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INSTRUCTOR PROMOTION GUIDE AND CRITERIA

This Instructor Promotion Guide and Criteria, created by College of Education Task Force and approved by the USFSM College of Education faculty on December 1, 2014, is intended to ensure systemic consistency of expectations across all faculty by delineating the standards that will guide the COE Tenure and Promotion Committee (hereafter called the Committee) members in review of applications for promotion by instructors. The Instructor Promotion Guide and Criteria, hereafter called The Guide, is aligned to the teaching and service criteria of the COE Tenure and Promotion Criteria document. The Guide is also intended to support promotion candidates in the preparation of their applications.

For candidates, this guide describes the breadth of activities that teaching and service comprise and the extent to which evidence of faculty performance should be reflected in a promotion portfolio. 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 Career Path for Instructor: Promotion Guidelines.

For the Committee, this guide provides working definitions of the dimensions underlying the domains of teaching 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 Un satisfactory performance are delineated. These criteria are intended to provide a common understanding of the scope and rigor of the promotion review.

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 and service that are pertinent to promotion decisions. Faculty collegiality, faculty in collaborative activities and regular practice of organizational citizenship are cross-cutting dimensions of faculty performance that potentiate performance in teaching and service.

In summary, these guidelines are not intended to prescribe inflexible minimal criteria for promotion, but rather to communicate expectations to faculty candidates for promotion and expectations to the Committee and administrators about our College’s common understanding of faculty productivity.
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PROMOTION GUIDELINES

In order to demonstrate appreciation for their many contributions to the mission of the University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee and to encourage continued career development, the university provides a promotional career path for individuals who hold the non-tenure track rank of Instructor.

Eligibility and Regulations

- Eligible employees are those classified as full-time Instructors, whose position has been one of continued employment, and who have not been given notice of non-reappointment or termination.

- Individuals must have been awarded the appropriate degree associated with the primary duties as defined by the college in which the appointment resides.

The individual must initiate the process by requesting to be evaluated for promotion. The decision to apply for promotion rests with the individual and there is no penalty for one's choice not to apply or specifically for failure to be granted promotion.

This career path creates no rights other than the option to apply for promotion to the designated positions.

- The candidate may withdraw at any point in the process preceding Item # 6 in the Review Process for Promotion.

Initial Appointments

- All initial appointments of non-tenure-earning Instructors will be designated as Level 1.

Requirements of Promotion Levels

Level 2

- Five (5) or more years of experience at Level 1 is typically expected. Earlier eligibility may be considered for exceptional candidates, but a minimum of 3 years of experience at Level 1 is required. After the appropriate period of service, Instructors may apply to be considered for a promotion on the basis of meritorious performance.

- Excellence in the principal assigned duty is required, as demonstrated by earning an overall rating of "Outstanding." This evaluation should be in concert with, but not
solely determined by, the last five years of annual evaluations (or total number available if being considered early). In addition to annual evaluations, the required comprehensive review should assess the individual's holistic contributions to the university.

- An overall rating of "Strong" is required on any additional areas of assignment during the last five years of annual evaluations (or total number available if being considered early).

If an individual has equal primary FTE assignments, one must be designated as the primary area and ratings assigned accordingly, as determined by the College Dean and in consultation with the candidate. The primary area must be evaluated as "Outstanding" and the remaining areas rated as no less than "Strong."

Level 3

Five (5) or more years of experience at Level 2 is typically expected. Earlier eligibility may be considered for outstanding candidates, but a minimum of 3 years of experience at Level 2 is required. After the appropriate period of service, Instructors may apply to be considered for promotion to Level 3 on the basis of meritorious performance.

- Excellence in the principal assigned duty is required, as demonstrated by earning an overall rating of "Outstanding." This evaluation should be in concert with, but not solely determined by, the last five years of annual evaluations (or total number available if being considered early). In addition to annual evaluations, the required comprehensive review should assess the individual's holistic contributions to the university.

An overall rating of "Strong" is required on any additional areas of assignment during the last five years of annual evaluations (or total number available if being considered early).

- If an individual has equal primary FTE assignments, one must be designated as the primary area and ratings assigned accordingly, as determined by the College Dean and in consultation with the candidate. The primary area must be evaluated as "Outstanding" and the remaining areas rated as no less than "Strong."

- In addition, in assigning ratings for Level 3, evaluating units should assess whether the individual has demonstrated continuous professional development and has achieved significant accomplishments beyond that considered at the Level 2 review.
Examples of such accomplishments include, but are not limited to receiving awards related to assigned duties, publishing material in professional outlets related to assigned duties (especially when receiving positive external attention), and developing innovations that have had a demonstrably positive effect in promoting the mission of the university.

**REVIEW PROCESS FOR PROMOTION**

Colleges with non-tenure earning faculty holding the position of Instructor will maintain procedures for processing career ladder applications and criteria for promotion within that college. Included in these criteria should be specifications to be used in determining requests for early promotion consideration. Such procedures and standards are subject to review and approval by the College faculty.

The general process, subject to variation according to academic structural arrangements, is as follows:

1. The Instructor meets with her/his Dean to ensure that he/she is eligible for promotional consideration. Deans are encouraged to provide a candid assessment at that time of the potential strengths and weaknesses of the Instructor's application.

2. If the Instructor meets eligibility criteria and decides to proceed with the application, the Instructor submits a formal application for promotion to the Dean. (Application forms are on the USFSM Tenure and Promotion website.)

3. A College Instructor Review Committee within the Instructor's college reviews the application. The College Instructor Review Committee consists of three faculty from the respective College. The College faculty select the Committee's membership. Faculty with the rank of instructor at a higher level than the candidate(s) being reviewed will be given priority in the selection process. When a College does not have three faculty holding the instructor rank at a higher level than the candidate, tenured faculty may be substituted. This committee reviews the application and assigns overall ratings for each relevant area of assigned duties and a recommendation concerning promotion. The review committee must provide a narrative that justifies the assigned ratings.

4. The Dean provides a separate review with ratings, narrative, and recommendation.

5. Should the Dean's recommendation differ from that of the College Instructor Review Committee, then the application is reviewed by the USFSM Instructor Review Committee. The USFSM Instructor Review Committee is a three-person review body drawn from the faculty outside the College of the candidate under review. In addition, the Chair of the College Committee serves as a fourth, ex-officio member to provide college-specific information. The Faculty Senate President in consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee selects the members, giving priority for membership to faculty holding the instructor rank at a
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higher level than the candidate. When the University does not have three faculty holding the instructor rank at a higher level than the candidate and outside his/her College, tenured faculty may be substituted. The USFSM Instructor Review Committee reviews the application and assigns a rating for each relevant area of assigned duties and a recommendation concerning promotion. The Committee must provide a narrative that justifies the assigned ratings.

6. The recommendations and narratives of the College Instructor Review Committee, Dean, and, the University-level Review Committee (if required to conduct a review) are sent to the Regional Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs (RVCAA). The RVCAA reviews all materials and makes a final decision.

7. The RVCAA sends a copy of the promotion decision to the candidate with a copy to the college dean and human resources by May 15.

An updated Timeline with deadlines is provided annually and should be followed.

APPLICATION

Application materials must include:
1. A completed USFSM application form
2. Philosophy of Teaching
3. Analytical self-evaluation/Reflective narrative on teaching
4. Teaching record (student evaluations completed by personnel in the Dean’s Office, same as completed for faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure)
5. Analytical self-evaluation/Reflective narrative on service
6. Based on self-evaluations, plan going forward
7. Curriculum vita
TEACHING

The art of teaching is at the heart of preparing future teachers. As such, we believe that (1) maintaining high standards, (2) keeping up on current research on teaching practices and (3) collaborating with faculty and students are the keys to an effective educator. In evaluating teaching performance, the 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.

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. Examples of Arts-Integrated instruction should be included.

The Committee requires faculty to submit copies of their syllabi and the means and criteria by which they assess their students (e.g., rubrics and assessment tools, Power Point presentations, innovative techniques, up-to-date technology, and work samples from students). Additionally, the Committee requires a thoughtful reflective statement outlining the candidate’s philosophy of education and how the philosophy is demonstrated in teaching. Finally, the Committee highly recommends that student written evaluations be examined and a reflective analysis be provided demonstrating growth.

The faculty recognize that some courses have lower averages on student evaluations than others regardless of the instructor. It is the candidate’s responsibility to provide data and interpretation to the Committee (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.

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 and (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
- revising courses substantively
- developing and supervising experiential learning projects for students
• conducting collaborative research with students
• presenting at professional conferences
• 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 and the following criteria serve only as a guide for assessing potential elements of teacher effectiveness. The following categories provide a guide to aid the Committee in differentiating between Outstanding, Strong, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory.

OUTSTANDING IN TEACHING

Continuous improvement in teaching over time (reflective)

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. Furthermore, when indicated, changes in behavior are evident. There is a clearly expressed alignment between the stated philosophy and teaching approach. Evidence of course development and revision of existing courses is offered.

Generally, an overall average score above the USFSM College of Education average on Annual Reports during the review period equates to outstanding.

Content knowledge and expertise

Syllabi reflect course content that is current in the discipline. Syllabi contain 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, the 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.

STONG 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 behavior are evident. A correspondence between stated philosophy and teaching approach is evident. Evidence of course development and revision of existing courses is offered. Generally, an overall average student evaluation score at or above the USFSM College of Education average equates to strong.

Content knowledge and expertise

Syllabi and course content reflect many of the current issues in the field. Syllabi contain content that will prepare students with 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. Teaching narrative, instructional materials, student evaluations, and observations of teaching demonstrate a commitment to and general success in involving and motivating all students.

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 student evaluation score
reflecting that most courses meet the USFSM College of Education average equates to satisfactory.

Content knowledge and expertise

Syllabi and course content contain some of the current issues in the field. Syllabi contain content that will prepare students with principal 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 student evaluation score reflects that many courses fall below the USFSM College of Education average equates to 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 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 institution, the profession and broader community served by USFSM. 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 (Program, College of Education, USFSM, and USF System)
2. Service to the Profession or Academic Discipline
3. Service to the Community

Service to the Institution is the main responsibility in the area of Service. Although service to the profession/academic discipline and community are recognized, they do not replace service to the institution. 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. Participation in each of the categories is expected, but relative emphasis of each category will vary among candidates.

A. Service to the Institution is a primary responsibility for instructors over service to the profession and community
   - Academic Advising
   - 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

B. Service to the Profession or Academic Discipline (examples)

• Presentation at professional conferences
• Officer, committee, or board 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

C. Service to the Local, State, Regional, National, and Global Community

• 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

Service to the Institution

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

Service to the Profession or Academic Discipline

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
Service to the Institution

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

Service to the Profession or Academic Discipline

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

Service to the Institution

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

Service to the Profession or Academic Discipline

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

Service to the Institution

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

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.