UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA SARASOTA-MANATEE COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

POLICIES RELATING TO STANDARDS TO BE APPLIED IN AWARDING TENURE AND PROMOTION

I. General Criteria

While the campus-wide document pertaining to tenure and promotion applies to all of the colleges and schools on the campus, the purpose of this tenure and promotion policy document is to provide general criteria for faculty in the USF Sarasota-Manatee College of Business. The expectations of performance take into consideration the mission statement of the College.

Any faculty member or administrator who would otherwise participate in the recommendation to grant or deny a promotion should be disqualified if that person has a relationship or financial interest that would give the appearance of biasing that person either in favor or against the candidate. Conflicts of interest exist not because actual bias is assumed, but because of the appearance of a lack of sufficient impartiality. Whether a disqualifying conflict of interest does exist often presents the difficult question of degree and it depends upon a determination by a participant in the process to identify the conflict and to disqualify her or himself when appropriate. In lieu of disqualification, it can be sufficient that the circumstances giving rise to an apparent conflict of interest be fully disclosed. When disqualification is required, that can be sufficient by a decision of a member of the college not to vote or otherwise participate in the evaluation process. At a stage of the process involving a single decision-maker, such as the collegiate Dean, additional arrangements for a substitute decision-maker will be made.

II. Tenure

A. Tenure Decision

The decision to grant tenure is one of the most critical in university life and is unparalleled in other organizations. Tenure anticipates the quality of contact between a faculty member and literally thousands of students. The granting of tenure must be the result of a careful analysis of a faculty member's consistent record of achievement and contribution in scholarship, teaching, and service to the university, profession, and community.

The university's decision to recommend the granting of tenure must be made on the basis of a faculty member's activities and accomplishments
over a period of time sufficient in length to judge the substance and regularity of teaching, scholarly research and publications, and service contributions. The review must lead to the conclusion that the colleague possesses teaching and scholarship skills necessary to contribute to and accommodate changes in the content of his or her profession or academic discipline, and the readiness to contribute to the university and the community.

Faculty members must have a consistent pattern of positive evaluation in teaching and substantive scholarly contributions judged to be significant and current. There must be evidence of strong performance in both teaching and scholarship and outstanding achievement in at least one of these areas. 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. One key monograph that changes the course of an area of study in one's discipline along with additional, yet unpublished, work related to that area might represent such sustained and substantial effort. A monograph of less importance and impact might not. Similarly, numerous journal articles or other contributions, important though not benchmark accomplishments in one's field, may serve to accumulate a record of substantive contributions. 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.

Just as university standards will not support the granting of tenure to an individual whose record lacks substantive contribution of a scholarly nature, so too, persons who are judged to be even superior scholars will not be granted tenure without sustained and positive evaluations of effectiveness in teaching and contributing knowledge to students. It is recognized that contributions in the area of service are also necessary for the granting of tenure at the University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee.

B. Criteria for Performance Evaluation

1. Evidence of the quality and quantity of research and other scholarly work as measured by the following where the order indicates priority:
a. Research culminating in publications in quality, refereed journals. Each discipline may maintain a list of quality refereed journals.

b. Scholarly books, book chapters and monographs published.

c. Refereed conference proceedings.

d. Citation analyses from sources such as the Social Science Citation Index and Google Scholar.

e. Presentations at conferences and professional meetings.

f. Grant-funded research and reports.

g. Research culminating in "Faculty Working Papers."

h. Other

Comment: Faculty committees and administrators responsible for tenure evaluations should have the opportunity to review not only the resume (vita) listings, but also the original evidence. Thus, a faculty member who wishes to be considered for tenure should assemble the results of her or his research and writing efforts for such review.

2. The quality of teaching in different areas at varying levels of sophistication as measured by:

a. Content of material offered in courses taught as evidenced by course syllabi, course handouts, examinations and other course material.

b. Reception by students in courses taught as evidenced by student evaluations of teaching.

c. Evaluations of teaching by faculty peers based on reviews of materials indicated in (a) and class visitations.

d. Dedication to effective teaching as demonstrated through continuous improvement and efforts to correct identified deficiencies.

e. Development of teaching materials, including textbooks and published cases, and innovative pedagogical techniques.
f. Course development in degree and non-degree programs.

g. Other.

Comment: Faculty Committees and Administrators responsible for tenure evaluations should have the opportunity to review both summarized and original evidence. It will be the responsibility of the faculty member, in conjunction with her or his Dean, to make sure all the teaching support evidence is available and assembled properly for such review.

3. The quality, quantity, and importance of the service contribution may include such activities as:

a. Service to the department, college, and university in the form of committee work or other program assignments.

b. Sponsoring or advising university organizations.

c. Developing and presenting continuing education or professional programs.

d. Effective consulting with public agencies or private companies.

e. Work with professional and academic organizations.

f. Editorial Board review and other journal article refereeing activities.

g. Review of conference articles and research grant proposals.

h. Research performed for public and private organizations.

i. Professional work with community organizations.

j. Other.

Comment: Service should be evaluated on the basis of involvement in the university, public, or private sector which has resulted in a valuable professional contribution.
Sixth Year Tenure and Promotion Review

The faculty member who is being reviewed/evaluated for promotion to Associate Professor and the granting of tenure should present a five-year record of teaching, published research and service that demonstrates the candidate has established a record of strong teaching, strong research, and strong service. There must be evidence of strong performance in both teaching and scholarship and outstanding achievement in at least one of these areas. The portfolio should also provide evidence that the candidate will continue a high level of performance in the future. To receive a positive recommendation for tenure and promotion the following expectations should be met:

**Teaching** – A continuation of the high level of performance achieved during the first three tenure-earning years. In addition, the faculty members should demonstrate how continuous improvement in teaching performance was achieved. A significant use of technology to deliver content will be expected to be demonstrated in the teaching portfolio.

**Research** – The candidate should present a research and publication portfolio that includes a consistent activity of 4-6 published or accepted articles and one article under review in quality, peer-reviewed journals. Continuing research and publication accomplishments should be presented that provides strong evidence that the faculty member will maintain an active research agenda and remain academically qualified. Other research and scholarship activities should be presented.

**Service** – It is expected that the candidate will present strong evidence of leadership and service to the college, the community and/or the profession, especially during the last three tenure-earning years.

III. Qualifications for Academic Rank

The judgment of readiness for academic rank is based upon scholarship, teaching, and service contributions. It is not the intent of the university to reject or approve recommendations for promotion solely on the basis of "time in rank." While significant time is typically necessary to accumulate the necessary record of professional accomplishment, exceptional persons whose contributions have been rapidly recognized may submit applications for promotion without regard for time in rank. Moreover, the categorical items found within the "Criteria for Performance Evaluation" used in making tenure decisions (listed in Section I-B) should serve as the general guidelines for the necessary information to be used in the process of assessing the faculty member's professional accomplishments.

A. Associate Professor

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor requires:
1. Strong performance in teaching,
2. Strong performance in research, and at least outstanding in research or teaching
3. Strong service contributions

Outstanding performance in research can be demonstrated by publishing in academic journals in the candidate’s field that are widely recognized as quality journals. Outstanding performance in research can also be demonstrated by publications in other respected academic outlets that constitute a focused program of research achievement.

The record must demonstrate professional accomplishment beyond the doctoral or terminal degree level.

At the University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee College of Business, the rank of Associate Professor signifies accomplishment in scholarship, teaching, and service worthy of the status of a member of the senior faculty. This rank is reserved for those whose accomplishments have achieved significance both in the individual's field and the university.

B. Full Professor

- Acknowledged record of success in teaching, or other comparable activity appropriate for the college, such as a record of participation on thesis and/or dissertation committees, and successful direction of the work of master’s and doctoral candidates, where applicable. Because not all faculty at USFSM will have options to participate in either master's or doctoral work with students, refer to college guidelines for further specifications.
- Established record of productive research/creative work of at least national visibility, supported by a record of substantial publications or their equivalent. Original or creative work may be considered an equivalent. The record should predict continuing high productivity in research/creative work throughout the individual's career.
- Substantive contributions in the area of service.
- Unmistakable evidence of significant achievement among peers in one's discipline at the national or international level. True distinction is expected in at least one of the areas of teaching (or comparable activity appropriate to the college); research/creative work; or service. Any recommendation for promotion to the rank of Professor must contain evidence that such distinction has been identified.
- As a general guideline a faculty member normally would not apply for promotion to rank of Professor without five years of service at the rank of Associate Professor.
REVIEW OF PROGRESS TOWARDS TENURE

Annual Review
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 to evaluate 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 tenure evaluation 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 evaluation of the faculty member's progress toward earning tenure, there should be a very complete and explicit explanation of how the candidate's evaluation 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 evaluation should indicate those areas that need improvement and provide suggestions as to how the deficiencies may be corrected. Appeals may be made to the appropriate faculty committee.

Three Year Review
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 has made 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 “third-year 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 and consists of the following:

1) Prior to beginning the formal initiation of the tenure/promotion process, a faculty member should request a consultation with college Dean regarding the faculty member’s 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.
2) Third-year reviews will be performed initially at the academic-unit level and subsequently by the campus TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE.
3) Documentation for these reviews shall parallel that of the tenure and promotion process except that outside reviews shall not be requested.
4) The TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE shall provide a report to the Dean and the Regional Vice Chancellor of the campus. 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.

5) After the campus 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.

End of Third Year Review Expectations

Teaching - Student narratives will be considered, and a strong positive attitude toward students and the learning environment is expected to emerge from the students' comments. The faculty member will be expected to present a teaching portfolio that represents a variety of pedagogical tools, enhancements to the learning process and innovative teaching. Other factors that will be considered in the evaluation of the teaching performance include, but are not limited to, number of preparations, number of classes taught, size of the classes, content of the courses, level of the courses, and number of times the course has been taught.

Research – The scholarly research/publications output that will be expected in the tenure-earning candidates packet consist of the following:

- One to three peer-reviewed articles accepted for publication and/or published
- At least one paper or other presentation made at a conference in the candidate's discipline
- Two articles submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal
- A significant stream of focused research-in-progress

Other factors that will be considered in the evaluation of the scholarship performance include, but are not limited to:

- The amount of the annual research assignment
- The amount of research support provided, i.e. financial support for data collection and analysis, graduate assistant support, conference travel support, etc.
- The quality of the journals published in or submitted to
- Single or multiple authorships

Service – Faculty members in tenure-earning positions will have minimal service expectations/assignments during their first three tenure-earning years on the faculty. They will be expected to attend college and campus-wide faculty meetings and participate in, and vote on, faculty matters.
CONTENTS AND FORM OF THE TENURE/PROMOTION PACKET

To assure uniformity of all faculty members' tenure and promotion packets, the following contents are recommended:

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

2. A minimum of three outside letters evaluating the faculty member's scholarly activities.

3. The required university documents completed with all of the required evaluations and votes recorded.

4. An appendix including a summary of all teaching evaluations prepared by an appropriate department/unit committee. Peer evaluations of the faculty member's teaching may also be included.

5. A complete set of scholarly works that have been used in the Dean and unit committee's evaluations.

6. A list of all professional papers delivered at meetings indicating the review process and whether a complete paper or an abstract is required in the review process.

7. A list of all published works, with complete scholarly citation. The Dean 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.

8. Results of citation analyses showing the number of times the faculty member's scholarly work has been cited.

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

10. A complete set of all reviews of "Progress Made Toward Tenure" made by the Dean and any appropriate faculty committees.
TENURE/PROMOTION PROCESS DATES

The University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee tenure & promotion timeline will be established by the Office of Academic Affairs each academic year.

PROCEDURES FOR SELECTING OUTSIDE REVIEWERS

All currently employed faculty applying for tenure or for promotion to Associate or Full Professor are required by COB 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 candidates’ written work, not simply a scrutiny of a curriculum vita. Faculty members, in consultation with 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 their 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 proper 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, who are former professors of the candidate, or co-authors of the candidate (except to ascertain levels of participation and contribution to jointly author works). 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 research activity. Reviewers should ideally be from peer or better institutions and should also be tenured faculty members at higher academic ranks (for decisions regarding promotion) and tenured faculty at the same or higher academic ranks (for decisions regarding tenure only).

The Dean of the College will select a minimum of three individuals from whom reviews will be solicited. In the event the Dean believes additional recommendations are desirable or necessary, then (1) the candidate should be requested to make supplementary recommendations, and (2) the Dean may suggest additional reviewers to the candidate. Ordinarily this process should result in a list of reviewers acceptable to the candidate’s College Dean. Should agreement not be reached in this fashion, the
college's tenure and promotion committee will, in consultation with the College Dean, select review candidates from lists provided by the candidate and the Dean.

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.
ILLUSTRATIVE LETTER

Invitation to External Reviewers

(COLLEGE LETTERHEAD)

______________________________(DATE)

Dear ____________:

_______________(NAME) is being considered for (tenure)(the rank of Full Professor)(the rank of Associate Professor) in the College of Business on the USF Sarasota-Manatee Campus. You have been recommended as a person highly qualified to review and evaluate ______________'s research/scholarly/creative contributions. We believe external evaluations contribute substantially to the academic review process and we would appreciate greatly your willingness to serve in this capacity.

Under existing agreements and regulations, your written comments would become part of _____'s file and be available for (his/her) review. If you are willing to accept our invitation, we solicit your comments regarding the depth, originality, importance, significance, visibility, productivity, and independent scholarship of (his)(her) contributions. We do not, of course, want you to make a (tenure)(promotion) recommendation as such. Your evaluative comments, however, based upon your knowledge and appreciation of the field and its standards, will make a significant contribution to our review and discussion. Please keep in mind that your comments should reflect appropriate norms, as you see them, for a candidate for (tenure/Associate Professor/Full Professor).

In order to complete our review, I hope we might have your response by ____________(DATE). Should you decide not to accept our invitation to serve as an external reviewer for ______________(NAME), we would appreciate learning of that decision at your earliest convenience. In either case, please be assured that we are very grateful for your consideration of our request.

Sincerely,

______________________________(DEAN)
CANDIDATE, DEAN, AND DEPARTMENTAL
STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES IN CompleTING
TENURE AND PROMOTION FORMS

Department Staff Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of the college/staff where the faculty member resides to assist in the preparation of all necessary forms and to ensure that the appropriate and current forms are used. As soon as the candidate indicates to the Dean that he or she is applying for tenure and/or promotion, the college secretary should meet with the candidate. It is the college secretary’s responsibility to provide the candidate with all of the necessary information requirements. The college secretary should package all the forms and then review each of them with the candidate. The college secretary should work with the candidate in the preparation of the forms. He/she should be prepared to type the forms at the candidate’s request and to maintain an accurate file of all information provided by the candidate. Also, if the candidate requests the opportunity to review files of prior candidates for promotion and/or tenure, the college secretary should provide the candidate with examples. It is important that the college secretary recognizes his or her responsibility to assist in the preparation of tenure and/or promotion data.

The Role of Dean

The role of the Dean is to guide the candidate for tenure and/or promotion through the process. The Dean’s responsibility is first to review the entire application process for tenure and/or promotion with the candidate and outline the steps necessary for the application and provide specific dates as to when each of the steps must be completed. A major responsibility for the Dean is to address how external reviews will be obtained. (See the guidelines presented on page 10 for more details.)

The Dean is to gather student and peer evaluations and any other meaningful information that may be helpful in determining the effectiveness of the candidate as a teacher. The Dean is responsible for gathering data on the candidate’s teaching effectiveness for the previous five years.

It is the responsibility of the Dean to work closely with all candidates for tenure from the time the faculty member accepts a position at the University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee. The Dean should, at a minimum, meet with the faculty member within the first semester and assist him or her in development of a file. The Dean should clearly outline the expectations of the College of Business. The Dean, at a minimum, should meet with the candidate each year to review the faculty member’s file and his or her progress for tenure and/or promotion.
Candidate Responsibilities

It is the candidate's responsibility to prepare accurate information attesting to his or her competency in the area of research, teaching, and service. The candidate is responsible for providing the Dean with information each year that they are a faculty member that attests to their competencies in these three areas. The candidate should also provide the Dean with any significant course development work and any thesis and dissertation committees they are presently on. Furthermore, the candidate should provide journal articles accepted for publication, journal articles that are published, books and monographs published, professional papers presented, reprinted articles, and other published work. Also, the candidate should provide information on research in progress and on research funds generated. Finally, the candidate must provide a citation analysis of his/her work using sources such as the Social Science Citation Index and Google Scholar. Self-citations should be excluded.

The candidate is also responsible for providing information on university, professional, and community service he or she may have provided. The candidate should include university and college committee and other appropriate assignments. The candidate may also include special institutional assignments and participation in special programs and seminars. The candidate should also include active participation in professional and honorary organizations and service at national, state, or local community levels.

It is the responsibility of the candidate also to provide information regarding honors and awards and anything else that the candidate believes should be considered in evaluating his or her performance.

When the candidate applies for tenure and/or promotion, he or she can provide the names of suggested external reviewers; however, it is the responsibility of the Dean to select external reviewers.

The candidate has the right to review his or her file at any time. The candidate is responsible for the accuracy of his or her file and the candidate may add to his or her file with approval of the campus Tenure and Promotion Committee at any time prior to the Dean forwarding his or her file to the provost's Office. Any additions to the file after the Dean has forwarded the file to the Regional Vice Chancellor's Office must be approved by the Dean of the College of Business.