research Program*

The scholarly record reflects a *fairly well-articulated, organized, coherent and systematic* program of research.

Scholarly record reflects *regular attempts and periodic success to secure grants and other resources* to support the conduct of inquiry or other creative activities.

*Productivity over Time*

*In general*, scholarly productivity is *consistent across time, but the level of productivity is less than exceptionally high*. 
SATISFACTORY IN RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK

Quality of Scholarship/Dissemination

The scholarly record suggests limited contributions which meet average standards of quality in the field.

Scholarly products are generally disseminated through less selective journals/conferences (local, state levels).

Coherent Research Program

The scholarly record suggests the beginnings of an organized, systematic research program and clear evidence of an intent to develop a research program.

Productivity over Time

In general, scholarly productivity is adequate but not consistent across the time period under evaluation.

UNSATISFACTORY IN RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK

Quality of Scholarship/Dissemination

The scholarly record suggests scholarship that often falls below the average standards of quality in the field. Or there may be no contributions evidenced.

Limited or no dissemination of scholarly products in primarily less selective journals/conferences.

Coherent Research Program

The scholarly record suggests contributions or scholarly activities which are not organized and coherent and show little intent to develop a research program. Or there may be no contributions evidenced.

Productivity over Time

In general, scholarly productivity is inadequate and not consistent across the time period under evaluation. Or the scholarly record may suggest no contributions.
TEACHING

Rationale

The art of teaching is at the heart of preparing future teachers. As such, we believe that maintain high standards, keeping up on current research on teaching practices and collaborating with faculty and students are the keys to an effective educator. In evaluating teaching performance, the Tenure and Promotion Committee will examine a wide array of factors that impact teaching performance and not rely on a single measure of performance. Two aspects of teaching are emphasized; evidence of teaching effectiveness and academic rigor. The development of new courses and online courses should be in particular value in this discussion.

Faculty members are fully responsible for providing evidence of their teaching-related activities. This evidence could be compiled into a teaching-related portfolio. This file could contain evidence, for example, that faculty members have created an online course, have used innovative pedagogical practices, and have completed teaching-related courses and workshops to help modify and improve their individual teaching.

The Committee requires faculty to submit copies of their syllabi and the means and criteria by which they assess their students. The committee should review student written comments on the evaluations.

Descriptors. The following four categories will be taken into consideration when evaluating one’s portfolio: 1) Continuous improvement in teaching over time (reflective); 2) Content knowledge and expertise; 3) Delivery; 4) Student Achievement.

The following accomplishments are based on but not limited to the following examples:

- substantial revisions of existing courses based upon student comments
- number of teaching preparations per semester
  - teaching evaluations demonstrate a consistent pattern of improvement
  - teaching evaluations are consistently high
  - receive teaching awards from either students or faculty organizations
- developing and implementing online courses
- peer review of your teaching
- integrating Web enhanced resources into existing courses
- developing new courses
- developing and supervising experiential learning projects for students
- conducting collaborative research with students
  - developing workshops
  - teaching in continuing education classes
  - continuing education/faculty development
- taking classes related to teaching
- participating in trainings/workshops related to teaching
- participating in campus programs to improve teaching
- developing technology skills to improve teaching
• using available programs to improve teaching

Effective teaching is not limited to the above, as these serve only as a guide of potential elements of teacher effectiveness. The following categories provide a guide to aid the committee in differentiating between Outstanding, Strong, or Satisfactory.

OUTSTANDING IN TEACHING

Narrative in teaching portfolio reflects a thoughtful, respectful, thorough consideration of feedback about teaching and consistent reflection about ways of improving or maintaining a high standard of teaching.

An overall average score during the review period of 4.0 to 5.0 will be considered Outstanding and a average for online delivery of 3.5 to 5.0. However, the committee recognizes that some courses have lower averages than others regardless of the instructor. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide to the committee data (i.e. means and standard deviation on those courses they wish the committee to evaluate.) in order to make a more accurate assessment of the student's ratings.

Content knowledge and expertise

Syllabi and peer evaluations of instruction indicate course content is current. Syllabi contain and optional peer evaluations of instruction describe content that will prepare students to master the knowledge and skills identified by relevant learned societies or that reflect conscientious dissent from these standards.

Course delivery

Syllabi reflect a logical, thoughtfully sequenced course. Expectations are stated explicitly and assignments explained in detail. Student evaluations indicate that instruction was delivered effectively. Instructor was very prepared, explained concepts clearly, and effectively used a variety of instructional strategies to deliver content.

Teaching materials, handouts, course format, instructional approaches are clearly aligned with the course objectives and are creative/innovative, reflecting a variety of instructional approaches.

Student achievement

Student products reflect outstanding achievement and/or substantial learning/ progress over time. Teaching narrative, instructional materials, student evaluations, and observations of teaching indicate a high level of skill in involving and motivating all students. Individual students' needs and perspectives are clearly respected and valued.
STRONG IN TEACHING

Continuous improvement in teaching over time (reflective)

Narrative in teaching portfolio reflects consideration of feedback about teaching and reflection about ways of improving teaching. When indicated, changes in strategy or behavior are evident. A correspondence between stated philosophy and teaching approach is evident. An overall average of 3.5 to 4.0 and 3.0 to 4.0 for online classes indicates strong in teaching

Content knowledge and expertise

Syllabi and peer evaluations of instruction indicate course content contains many of the current issues in the field. Syllabi contain and peer evaluations of instruction describe content that will prepare students to master the knowledge and skills identified by relevant learned societies.

Course delivery

Syllabi are organized and class activities appear to be logically sequenced. Assignments are clearly explained. Student evaluations indicate that the instructor was prepared, explained concepts well, and used effective teaching strategies.

Teaching materials, handouts, course format, instructional approaches are aligned with the course objectives and reflect a variety of instructional approaches.

Student achievement

Student products are of good quality and clearly reflect considerable learning/progress over time. Instructional materials, student evaluations, and general success in motivating all students is a general sign of success.

SATISFACTORY IN TEACHING

Continuous improvement in teaching over time (reflective)

Narrative in teaching portfolio reflects efforts to self-evaluate and attend to helpful feedback, but a corresponding change in teaching behavior is limited. Correspondence between the stated philosophy and teaching approaches is implied. An overall average of 3.0 to 3.5 and 2.75 to 3.5 for online classes equates to satisfactory teaching.

Content knowledge and expertise

Syllabi and peer evaluations of instruction indicate course content contains some of the current issues in the field. Syllabi contain and peer evaluations of instruction describe content that will prepare students to master the knowledge and skills identified by relevant learned societies.
Course delivery

Syllabi suggest that the course format was adequately organized, and student evaluations for the most part report that the instructor was usually prepared, and explained concepts in comprehensible ways.

Teaching materials, handouts, course format, instructional approaches are aligned with the course objectives and reflect some variation in approach.

Student achievement

Student products are of acceptable quality and reflect adequate learning/progress over time. Teaching narrative, instructional materials, student evaluations, and observations of teaching reflect efforts to involve and motivate all students, but student feedback and teaching observations across multiple semesters indicate that some students’ needs and perspectives are not being successfully addressed.

UNSATISFACTORY IN TEACHING

Continuous improvement in teaching over time (reflective)

Narrative in teaching portfolio does not consider feedback about teaching, nor are efforts to improve teaching evident. No correspondence is noted between the stated philosophy and teaching approaches. An overall average score below 3.0 and below 2.75 equates unsatisfactory.

Content Knowledge and expertise

Syllabi are not complete and reflective of learned society standards. Peer evaluations are missing or they indicate instructional practice is out of date, shallow and inaccurate.

Course Delivery

Student evaluations indicate delivery of instruction was consistently inadequate. Teaching materials, handouts, course format, instructional approaches are neither aligned with the course objectives nor varied in approach.

Student Achievement

Student products are not of acceptable quality or are not provided. Teaching narrative, instructional materials, student evaluations, and observations of teaching report do not reflect efforts to involve and motivate students with special needs, nor do they reflect sensitivity to individual differences among students.
SERVICE

In evaluating service-related activities, the Tenure and Promotion Committee will examine all aspects of a candidate’s service and not rely on a single measure of performance. As we are a small campus with a very limited number of faculty representing their discipline, it is important that faculty members verify a sustained commitment to service-related activities and that they fulfill their service obligations cooperatively and collegially. Applicants are fully responsible for providing evidence of their service-related activities.

The expectation for all faculty is that they assist in the activities and duties of the College, University and Profession as a whole. Faculty are expected: (1) to serve on College committees as needed; (2) participate in College activities as needed; and (3) attend College meetings on a regular basis. Note that the Committee recognizes that the service load will differ among faculty and across ranks (e.g., newly hired faculty will have less service-related activities than more senior faculty). The Committee will also consider the percentage of assignments that are service-related.

The following three categories will be taken into consideration when evaluating a candidate’s service portfolio:

1. Service to the Institution
2. Service to the Profession
3. Service to the Community

Service descriptors in each of the three service categories are provided. These examples are not a definitive list; rather they are intended to support a broad range of evidence to be presented and considered.

A Service to the University and School of Hotel and restaurant Management ***

- Committee service (e.g. Annual Review, Search, Grievance, Faculty Governance, Student Awards)
- Leadership in service activities (chair of committee, etc.)
- Project committee or task force
- Sponsoring or advising a university student organization
- Recruiting and orienting new students
- Contributing to news media as a USFSM representative

A. Service to the Profession

- Officer or Board Member of a professional organization Committee Member of a professional organization
- Editor of a professional publication (associate editor, consulting editor, etc.)
- Editorial Board Member of a professional publication
• Reviewer for professional activity (journals, grant proposals, books and chapters, conference proposals)
• Volunteer support for professional conferences (e.g. chairing a session)
• Contributing to news and popular media as an expert in the field

B. Service to the Community, Region, and State

• Officer or Board Member of an education-related civic organization
• Participant in educational community activities and programs
• Volunteer service to civic organizations
• Liaison to Professional Development School

Please note that the above list is not exclusive. Faculty members can provide evidence of other service-related activities.

OUTSTANDING IN SERVICE

An overall average score of 4.0 – 5.0 on Annual Reviews from the review period equates outstanding.

Service to the University
Narrative and documentation in portfolio consistently demonstrate high levels of leadership on university councils/committees. Faculty consistently promotes the goals and mission of the university.

Service to the College and Discipline
Narrative and documentation in the portfolio consistently demonstrate high levels of leadership on College committees/councils. Faculty consistently promotes the goals and mission of the college.

Service to the Profession
Narrative and documentation in portfolio consistently demonstrate a leadership role in his/her profession. Faculty assumes leadership roles in professional organizations. Faculty serves as journal editor and/or reviewer, assumes leadership role on accreditation and review teams.

Service to the Community
Faculty demonstrates high levels of leadership of constituencies in the community.

STRONG IN SERVICE

An overall average score of 3.0 to 3.9 equates to strong.

Service to the College and Discipline
Narrative and documentation in the portfolio consistently demonstrate faculty participates on College councils and/or committees and contributes often to the goals and mission of the college.

Service to the University

Narrative and documentation in the portfolio consistently demonstrate faculty participates on University councils and/or committees and contributes often to the goals and mission of the University.

Service to the Profession

Narrative and documentation in the portfolio consistently demonstrates faculty participates often to his/her professional organizations, participates in a leadership capacity in professional organizations, serves as journal reviewer and serves on professional accreditation and review teams.

Service to the Community

Narrative and documentation in the portfolio consistently demonstrate faculty contributes often to constituencies in the community

Satisfactory in Service

An overall average score of 2.5 – 2.9 equates to satisfactory.

Service to the College and Discipline

Narrative and documentation in the portfolio consistently demonstrate faculty works with others to benefit the college.

Service to the University

Narrative and documentation in portfolio consistently demonstrate faculty generally serves to promote the goals and mission of the university.

Service to the Profession

Narrative and documentation in portfolio consistently demonstrate faculty generally shows development of an on-going agenda of service to multiple levels and constituencies.

Service to the Community

Narrative and documentation in portfolio consistently demonstrate faculty shows general cooperation and collaboration with constituencies in the community.

Unsatisfactory in Service

An overall average score of 2.0 – 2.4 equates to unsatisfactory.
Service to the College and Discipline

Narrative and documentation in portfolio consistently demonstrate faculty shows limited or no effort to cooperate or contribute to benefit the college.

Service to the University

Narrative and documentation in portfolio consistently demonstrate faculty limited or no effort to promote of the goals and mission of the university.

Service to the Profession

Narrative and documentation in portfolio demonstrates faculties limited or no effort to cooperate or collaborate with professional organizations.

Service to the Community

Narrative and documentation in portfolio demonstrates faculties limited or no effort to cooperate or collaborate with constituencies in the community.
Portfolio Contents  
For Tenure and or Promotion

All faculty members' tenure and promotion portfolios should contain the following contents:

a. A complete and current up-to-date academic curriculum vitae.

b. A minimum of three outside letters evaluating the faculty member's scholarly activities. In most cases this will be all four that were sent to reviewers but should one not be received three reviews will be used.

c. The required university documents and all evaluations.

d. An appendix including a summary of all teaching evaluations prepared by an appropriate department/unit committee. Peer evaluations of the faculty member, teaching evaluations must be included.

e. A complete set of scholarly works.

f. A list of all professional papers delivered at meetings indicating the review process REFERRED, INVITED OR NON REFERRED and whether a complete paper or an abstract is required in the review process.

g. A list of all published works, with complete scholarly citation. The department chairperson/director should provide an indication of the quality of the journals in which the candidate has published and also the degree of contribution of the candidate to co-authored publications.

h. A complete set of all annual evaluations by the dean and any appropriate faculty committees.

i. A complete set of all reviews of "Progress Made Toward Tenure" made by the chairperson/director and any appropriate faculty committees.

Reviewers spend considerable time reviewing all candidates' credentials. Clearly organized folios facilitate the process and enable reviewers to spend their time carefully reading the documentation. Folios consist of two sections: the notebook containing all required elements as identified in the USFSM Tenure/Promotion Application and the accompanying documentation file. The following are offered as suggestions for clearly organizing folios.
Overall Organization

Place an up-to-date vita in the pocket of the notebook.

Tab sections clearly and in a predictable order, as specified in the university's guidelines.

The application format requires the candidate to provide indexes so that the reader can easily find the required elements. Tabs are needed for the following:

a. Introduction  
b. General Information  
c. Assigned Duties  
d. Teaching  
e. Research and Creative Work  
f. Service  
g. Evaluations

Candidates should carefully follow the directions in the university's application format requirements. The suggestions that follow are intended as supplements to the guidelines.

General Information Section

A clear statement about when the candidate came to USF and the period to be evaluated.

Only productivity and accomplishments in the School of Hotel and Restaurant Management are ***considered unless*** the candidate negotiated time from another institution at the time of hiring.

Assigned Duties Section

Provide a summary table in the front of the section detailing by semester the candidate’s assignments.

Assignment sheets are included in this section, but should follow an overview summary table.

Teaching Section

A concise narrative describing the candidate’s teaching and learning should be at the front of this section. In this narrative, candidates should explain how their beliefs about teaching and learning are actualized in their pedagogy. Whenever possible, evidence contained in the portfolio should be referenced and explained in relation to the candidate’s philosophy and pedagogy.

A summary table detailing all courses and sections taught during the period under review and the number of students in each course should be included. In listing these courses, it is important that reviewers be able to easily distinguish the level of the course.
The dean’s table of student evaluations should follow the teaching assignment table. It is helpful when this table clearly indicates the nature of the item being rated, not just the item number. Course evaluation forms have changed over the years so it is important to identify the dimension being evaluated. Student comments follow, again presented by the dean.

Research and Creative Work Section

A brief narrative should be placed in the front of this section that provides an overview of the candidate’s research agenda, major accomplishments, and future scholarly goals and plans. The attached matrix on research and scholarship should be used to guide the narrative.

Work should be classified as detailed per the university’s application requirements as books published, refereed journal articles, book segments, non-referred articles. All are considered scholarly contributions, although ones at the top of the list are generally viewed as being more significant than ones at the lower end of the list. It is helpful to report the number of times the candidate’s work has been cited by others. Although, citing is not as common in the hospitality field acceptance rate and journal ranking are extremely helpful. The dean’s evaluation of the journals in which the candidate has published should be included.

For works that are in press, include the letter or e-mail reporting its acceptance. State clearly the status of works underway and works that have been submitted. Letters acknowledging receipt of the article and drafts of works underway should be included to document the status of the work.

As specified in the university's application format requirements, underline the senior author of each work. Collaborative work among faculty is valued thus it is expected that many submissions will have more than one author; however, it is also expected that the candidate will have been senior or sole author of some of the works. Although the first author of a multi-authored paper is typically assumed to be the senior author, exceptions should be explicitly noted.

Service Section

A brief narrative about the nature of the candidate’s service should be placed in the front of this section.

Every USF faculty member is expected to be a good citizen of the academic community. Service activities refer to the activities detailed in the attached matrix. Paid consultancies, although they may be listed on the vita, generally are not considered service and should be listed as outside activity. However, federal, state and local agencies often provide honoraria or stipends as well as reimbursement for travel expenses. Such work is considered service.

Candidates are encouraged to document the time commitments of their service activities. This may be done by letters of support that detail the commitment.
Evaluation Section

Tabs in this section are particularly important as the various documents can easily be confused.

The following order is recommended:

a. External reviewers
b. College committee’s evaluation and recommendation
c. Dean’s evaluation and recommendation
d. Mid-tenure review (for tenure candidates)
e. Annual reviews

In selecting external reviewers, it is recommended that they not be people who know the candidate on professional bases only. The reviewers should not be former colleagues, co-authors, or in some way, close associates and friends of the candidate.