

SCHOOL OF INFORMATION

STATEMENT ON GOVERNANCE

Mission

The School of Information is concerned with interdisciplinary approaches to better understand the complexities, innovations, and challenges of a global and technologically complex information society. We are interested in impacting how people interact with information and technology, and the knowledge, tools, and processes that empower people in a variety of contexts at micro and macro levels.

Values

The core values of the School of Information are:

- Advocacy and promotion of intellectual freedom, literacy, and information access;
- High-quality, accessible educational programs that prepare leaders in the discipline;
- Bridging the gap between research and practice by generating new knowledge, processes, and tools geared toward understanding and improving the role of information in people's lives;
- Meaningful collaborations with community partners.

Description

The School of Information is an academic unit in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). This unit currently offers four degrees: a Master of Arts in Library and Information Science, a Master of Science in Intelligence Studies, a Master of Science in Cyber Intelligence and Information Security, a Bachelor of Science in Information Science, as well as a minor in Intelligence Studies. The BS in Information Science is a STEM-based degree that includes five concentrations that articulate with high demand career paths: Data Science & Analytics, Health Informatics, Information Security, Intelligence Analysis, and Web Development Technologies. The MA in Library and Information Science has been continually accredited by the American Library Association since 1975. The MS in Intelligence Studies is a STEM degree and includes two concentrations: Cyber Intelligence and Strategic Intelligence. The Cyber Intelligence Concentration is also offered through the USF-wide MS in Cybersecurity. The School of Information is also designated an Intelligence Community Center of Academic Excellence.

The School of Information employs both tenure-track and non-tenure track (e.g. instructional and/or practice-focused/clinical) faculty, supplemented by adjunct faculty. At USF, the faculty participate in shared governance in conjunction with the administration of the University. Shared governance as a concept envisions a collegial partnership in the governance and administration of the academic mission of the University. Academic policies for admissions, standards, curricula, and faculty development through promotion and tenure processes devolve to the faculty. The faculty also partners in long-range planning and continual improvement of programs driven by academic excellence and student success. This governance document delineates the roles and responsibilities of the faculty and the Director of the School of Information under the shared governance model.

The School of Information is not currently a multi-campus unit. If departmental faculty are hired at branch campuses, we will modify our governance and T&P documents to ensure that those faculty are included in matters of faculty governance and Tenure & Promotion to ensure they have voice in departmental issues. We recognize the principles of equity of assignment, resources, and opportunities of faculty across a multi-campus university.

I. Faculty

The School of Information “faculty” refers to the voting members of the School of Information (membership described below, in section I.A.). Faculty are expected to participate in the governance of the unit. It is the role of the faculty to set policy with respect to academic standards, admissions, development of curriculum, and revision of such. Tenured faculty members have the added responsibility of mentoring and assisting in the development and success of tenure-track faculty. Policies and processes for these responsibilities are developed in conjunction and cooperation with the Director of the School of Information.

A. Faculty Membership

Faculty membership includes all tenured, tenure-track, and instructional faculty who have a majority of their effort assigned to the unit. Graduate faculty are defined and credentialed by the faculty based on input from the respective program’s faculty and in accordance with USF guidelines and policies.

Visiting, adjunct, and courtesy faculty are not considered faculty members and do not have voting rights. However, these individuals are encouraged to serve on various committees in order to provide input.

B. Voting procedures

For all actions requiring a faculty vote, voting may be conducted electronically via survey software or other means, or in person during faculty meetings. A secret ballot may be requested by any faculty member for any vote. Proxy voting is not allowed.

C. Meetings

Meetings of the faculty should be convened regularly during the academic year, and as needed during the summer semester. These meetings are primarily to communicate information from College and other University meetings or information, and to conduct other official school and faculty business. Separate meetings are conducted as deemed necessary by faculty to conduct business specific to individual programs, for committee work, and so on.

II. Responsibilities of Faculty

A. Appointment of the Director

As described in Section III.A, below, the faculty is responsible for recommending appointment of a Director to the CAS Dean.

B. Selection of School of Information Faculty.

Faculty participate in the selection of School of Information faculty through service on search committees, participating in interviews, and through voting on suitable candidates for vacant positions. In making recommendations to the Dean of CAS, the Director shall consider the input from the faculty.

Appointment of full-time faculty requires a simple majority vote of the faculty of the School of Information.

Input on identifying, credentialing, and hiring adjuncts for certain courses should come from the respective programs' faculty and others as needed, and is ultimately approved by the Director.

Courtesy faculty appointments may be recommended by a majority vote of the faculty.

Emeritus faculty follows the USF procedures as outlined by the USF Provost's office.

C. Faculty Committees

All members of the faculty are eligible to serve on and/or chair School of Information committees. Visiting and adjunct faculty, as well as alumni or other interested practitioners, are also eligible to serve on committees and sub-committees, but do not have voting rights.

Faculty committees are determined and populated as needed and determined by the faculty; for instance, in the case of searches, or for various *ad hoc* purposes as needed by the School. Faculty for specific programs may wish to organize committees to conduct program-specific business, such as curriculum reviews, planning and assessment, or external reporting/accreditation.

Tenure and promotion is governed by the School of Information Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, and in accordance with College and University policies and procedures.

III. School of Information Director

The School of Information is administered by a Director who is the chief accountable officer. The Director is responsible to the faculty of the School of Information and reports directly to the Dean of CAS for the conduct of School of Information affairs.

A. Appointment

Selection. The Director is recommended for appointment to the Dean of Arts and Sciences by the School of Information faculty following a simple majority vote.

Eligibility. Only tenured faculty (associate or full professor) may be Director. The faculty may decide to recommend a Director from among current tenured faculty or request a national search (with the approval of the Dean of Arts and Sciences) in accordance with standard USF procedures.

Term of Office. The usual term of office is set by the Dean and usually should not exceed three years. The Director may be recommended to serve consecutive terms with a simple majority vote of the faculty of the School of Information.

Removal from Office. The faculty may recommend to the Dean the removal of the Director prior to the expiration of a normal term by a two-thirds majority of the faculty of the School.

Evaluation of Director. The faculty will evaluate the Director's performance annually. This includes overseeing the administration of any assessment surveys or tools required by CAS, as well as standard supporting materials provided by the Director regarding his/her research, teaching, and service activities.

B. Responsibilities of the Director

The Director is charged with insuring the effective operation of the School of Information and its activities through implementation of the policies established by the University, the College, and the School of Information Faculty, and by providing an organizational structure with support staff appropriate to successful administration of the unit.

1. Responsibilities with respect to the Faculty

- To assign faculty duties in collaboration with the Faculty member in accordance with University, College and School of Information policies, as well as with CBA 9.3-9.5.
- To report to the faculty on the affairs and business of the School of Information and to make such recommendations to the Faculty as the Director shall deem appropriate to the efficient and effective operation of the School of Information.
- The Director conducts separate independent annual performance reviews of faculty, as well as reviews of the staff of the School of Information.

2. Responsibilities with respect to the School

- The Director has ultimate responsible for overseeing the development and implementation of degree programs in cooperation with program coordinators and faculty.
- The Director is responsible for development and fund-raising activities as appropriate, including working with relevant alumni groups, potential donors, and other groups.
- The Director functions as the official representative of the School of Information and the Faculty, both within the University and with external groups.
- The Director is responsible for the School of Information's budget and expenditure of funds.
- The Director communicates relevant information to the faculty, staff, students, and other interested parties, including policies from the College and University

administration through regular departmental meetings of the School of Information during the academic year and as needed during the summer. All faculty and staff are eligible to attend departmental meetings. Official representatives from the student organizations are invited to represent the student body. Visiting, adjunct, and courtesy faculty are also invited to attend departmental meetings.

C. Associate Director

The Director may appoint an Associate Director who will act in a supporting role to the Director. The Associate Director will act in place of the Director for day-to-day administration of the School of Information during times when the Director is absent, such as during routine travel periods, annual leave, etc. Generally, the Associate Director will take the lead on curriculum matters, scheduling, student issues, and other functions as determined by the Director.

1. Selection and Term of Office

- The Associate Director is appointed by the Director, in consultation with the Dean, generally within one month after the Director is appointed/reappointed.
- The position of Associate Director can be held by any full-time faculty member as defined above (tenured, tenure-track, or instructor).
- The term of office of the Associate Director is two years, with automatic renewal at the discretion of the Director if the Associate Director is willing to continue. The Associate Director is eligible for additional terms if selected by a new or continuing Director.

2. Removal

- The Associate Director may be removed by the Director with appropriate notice, generally 30 days.
- The Faculty may recommend to the Director the removal of the Associate Director. This recommendation must be forwarded to the Director along with the results of a vote by the Faculty.

3. Duties

The Associate Director will:

- Assume such responsibilities and duties of the Director, as University regulations allow, when the Director is unavailable to undertake such responsibilities or duties;
- Supervise all Graduate Assistants, including assignments to faculty, evaluation, and scheduling of work;
- Supervise all course scheduling in coordination with program coordinators;
- Oversee and coordinate all curriculum and program matters in close coordination with all program coordinators and relevant committees;
- Handle initial responsibility for all undergraduate and graduate student issues, in consultation with the Director;
- Oversee and facilitate any distance learning activities to ensure high quality distance learning programs; and,
- Oversee and lead programmatic assessment data in close coordination with program coordinators, staff, and the Director.

D. Program Coordinators

Each degree program in the School of Information shall have, as deemed necessary by the faculty, a faculty member, appointed by the Director, to act as Program Coordinator. The Director may act as the Program Coordinator for one of the programs if appropriate, but this is not required.

Program Coordinators must be full-time faculty members of any rank as described above, and are appointed by the Director in consultation with the faculty. Terms are generally for two years and individuals in these roles are eligible for reappointment at the discretion of the Director.

Program Coordinators will:

- Facilitate regular meetings for each program's faculty;
- Receive, review, and make recommendation regarding any changes to the curriculum, course proposals and revisions;
- Review all student applications for admissions and provide recommendations to admissions requirements and standards;
- Review applications for and recommend to the Associate Director and Director appointments to graduate assistantships (when applicable);
- Take responsibility for updating the relevant handbooks, catalog copies, etc. required by the University;
- Ensure information related to programs is accurate and accessible via the School of Information website;
- Oversee all advising activities, both by faculty and official program advisers;
- In coordination with the Associate Director, take responsibility for all program assessment and external reporting activities; and,
- As necessary, review credentialing of faculty who may teach in each program.

IV. Governance Document

The Governance Document is the responsibility of the School of Information faculty. The document will be reviewed as needed for changes necessitated by policies within the University or within the School of Information. Amendments to the Governance Document require a two-thirds vote of the faculty. Policy documents appended to this Governance Document are considered policies that have the same authority as the Governance Document and may be amended without revision of the primary document.

It is recognized that this document may not contravene the constitutions and laws of the State of Florida; rules, regulations, and policies of the Florida Board of Governors; rules, regulations, and policies of the University of South Florida; the Governance Documents of CAS and the School of Social Sciences; and any applicable collective bargaining agreement or legislatively-mandated management right. The foregoing authorities will govern in the event that any provision of a local governance document is inconsistent with or in conflict with them.

VI. Governance Procedures

- A. The arbiter of procedure for all faculty and committee meetings shall be *Robert's Rules of Order*. A quorum of a simple majority of the faculty shall be required to conduct the business of all faculty and committee meetings, unless otherwise stated in this document.
- B. Minutes shall be taken at all Faculty and Committee meetings. The Director shall designate the person to take the minutes, and the minutes shall be available to all shortly after the meeting for review by faculty.
- C. Details of actions on confidential personnel matters shall not be included in the minutes. The approved minutes shall be stored as a permanent record on the SI governance site.

School of Information Faculty Approved, May 6, 2020

Approved by Deans Office, May 11, 2020

Approved by Provost's office, May 13, 2020

SCHOOL OF INFORMATION

FACULTY TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES

I. Introduction

Mission

The School of Information is concerned with interdisciplinary approaches to better understand the complexities, innovations, and challenges of a global and technologically complex information society. We are interested in impacting how people interact with information and technology, and the knowledge, tools, and processes that empower people in a variety of contexts at micro and macro levels.

Values

The core values of the School of Information are:

- Advocacy and promotion of intellectual freedom, literacy, and information access;
- High-quality, accessible educational programs that prepare leaders in the discipline;
- Bridging the gap between research and practice by generating new knowledge, processes, and tools geared toward understanding and improving the role of information in people's lives;
- Meaningful collaborations with community partners.

Overview

The School of Information evaluates candidates for tenure and/or promotion based on their contribution to the School's mission through performance in teaching, research, and service. The expectations for performance in teaching, research, and service appear below under the appropriate category.

The requisite degree for tenure earning faculty in this School, and by national standards, is an earned doctorate in Information Science or a related field from an appropriately accredited program or school.

In addition to reading this document, faculty members should familiarize themselves with the University and College of Arts & Sciences (CAS) guidelines for promotion and tenure, as well as the current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

This School of Information is not currently a multi-campus unit. If departmental faculty are hired at branch campuses we will modify our governance and T&P documents to ensure that those faculty are included in matters of faculty governance and Tenure & Promotion to ensure they have voice in departmental issues. We recognize the principles of equity of assignment, resources and opportunities of faculty across a multi-campus university.

II. Procedures

A. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

1. The tenured School of Information faculty recommend a departmental tenure and promotion committee (T/P Committee) composed of at least 3 tenured faculty members. The recommended T/P Committee must be approved by the Director.
 - a. The Director works with the candidate in developing a list of potential external reviewers and in submitting this for approval to the College Dean's Office.
 - b. The T/P Committee is responsible for reviewing the candidate's package and submits a narrative describing their review and recommendation supporting or opposing tenure and promotion for the candidate.
2. The report and candidate's package is then reviewed by all other tenured faculty. A request may be made for the T/P Committee to hold a meeting (online or in-person) to summarize their recommendation and answer questions. All tenured faculty then vote via a secret ballot to accept or reject the recommendation of the T/P Committee. The Director does not vote with the tenured faculty. The T/P committee's recommendation along with that of full tenured faculty, are then submitted for the next level review. In the event of a split decision, a minority opinion must also be submitted.
3. The Director performs an independent review and assessment of the candidate's package and makes a written recommendation supporting or opposing tenure and promotion.
4. The recommendations of the department (SI) T/P committee and the Director, accompanied by a clear, substantive summary of reasons for both positive and negative votes, will be forwarded to the College for School level review. A copy of the Department's criteria for tenure and promotion is also included.

B. Promotion to Professor.

1. The procedures for promotion to Professor are similar to those used for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor; however, the Promotion Committee may only be composed of full-time tenured faculty who hold the rank of Professor, and may be smaller than 3 people. In the event that the Director does not hold the rank of Professor, a different Professor from the faculty (or outside, if necessary) may serve as Surrogate Chair. The Promotion Committee helps select external reviewers and itself reviews the promotion package of the candidate, finally making a recommendation supporting or opposing promotion, including a minority opinion if needed.
2. The Director (or Surrogate if there is one) organizes a meeting of all tenured faculty at the rank of Professor. After discussion, all tenured faculty at the rank of Professor physically present at the meeting (even if remote) via a secret ballot to accept or reject the recommendation of the Promotion Committee. The full tenured Professor rank faculty vote and minority opinion (if needed) is included with the Promotion Committee recommendation.

3. The Director will perform an independent analysis of the candidate's package and make a recommendation supporting or opposing promotion.
4. The recommendation of the Promotion Committee, along with the recommendation of the Director, accompanied by a clear, substantive summary of reasons for both positive and negative votes, will be forwarded to the College for School-level review. A copy of the Department's criteria for promotion to Professor should be included.

III. Required and Recommended Materials to be Submitted

1. Required materials:
 - a. Tenure/Promotion application,
 - b. Curriculum Vitae,
 - c. Narratives
 - i. A research narrative outlining the applicant's research area and activities;
 - ii. A teaching narrative outlining teaching activities and pedagogy;
 - iii. A service narrative;
 - d. Annual evaluations from FAIR/Archivum;
 - e. List of research outputs (published and accepted articles, research grants submitted, research grants won, other publications and research outputs);
 - f. Table of courses taught and student course evaluations, and a spreadsheet, prepared by the Academic Services Administrator, or other staff member, aggregating the student assessment of teaching; and,
 - g. (for Tenure applications only) Mid-tenure evaluations (all levels).
2. Recommended materials:
 - a. Research
 - i. Copies of publications. For materials "in press", provide external documentation regarding the status of the work or paper (e.g. correspondences from journals, editors, status updates, etc.).
 - ii. Evidence of submitted grant proposals or projects, including reviewer summary statements provided by the funding agency.
 - iii. Information on the impact of the applicant's research. Impact should include scholarly impact, as measured by bibliometric indices from Web of Science, Social Science Citation Index, Science Citation Index, etc., but may include evidence of broader impacts on influence, thinking, and practice within the discipline. Broader impact may include evidence of readership, use of the applicant's work/materials by other scholars, and applied use of the applicant's work/materials to guide practice.
 - iv. Documentation of research awards and acknowledgements, competitive awards, grant, and fellowships.
 - a.
 - b. Teaching
 - i. Course syllabi from each distinct course taught during the evaluation period.
 - ii. Other course materials that a faculty member wishes to report to support their package.

- iii. Evidence of curriculum design: new course creation, significant course modification, moving a course from classroom to online instruction, etc.
 - iv. Student written evaluations (a faculty member may supplement this section by adding any information pertinent to the review of student evaluations)
 - v. Other communications from students related to courses and/or outcomes
 - vi. Exemplary student work and outcomes.
 - vii. Peer evaluations of teaching.
 - viii. Documentation of attendance at workshops or other training to enhance teaching effectiveness, course design, or other pedagogic factors.
 - ix. Documentation of students advised and/or thesis/dissertation committee membership/leadership.
 - x. Documentation of teaching awards.
- c. Service
- i. Evidence of professional/public service activities, including minutes, any products from the committee's work, etc.
 - ii. Awards or honors given for service contributions.
 - iii. Any supporting evidence of excellence in service engagement and activities at all levels.

IV. Evaluation for Tenure

Evaluation for tenure involves three components appropriate to the unit:

- Research/creative/scholarly work;
- Teaching or comparable activity (including advising and mentoring);
- Service to the University, the profession, and the community

General standards for recommending tenure are a record of excellence in research/creative/scholarly work, a record of excellence in teaching or other comparable activity, and a record of substantive contribution of service to the University, profession and/or public. Expectations for what constitutes excellence in each of research/scholarly work, teaching, and service are detailed individually below.

A. Research

Candidates for tenure and promotion in the School of Information are expected to demonstrate excellence in research that shows their independence as researchers and maintaining an active program of scholarship. Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to maintain an active program of scholarship following tenure. Excellence in research must demonstrate both quality and quantity.

The normal expectation of candidates for tenure is an average of at least two research/scholarship outputs per year, with at least half of these being in high quality outlets. The expectation for promotion to Professor is an international reputation and continued scholarly output production averaging two outputs per year, with at least half of these appearing in high quality outlets.

The School of Information recognizes that a candidate can contribute to the University's research mission through multiple forms of scholarship, including¹:

1. High Impact Forms of Scholarship
 - a. External grants and contracts awarded
 - b. Articles in peer-reviewed academic or professional journals
 - c. Academic books, chapters in peer-reviewed books, monographs
 - d. Peer-reviewed, indexed papers presented at national/international conferences deemed as being highly impactful and competitive
2. Medium Impact Forms of Scholarship
 - a. External Grant/contract applications
 - b. Internal grants and contracts awarded
 - c. Juried papers, symposia, and posters at refereed professional meetings/colloquia
 - d. Invited addresses
3. Lower Impact Forms of Scholarship
 - a. Technical reports
 - b. Un-refereed/reviewed articles
 - c. Un-refereed conference papers, symposia, posters, and presentations
 - d. Book reviews, commentaries etc.
 - e. Instructional computer programs, videotapes, and other instructional materials
 - f. Digital media, including programs, web sites, social media, etc.

Assessments of quality are evaluated in the School of Information through a relatively standardized process of professional judgment. Journal article quality assessment includes, but is not limited to, factors such as: is journal peer-reviewed, ranking of the journal, acceptance/rejection rate of the journal, the apparent difficulty in conceptually framing and pursuing the study, originality of the research, estimates of the contribution made by the author (both in relationship to other authors in multiple authored pieces as well as the contribution to the field as viewed by the evaluators), the degree to which published works have been cited as measured by the relevant citation indices or scholarly communication analysis tools, and other measures of scholarly influence and applied

impact. Conference papers are evaluated on the basis of the stature of the meeting and the distinction of the presentation, including specially invited addresses to professional/academic groups, the review process and acceptance rate, whether the proceedings are indexed in major databases, and citation rate for the paper.

B. Teaching

The School of Information expects candidates to establish a record of effectiveness in teaching, so that students master the body of theory, knowledge, and skills held essential to function as effective information professionals. To achieve “excellence” in teaching, candidates for tenure and also promotion are expected to demonstrate exemplary quality, through indicators like student evaluation ratings, results of peer review, implementation of innovative teaching methods, and development of new curricula.

The School of Information considers the teaching role to be multi-faceted, and evaluations of its effectiveness includes more than students’ quantitative and narrative evaluations of the instructor. The School of Information looks closely at those evaluations, but also considers such factors as student advising, availability to students, participation in the School’s curricular activities, development of new courses and continuous improvement of existing courses, student engagement, innovative teaching methods, teaching load and credit hour productivity, and professional development in subject area and pedagogic methods.

For evaluating teaching expectations, the following will be examined:

1. Teaching

A. Teaching courses

- i. Syllabi
- ii. Grade Distribution
- iii. Productivity, including course loads
- iv. Student evaluations, including quantitative and qualitative, with attention to data and comments that form a pattern—note that student evaluations will be considered in light of narrative information about classes provided by the instructor as well as factors that typically affect ratings of teaching, such as:
 - Delivery format (Online vs blended vs face-to-face delivery)
 - Class size
 - Class difficulty
 - Core course vs. elective
 - And other appropriate factors
- v. Communications from students or other stakeholders regarding course content, teaching methods, course outcomes, or other course related items
- vi. Development of new courses or substantial revision of existing courses
- vii. Adaptation to new formats and media using emerging technologies

- viii. Use of outcomes assessment data to improve teaching and student learning
- ix. Teaching awards and other recognition

2. Instruction-Related

A. Advising and mentoring

- i. Academic advising, including office hours and availability to students
- ii. Writing letters of recommendation for, and assisting students with scholarships, internships, and job placement
- iii. Mentoring and involving students in professional activities, research, and publication, including support (as Director or Committee Member) of student Honors Theses or Doctoral Dissertations
- iv. Supervision of GAs

B. Other teaching

- i. Guest lectures in SI and outside classes
- ii. Seminars/workshops for faculty and/or students in the School
- iii. In-service seminars/workshops for professional constituency

C. Engaged scholarship with teaching/learning components

- i. Textbooks/Scholarly papers published on teaching in your field and not counted as research

D. Professional development for improving teaching or subject matter expertise

E. Training grants

F. Other

Evaluation for tenure and promotion is performed on multiple measures from above, including student evaluations.

C. Service

Faculty provide service to the School, the College, the University, the profession, and to local, state, national, and international communities.

To perform substantive service, candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to share their expertise by participating in School, College, and University committee service and to contribute to the profession or local or international community. The general expectation of candidates is to maintain at least two service activities each year, with at least one of those service activities generally being School/College/University related.

In evaluating service for tenure and promotion, the following will be examined:

1. Departmental Service

- A. Departmental committees and governance
- B. ASIST-USF, ALA-USF, SLA-USF, Beta Phi Mu, etc.
- C. Departmental administrative activities (e.g. Committee on Accreditation Self-Study assignments).

- D. Activities in student recruitment and outreach
 - E. Collection development liaison to USF Library
 - F. Oversight of Henrietta Smith Library
 - G. Oversight of technology and facilities
 - H. Management of SI electronic mailing lists and Web page, and other communication tools
2. University Service Outside of Department
 - A. Collaborative programs with other disciplines
 - B. College-wide and university-wide committees
 - C. Other organizations such as faculty governance or working groups appointed by the Faculty Senate, Provost, or University President.
 3. Professional
 - A. Relevant Organizations
 - i. Professional offices and committees
 - ii. Regional offices and committees
 - iii. State and local
 - B. General Academic
 - i. Editorships of professional/academic journals, service on Editorial Boards, and ad-hoc journal reviews
 - ii. Participation in grant review boards, national policy making, journal editing, program evaluation and similar activities.
 - iii. Organizing or in other ways facilitating conferences, workshops, or symposia.
 - iv. Officer or committee work such as AAUP, Beta Phi Mu, at national, regional, state, and local levels.
 4. Community
 - A. Public lectures relevant to discipline
 - B. Media coverage--community issue-oriented papers in the popular press.
 - C. Activities on behalf of local, state, and federal agencies

V. Evaluation for Promotion

A. Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to Associate Professor is considered at the same time as tenure and is evaluated using the same expectations for tenure.

B. Promotion to Professor (from USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines)

For promotion to the rank of professor, the candidate must offer conclusive evidence of a reputation beyond the University, among peers on a national or international level. The candidate is expected to demonstrate:

1. A continued record of excellence in teaching or other comparable activity appropriate for the unit,

2. A record of excellence in research/creative/scholarly work of at least national visibility of demonstrated quality supported by a record of ongoing publications or their equivalent following tenure,
3. A record of substantial contribution of service to the university and to the field, profession or community as appropriate to the mission and goals of the department, college and university. Expectations about the level of meaningful service contributions for candidates for professor are significantly higher than those for attaining the Associate rank.
4. Compelling evidence of significant achievement among peers in one's discipline or professional field at the national or international level. Any recommendation for promotion to the rank of Professor must contain evidence that such distinction has been identified.

This document may be amended by a two-thirds majority vote of the voting members of the Faculty at any regular meeting of the department. After amendment, it must be approved by the Offices of the Dean and Provost.

School of Information Faculty Approved, May 6, 2020

Approved by Deans Office, May 11, 2020

Approved by Provost's Office, May 13, 2020

SCHOOL OF INFORMATION

INSTRUCTOR PROMOTION PATH GUIDELINES

The University of South Florida Board of Trustees ratified a Memorandum of Understanding with the UFF Bargaining Unit to create promotional tracks for instructors and incorporated promotion guidelines approved by the USF-Tampa Faculty Senate on January 27, 2010. Subsequently, the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) issued promotion guidelines under their Career Path for Instructors. In alignment with the final documents, the School of Information developed the following procedures to facilitate the processes in the general guidelines:

- The titles for the three levels of instructors are: Assistant Professor of Instruction/Assistant Instructor, Associate Professor of Instruction/Associate Instructor, and Professor of Instruction/Senior Instructor.
- Associate Professor of Instruction/Associate Instructor, and Professor of Instruction/Senior Instructor, or early promotion to either of these levels requires substantial contribution to the Department, College, or University mission or to the profession at an outstanding rating in addition to outstanding teaching. A package of evidence supporting the promotion request should be submitted to the department Faculty Affairs committee in alignment with existing college and faculty senate guidelines.
- The department's instructor promotion committee will/may be comprised of department faculty who are senior instructors or tenured/tenure track faculty.
- The department instructor promotion committee makes recommendations for promotion to the Director.
- The Director may approve/concur or not approve/concur with the department committee's recommendation.
- The Director makes recommendations for promotion the College Instructor Promotion Committee;
- The College committee's recommendations are presented directly to the Dean or Associate Dean of Faculty for approval/disapproval in accordance with CAS guidelines.

**UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA – TAMPA
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES**

CAREER PATH FOR INSTRUCTORS: PROMOTION GUIDELINES

In order to demonstrate appreciation for their many contributions to the mission of the University of South Florida (USF) and to encourage continued career development, the university provides a promotional career path for individuals who hold the non-tenure track rank of Instructor. Historically, appointments to the position of Instructor have been made to cover a wide variety of job assignments at USF, some of which do not entail traditional faculty activities. For this reason, judgments regarding the instructor career paths should be based on the individual's primary assignment.

NOTE: In the guidelines that follow, the terms department and College are used generically to mean the academic or service unit that provides personnel evaluations for the faculty member. It is recognized that there may be alternative organizational arrangements, and procedures should be adjusted accordingly.

Eligibility and Regulations

Eligible employees are those classified as 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 department in which the appointment resides.
- Following an initial phase-in period, promotion to the designated positions described below requires continuous appointment for specified periods of time.
- 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.

Initial Appointments

All initial appointments of non-tenure-earning Instructors will be designated as Assistant Professor of Instruction/Assistant Instructor.

Requirements of Promotion Levels

Associate Professor of Instruction/Associate Instructor

Following an initial phase-in of the career path program, 5 or more years of experience at Assistant Professor of Instruction/Assistant Instructor is typically expected. Earlier eligibility may be considered for exceptional candidates, but a minimum of 3 years of experience at Assistant Professor of Instruction/Assistant Instructor is required. After the appropriate period of service, Instructors may apply to be considered for a promotion on the basis of meritorious performance.

- Following a comprehensive review and assessment, excellence in the principal assigned duty is required, as demonstrated by earning an overall rating of “Outstanding” from the evaluating department. 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 department.
- An overall rating of “Strong” is required from the department on any additional areas of assignment that average more than .10 FTE 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. That is, the primary area must be evaluated as “Outstanding” and the remaining areas rated as no less than “Strong.”
- Where individuals have multiple assignments, a rating of “Satisfactory” will not disqualify an individual from consideration for promotion if the FTE assignment in that area is .10 or less.

Professor of Instruction/Senior Instructor

Following an initial phase-in of the career path program, 5 or more years of experience at Associate Professor of Instruction/Associate Instructor is typically required. Earlier eligibility may be considered for outstanding candidates, but a minimum of 3 years of experience at Associate Professor of Instruction/Associate Instructor is required. After the appropriate period of service, Instructors may apply to be considered for promotion to Professor of Instruction on the basis of meritorious performance.

- A comprehensive review and assessment is conducted following the guidelines specified for Associate Professor of Instruction/Associate Instructor.
- In order to be promoted to Professor of Instruction/Senior Instructor, candidates must possess a terminal academic degree (doctorate) in their respective discipline of expertise.
- In assigning ratings for Professor of Instruction/Senior Instructor, evaluating units should assess whether the individual has demonstrated continuous professional development and has achieved significant accomplishments beyond that considered at the Associate Professor of Instruction/Associate Instructor 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

Departments with non-tenure earning employees holding the position of Instructor will establish procedures for processing career ladder applications and will develop standards for promotion within that unit. Included in those standards should be specifications for criteria to be used in determining requests for early promotion consideration. Such procedures and standards are subject to review and approval by the College. The College may choose to specify a further set of standards that must be employed by all of its departments.

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

- The Instructor meets with her/his supervisor to ensure that he/she is eligible for promotional consideration. Supervisors are encouraged to provide a candid assessment at that time of the potential strengths and weaknesses of the Instructor's application.
- If the Instructor meets eligibility criteria and decides to proceed with the application, the Instructor submits a formal application for promotion to the department. (An application form will be made available.)
- A designated faculty committee within the Instructor's department reviews the application and assigns overall ratings for each relevant area of assigned duties, and a recommendation concerning promotion. If the Instructor has multiple supervisors in a unit, the immediate supervisor should be a member of this committee if he/she is not head of the department. A narrative is to be provided by the review committee that justifies the assigned rankings.
- The head of the department (typically the chair) provides a separate review, ranking, narrative, and recommendation.
- These recommendations are sent to the office of the College Dean. At the discretion of the College, and in consultation with the appropriate faculty governance group, a College designated faculty committee may provide a separate review. The committee may be used to review all cases or to serve as consultant to the Dean on selected cases. If this level of review is employed, the faculty committee must provide a narrative only if it elects to recommend against promotion. The narrative should specify the reasons for that decision. The Dean reviews all materials and provides a final decision. A narrative need only be provided in cases where promotion is not recommended. The narrative should specify the reasons for that decision and make suggestions for improvement that might result in a positive decision at a later date.
- At the College's discretion, Instructor promotion reviews may be conducted as part of the regular tenure and promotion cycle or may be conducted at a separate time. However, final decisions regarding promotion must be completed before the end of the Spring semester each academic year.
- A listing of Instructor promotional decisions is to be provided by Colleges to the Office of the Provost by May 15 of each year.

Faculty Assignment and Annual Evaluation Guidelines

School of Information

The purpose of these guidelines is to clarify expectations for faculty members and to facilitate transparency and a shared understanding of faculty assignments and annual evaluation procedures.

I. Faculty Assignment Guidelines

The faculty will make recommendations to the Director for faculty assignments based on the following guidelines. Assignments will be recommended for the next academic year as a component of the annual evaluations in the spring. The assignments for the current academic year and performance for the past calendar year will be taken into consideration in the recommendation of assignments for the next academic year as well as the School's need for instruction. Not every faculty member will have the same percentages of assignment for contact hour teaching load, research, and service. The percentage assignments may vary from one semester to another for each faculty member. The Board of Governor (BoG) guidelines mandate that a faculty member be evaluated on every category for which there is an assigned percentage. If there is no percentage assigned, the faculty member cannot be evaluated on that component.

A. Research

All tenured and tenure track faculty members should have some research assignment. The percentage assigned to research can range from 25% to 60%. The assignment should not be less than 25% for tenured and tenure-track faculty, unless approved by the Director. Instructional faculty members (faculty with primarily instruction-related duties) generally do not have a research appointment.

B. Teaching & Instructional Related

Instructional faculty members have roughly an 85-95% instructional assignment. This translates roughly to a 4/4 teaching load with a percentage reserved for service. This teaching load is a rough guideline, and mitigating factors such as class size, student need, difficulty of the course, other instructional effort, etc. should be considered.

Tenured faculty generally have an assignment of five courses (3/2 load or equivalent) and tenure-track faculty will have no more than four courses (2/2) per 9-month academic year. Assignments for instruction should normally range from 40-75% taking into consideration the faculty member's other instructional contributions, contributions to the School's mission and governance, research productivity, and extent of service activities. The maximum assignment for any three contact hour course is 25%. Average teaching loads for full-time ranked faculty who do not have ongoing productive research programs or exceptionally heavy levels of uncompensated service should be higher. The Director will generally teach one course per semester during the academic year, unless otherwise approved by the Dean.

The following list is meant as only a guideline (for instance, to help with filling out AFD/FAR forms) for allowable percentages for instructional activities as applicable to the instructional mission of SI:

- 25% --teaching a course requiring new preparation; teaching a course with larger than median enrollment
- 20% -- teaching a course offered on a regular repeat basis
- 15% -- teaching multiple sections of a course
- 5% for development or major revision of a course
- 5% for curriculum revision
- 1.5% for chairing a Master's or Ph.D. exam committee
- 1% for serving on a Master's or Ph.D. exam committee
- 1-3% per student per three-hour course in directing Master thesis
- 3-5% per student per three-hour course in directing Ph.D. dissertation
- 0.5% Directed Study per student not to exceed 7.5%

In addition to the listed instructional activities, other instructional activities (guest lectures /seminars / workshops for faculty and/or students in the School) and advising and mentoring will be considered instructional-related assignments.

C. Service

Assignments in this category include school, college and university governance and professional and other public services, and the assignments in service category will be no more than 10%. For school, college or university governance, maximum percentage is given only for chairing major committees (e.g. CAS Tenure and Promotion Committee, Graduate Council, etc.). School committees will usually be 0.5-2% for membership, 2-4% for chairing committees. Maximum percentage can be given for preparing self- studies / reports for accreditation or program reviews (BoG, ALA/COA, SACS, etc.).

Service to the profession is an important aspect of education in library and information science. Normally, from 0.5 - 4% should be assigned for membership / chairing committees of professional organizations, reviewer of scholarly journals, and public service to local, state, national or international communities. The service percentage might be larger if the faculty member is engaged in service that brings national recognition to them and the department, e.g. editor of a refereed journal or service on leading editorial boards, holding major elective office in a state or national professional association or prominent national committees.

II. Annual Evaluation Guidelines

According to the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), "the purpose of the annual evaluation is to assess and communicate the nature and extent of an employee's performance of assigned duties." It is understood that faculty activities should be commensurate with the proportion of time assigned in Faculty Information System. A faculty member's performance can be above average in an area where the proportion of her/his assignment is below the unit average. Conversely, if a faculty member's FIS proportion for a given area is above the unit average, this does not necessarily suggest a higher

evaluation rating will be assigned for that area. These guidelines are developed to clarify expectations for faculty members and to facilitate transparency and a shared understanding of annual evaluation methods and ratings between evaluators (i.e., Director/Chair) and faculty members. In addition to Research, Teaching, and Service, departmental administrative activities can be assigned to faculty members. These assignments will be evaluated by the Director. The Director is evaluated on his/her teaching, service and research by the College Dean. A survey instrument disseminated by CAS is used to gather faculty input on the Director's overall performance regarding administrative duties.

Given the School of Information's collegial and collaborative climate and its ongoing commitment to supporting professional development, SI uses a streamlined, faculty-centered annual evaluation process that the faculty has endorsed. In that process, faculty submit a self-assessment to the Director, rather than using a standing Faculty Evaluation Committee¹. Each faculty member retains the right, however, to request an ad-hoc faculty committee review if they believe the Director's assessment does not accurately reflect their performance.

The streamlined process is intended to reduce the burden of documentation on faculty and to emphasize the faculty member's own constructive narrative about research/scholarship, teaching and service for the year. They can emphasize what was important to them about what they accomplished and why and reflect on anything that didn't go as planned (and any adjustments they hope to make based on their experience or feedback from others).

At the time for annual evaluations, each faculty member will submit to the annual evaluation system a brief self-evaluation narrative and their self-ratings in each of the three major areas - research, teaching, and service. Faculty may outline their narrative in prose or use bulleted lists to highlight accomplishments.

Fundamentally, in their self-assessment narratives faculty can outline:

- what they did in the three domains in the pertinent calendar year
- how it went (progress, products, performance, impact, etc - including challenges), and,
- briefly, what they are planning to do in the next year, including any specific goals and plans to improve if there was something they wished to improve upon.

The annual evaluation guidelines also include a matrix (attached) that provides criteria for each rating level in each area assessed—Research, Teaching, & Service. These are the criteria that faculty should use for their self-ratings and that the Director should use for the formal annual evaluation ratings.

A. Research

¹ On 10-27-21, a draft of the revised SI guidelines for the annual evaluation process was circulated to faculty with a request to via Qualtrics. The revised process described in that draft, consistent with the unanimous faculty vote in 2019, eliminates the "faculty committee" review component of the annual evaluation process, and replaces it with a brief self-evaluation. The 10-27-21 faculty vote for the streamlined process was also unanimous.

The School of Information recognizes that a faculty member can contribute to the University's research mission through multiple forms of scholarship, including¹:

- Scholarship of Discovery (Investigation) encompasses scholarly activities that contribute to the stock of human knowledge through systematic and disciplined methods of inquiry, such as through basic research.
- Scholarship of Integration (Synthesis) encompasses scholarly activities that make connections across the disciplines, placing specialties in larger context (perhaps even educating non-specialists), or through serious, disciplined inquiry, seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insight to bear on original research.
- The Scholarship of Application (Engagement) encompasses scholarly activities that seek to responsibly apply existing knowledge to consequential problems to benefit people and institutions.
- The Scholarship of Teaching encompasses scholarly activities that are directly related to pedagogy – not just transmitting knowledge, but transforming and extending knowledge as well. Such scholarship seeks to improve pedagogy and mentorship by discovering, evaluating or transmitting information about teaching methodologies, models, and outcomes.

As stated in the USF SLIS Mission, Goals, and Objectives, the objectives for research are as followings:

- Faculty develop and carry out an individual and/or collaborative agenda of interdisciplinary research and development within the context of LIS scholarship.
- Faculty disseminate the products of research and development activities through accepted scholarly communication channels, and demonstrate impact on the field.
- Faculty seek external funding for supporting research and development.
- Faculty mentor students and collaborate with students in the evaluation and production of research and development activities.

For annual evaluation purposes, the previous year of research and publication activities will be examined. For annual evaluation purposes, the following research and scholarly activities/evidence will be considered:

- Books, chapters in books, monographs
- Articles in refereed professional journals
- Grants and contracts solicited; grants and contracts obtained
- Papers, symposia, and posters at professional meetings/colloquia, invited addresses
- Other contributions, such as
 - Technical reports
 - Un-refereed articles
 - Book reviews, commentaries etc.
 - Instructional computer programs, videotapes, and the like

- Web sites
- Submissions of scholarly manuscripts
- Research plan/program
- Other activities/evidence the faculty members wishes to have considered

The evaluation shall include consideration of the employee's productivity and of the employee's research and other creative programs and contributions; and recognition by the academic or professional community of what is done.

Evaluation of research productivity is based upon two primary considerations, one a matter of quantity, the other a matter of quality. A simple paper count, or arithmetical weighing of jointly authored papers, books, and scholarly publications, does not suffice for making evaluations regarding research productivity. Such considerations must also take into account specific aspects of research programs which properly influence the rate of publications; these include, but are not limited to, information on the rate at which data relevant to published studies can be collected, the amount of support provided for the research, the proportion of assigned duties specifically allocated to research and creative activity, commonly expected rates of publication in specifically relevant areas of scientific investigation, the breadth of individual articles, whether books and papers are jointly authored, whether such publications are authored or edited, whether the research reported is longitudinal or cross-sectional, and whether it was conducted in a field setting or a laboratory.

Quality inevitably refers to professional judgment and it is through relatively standardized processes of professional judgment that the School of Information reaches its evaluations. With regard to the publication of professional articles, judgments of quality will include but not be limited to factors such as the apparent difficulty in conceptually framing and pursuing the study, publication in refereed journals, the quality of these journals, journal rejection rates, estimates of the contribution made by the author (both in relationship to other authors in multiple authored pieces as well as the contribution to the field as viewed by the evaluators), an estimate of the quality of the content of the paper in the sense that a reviewer would evaluate such content, evaluation comments in letters from appropriately placed outside experts in the field, methodology appropriate to the research, the degree to which published works have been cited as measured by the relevant citation indices or scholarly communication analysis tools. Another important area in judgments of research and creative activity includes the seeking and favorable review of grants and contract proposals for scholarly activity, considering available funding within such areas. The final general area that receives attention is paper presentations at scientific meetings and professional conferences. These are evaluated on the basis of the level of the meeting and the distinction of the presentation, including specially invited addresses to professional/academic groups, the review process and acceptance rate, and whether the proceedings are indexed in major databases.

It is generally expected that tenured and tenure-track faculty in USF's School of Information will generate at least two new substantial research products each year. At least one of those products will generally be a peer-reviewed journal article. The second might be another article, a book/monograph, a grant application for external (non-USF) funding, or a competitively selected presentation. Ratings of "Strong" or "Outstanding" should reflect exemplary quality (e.g. publication in a highly rated journal in

the field, book publication by a prestigious press/publisher, successful competitive funding, or clear evidence of some work's extraordinary impact) and/or increased productivity beyond this basic expectation.

B. Teaching and Instructional Related

The School of Information expects faculty to establish a record of effectiveness in teaching, so that students master the body of theory knowledge, and skills held essential to function as effective library and information professionals. As stated in the USF SI Mission, Goals, and Objectives, the objectives of a faculty member's teaching role are as followings:

- Faculty are effective teachers and engage in continuous professional development to maintain subject expertise and pedagogy in their own and related subject areas.
 - 1.a. Faculty are productive participants in the School's curriculum planning, development, and evaluation responsibilities.
 - 1.b. Faculty are actively engaged in advising and mentoring students.
- Faculty use relevant technologies in their teaching and include content on technologies appropriate for subject areas and specializations covered in their courses.
- Faculty incorporate the core professional values and competencies appropriate for subject areas, specializations, and user populations covered in their courses.
- Faculty integrate current theoretical and applied knowledge of the discipline into course content.
- Faculty assess course outcomes and use assessment information for continuous course improvement.

The School considers the teaching role to be a multi-faceted responsibility that includes more than students' quantitative and narrative evaluations of the instructor. The School looks closely at those evaluations but also considers such factors as student advising, office hours and availability to students, participation in the School's curriculum activities, development of new courses and continuous improvement of existing courses, and teaching load and credit hour productivity.

For annual evaluation purposes, the following activities/evidence will be considered:

a. Teaching

- Teaching courses
 - Syllabi (if the faculty member chooses to submit additional documentation)
 - Grade Distribution
 - Productivity, including course loads
 - Student evaluations, including quantitative and qualitative, with attention to data and comments that form a pattern—note that student evaluations will be considered in light

of narrative information about classes provided by the instructor as well as factors that typically affect ratings of teaching, such as:

- Years of teaching experience
- Online VS blended VS face-to-face delivery
- Size of class
- Core course vs. elective
- And so forth
- Developing new courses or substantially revising existing courses
- Adaptation to new formats and media through incorporation of emerging technologies
- Using outcomes assessment data to improve teaching and student learning
- Supervision of Gas
- Other activities/evidence the faculty members wishes to have considered

b. Instruction-Related

- Advising and mentoring
 - Academic advising, including office hours and availability to students—guideline is a minimum of nine hours per week across a minimum of three days
 - Writing letters of recommendation for students for scholarships and job placement
 - Mentoring and involving students in professional activities, research, and publication
- Other teaching
 - Guest lectures in SI and outside classes
 - Seminars/workshops for faculty and/or students in the School
 - In-service seminars/workshops for professional constituency
- Engaged scholarship with teaching/learning components
- Continuing education for improving teaching
- Other activities/evidence the faculty members wishes to have considered

As noted, it is generally expected that faculty in USF's School of Information will devote significant effort to teaching activities, as noted above and specified in their AFDs, and that the pedagogical structure and preparation for the course and the methods used will be consistent with prevailing standards and "best practices" in undergraduate or graduate education.

Ratings of "Strong" or "Outstanding" should reflect exemplary quality (e.g. student evaluation ratings above the College and Department mean, demonstrated effectiveness through peer review, implementing innovative teaching methods, developing new curricula) and/or increased productivity in teaching beyond this basic expectation. Faculty are evaluated upon a full range of instructional activities, not just individual course student evaluations.

C. Service

Faculty and students provide service to the School, the College, the University, and the profession; and to local, state, national, and international communities. The objectives for service are as follows:

- Faculty share their expertise and participate in academic leadership and governance in the School, the College, and the University.
- Faculty share their expertise and participate in leadership and governance in local, state, national, and international professional constituencies.
- As engaged members of local and global societies, faculty use their professional expertise to help improve and sustain the community's quality of life.
- Faculty mentor and collaborate with students in serving the University, the profession, and the community.

For annual evaluation purposes, the following activities/evidence will be considered:

a. Departmental Service

- Departmental committees
- ASIST-USF, ALA-USF, SLA-USF, Beta Phi Mu, etc.
- Departmental administrative activities (e.g. Committee on Accreditation Self-Study assignments).
- Activities in student recruitment and outreach
- Collection development liaison to USF Library
- Oversight of Henrietta Smith Library
- Oversight of technology and facilities
- Management of SI electronic mailing lists and Web page, and other communication tools
- Other activities/evidence the faculty members wishes to have considered

b. University Service Outside of Department

- Collaborative programs with other disciplines
- College-wide and university-wide committees
- Other organizations such as faculty governance groups
- Other activities/evidence the faculty members wishes to have considered

c. Professional

- Library and Information Science Organizations
 - Professional offices and committees
 - Regional offices and committees
 - State and local
 - Other activities/evidence the faculty members wishes to have considered

- General Academic
 - Participation in grant review boards, national policy making, journal editing, program evaluation and similar activities.
 - Officer or committee work such as AAUP, Beta Phi Mu, at national, regional, state, and local levels.
 - Other activities/evidence the faculty members wishes to have considered

d. Community

- Public lectures relevant to discipline
- Media coverage--community issue oriented papers in the popular press.
- Activities on behalf of local, state, and federal agencies
- Other activities/evidence the faculty members wishes to have considered

It is generally expected that faculty in USF’s School of Information will maintain at least two service activities each year. At least one of those service activities will generally be University related. The other might be a professional or specialized community engagement service activity.

Ratings of “Strong” or “Outstanding” should reflect exemplary quality (e.g. holding a leadership position in University governance or national/international professional associations, memberships on journal editorial boards, serving on federal grant review panels, serving on review or study committees for national/international scholarly societies such as NAS or AAAS) and/or increased productivity in service beyond this basic expectation.

III. Guidelines for Preparing Annual Evaluation Supplementary Materials

Faculty should complete the Annual Evaluation in the Archivum (FIS) and submit annual evaluation supplementary materials by the deadline that is set by Academic Affairs in the Provost Office. It should be noted that student evaluations, prior year course assignments. Faculty are welcome to submit supplemental material with their narratives if they wish but nothing specific is required. If the Director would like to see some product or documentation, they can follow-up with the faculty member with that request.

a. Research²

- Complete the Research Narrative in the box provided in Archivum

c. Teaching

- Complete the Teaching Narrative in the box provided in Archivum

² For instructional faculty, any evidence of research related activity supporting the instructor’s teaching should be included under Teaching.

d. Service

- Complete the Service Narrative in the box provided in Archivum

Last reviewed and updated 5/4/2023.

ⁱ Adapted from: Ernest Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (New York: Jossey Bass, 1997).

School of Information Annual Evaluation Matrix

RESEARCH				
<p>Evaluation ratings in the area of Research (which includes scholarship, as broadly defined in SI governance documents) generally reflect the faculty member’s research <u>productivity</u> (developmental and completed projects) and <u>impact</u>. Research/scholarly productivity should generally be commensurate with the proportion of faculty duties assigned in the research category (e.g., productivity expectations for faculty with a 40% research assignment will be higher than for faculty with a 20% research assignment). For forms of scholarship other than those designated in the SI Guidelines as “high impact,” the faculty member should provide a brief narrative describing the work, its importance/significance, and its impact. Research activity will be evaluated holistically, not just based on the number of indicators. Faculty can meet criteria for a given rating in the domain of Research with qualifying performance indicators in one or more of the rating level descriptions.</p>				
Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Unacceptable (1)
<p>Evidence of exceptional progress on (e.g., data collection, data analysis, manuscript pages written) and/or completion of at least one scholarly product or “high impact” form of scholarship (per SI Guidelines; typically peer-reviewed article and/or substantial application for external funding, not just letter of intent) for each 20% Research Assignment.</p> <p>Evidence of exceptional research impact or professional recognition of the faculty member’s status as a leading or emerging scholar in their field (e.g., applied use of one’s</p>	<p>Evidence of significant progress on and/or completion of one scholarly product or “high impact” form of scholarship (per SI Guidelines; typically peer-reviewed article and/or substantial application for external funding, not just letter of intent), but below the rate of one product for each 20% Research Assignment.</p> <p>Evidence of significant research impact or professional recognition of the faculty member’s status as a leading or emerging scholar in their field (e.g., applied use of</p>	<p>Evidence of average progress on any scholarly product—high impact or otherwise—that meets minimum expectations within the School.</p>	<p>Little progress on any scholarly product and no completed products. Productivity is below minimum expectations within the School.</p>	<p>Not actively engaged in research or scholarship for more than one year</p>

research/scholarship in a professional practice community, scholarly use of one's research/scholarship to advance the profession or contribute to an important research topic/area, which may be measured qualitatively (e.g., scholarly recognition by peers, awards, or appointments) or quantitatively (e.g., h-index, citation counts, or productivity/impact "rankings")	one's research/scholarship in a professional practice community, scholarly use of one's research/scholarship to advance the profession or contribute to an important research topic/area, which may be measured qualitatively (e.g., scholarly recognition by peers, awards, or appointments) or quantitatively (e.g., h-index, citation counts, or productivity/impact "rankings")			
---	---	--	--	--

TEACHING

The School of Information recognizes (a) that teaching "performance" is multidimensional, (b) that excellence in teaching can be demonstrated in different ways, and (c) ratings for some courses and for some types of courses (regardless of instructor) are typically higher or lower than others. Teaching activities may pertain to formal courses and to student mentoring, professional development, and advising. Teaching should generally be commensurate with faculty assignment and role (tenure-track and instructional faculty). The following rating guidelines are intended to reflect that diversity. No single indicator is necessary and may not be sufficient to warrant a given rating. Teaching activity will be evaluated holistically, not just based on the number of indicators. Faculty can meet criteria for a given rating in the domain of Teaching with qualifying performance indicators in one or more of the rating level descriptions.

Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Unacceptable (1)
Evidence of exceptional teaching performance and/or effectiveness, considering indicators such as the following: Student evaluation ratings predominantly and	Evidence of above-average teaching performance and/or effectiveness, considering indicators such as the following: Student evaluation ratings	Evidence of teaching performance and/or effectiveness that meets minimum expectations within the School, considering indicators such as the following:	Evidence of below average teaching performance and/or effectiveness that fails to meet minimum expectations within the School, considering indicators such as the	No clear evidence of adequate teaching performance and/or effectiveness at the level expected for the rank for more than a year. Ignoring deficiencies in

<p>consistently at or above the School and College averages</p> <p>Completed or nearly completed development a new course or officially “refreshed” an existing course with Innovative Education, meeting all quality indicators</p> <p>Exceptional performance in facilitating student success, engagement, mentoring, professional development, and advising, which may include:</p> <p>Student ratings and/or narrative suggesting exceptional accessibility/responsivity to and effective communication with students</p> <p>Faculty narrative describing how they have incorporated feedback from students into substantive course revisions and articulated a plan to assess the impact of those changes</p> <p>Faculty narrative reflecting significant, positive efforts to increase student</p>	<p>predominantly and consistently at or approaching the School and College averages with a reasonable narrative explanation from the faculty member</p> <p>Significant progress on a new course or refreshing (updating or enhancing more than .20% of content) of an existing course for one or more of the School’s programs</p> <p>Above-average performance in facilitating student success, engagement, mentoring, professional development, and advising, which may include:</p> <p>Student ratings and/or narrative suggesting above average accessibility/responsivity to and effective communication with students</p> <p>Faculty narrative describing how they have incorporated feedback from students into</p>	<p>Student evaluation ratings predominantly and consistently at the School and College averages or slightly below with a reasonable narrative explanation from the faculty member</p> <p>Maintains existing courses, but without efforts to update or improve them</p> <p>Average performance in facilitating student success, engagement, mentoring, professional development, and advising, which may include:</p> <p>Student ratings and/or narrative suggesting average accessibility/responsivity to and effective communication with students</p> <p>Meets minimum expectations for attending to feedback from students, but without substantive course revisions and/or articulated plan to</p>	<p>following:</p> <p>Student evaluation ratings predominantly and consistently below the School and College averages with no reasonable narrative explanation to mitigate or contextualize them. Ignoring deficiencies in existing courses</p> <p>Below average performance in facilitating student success, engagement, mentoring, professional development, and advising, which may be reflected in:</p> <p>Student ratings and/or narrative suggesting below average accessibility/responsivity to and effective communication with students</p> <p>Failing to meet minimum expectations within the School for attending to feedback from students</p> <p>Faculty narrative reflecting below average</p>	<p>existing courses; no efforts to improve</p> <p>Syllabi fail to follow required USF template requirements, are missing critical information</p> <p>Clear evidence that faculty member is inaccessible and non-responsive to students</p>
--	--	--	---	--

<p>engagement</p> <p>Faculty member has gone above and beyond usual expectations to facilitate student success, including accommodating more students when course demand is particularly high</p> <p>Faculty member serves on major area paper, thesis, and/or doctoral committees within the university</p> <p>Faculty member directs undergraduate Honors Thesis</p> <p>Faculty member is actively engaged with students in activities such as advising, capstones, ePortfolios, supervising and managing practicum and internships, and career planning/development and/or other forms of student engagement appropriate to the faculty member's assignment</p> <p>Faculty member mentors students within their research "lab" and/or supervises student independent research</p>	<p>substantive course revisions and articulated a plan to assess the impact of those changes</p> <p>Faculty narrative reflecting significant, positive efforts to increase student engagement</p> <p>Faculty member has gone above and beyond usual expectations to facilitate student success, including accommodating more students when course demand is particularly high</p> <p>Faculty member serves on major area paper, thesis, and/or doctoral committees within the university</p> <p>Faculty member directs undergraduate Honors Thesis</p> <p>Faculty member is actively engaged with students in activities such as advising, capstones, ePortfolios, supervising and managing practicum and internships, and</p>	<p>assess the impact of those changes</p> <p>Faculty narrative reflecting student engagement that meets minimum expectations within the School</p>	<p>student engagement that fails to meet minimum expectations within the School</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

Faculty member receives teaching awards/recognition	<p>career planning/development and/or other forms of student engagement appropriate to the faculty member's assignment</p> <p>Faculty member mentors students within their research "lab" and/or supervises student independent research</p> <p>Faculty member receives teaching awards/recognition</p>			
---	---	--	--	--

SERVICE

The School of Information recognizes (a) that university service activities of equal importance or impact can occur at different "levels" (e.g., university, college, and school); (b) that service activities of equal importance or impact can occur in different domains (e.g., university professional, professional (c) that excellence in service can be demonstrated in different ways. The following rating guidelines are intended to reflect that diversity. Service should generally be commensurate with the proportion of faculty duties assigned in the service category (e.g., productivity expectations for faculty with a 10% service assignment will be higher than for faculty with a 5% service assignment). No single indicator is necessary and may not be sufficient to warrant a given rating. Service activity will be evaluated holistically, not just based on the number of indicators. Faculty can meet criteria for a given rating in the domain of Service with qualifying performance indicators in one or more of the rating level descriptions.

Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Unacceptable (1)
Evidence of exceptional service activity, considering indicators such as the following (typically two or more for an Outstanding rating):	<p>Evidence of above average service activity, considering indicators such as the following:</p> <p>Service activity both for the university and for the</p>	Evidence of average service activity that meets minimum expectations within the School.	No effective service activity or activity that is below minimum expectations within the School.	No effective service activity at the level expected for the rank, for more than a year.

<p>Service activity both for the university and for the profession.</p> <p>Service activity in multiple roles or on multiple committees, or at multiple levels—i.e., university, college, and school</p> <p>Holding office or positions of professional distinction (e.g., journal editorships) in professional service.</p> <p>Engagement in high-priority, time-intensive service activities, e.g., busy committees, special task forces</p> <p>Serving in leadership roles in university and/or professional association committees</p> <p>School-related community engagement - e.g., presentations to or consulting for community, library, government organization and/or serving as officer or board member of civic organization.</p>	<p>profession.</p> <p>Service activity in multiple roles or on multiple committees, or at multiple levels—i.e., university, college, and school</p> <p>Holding office or positions of professional distinction (e.g., journal editorships) in professional service.</p> <p>Engagement in high-priority, time-intensive service activities, e.g., busy committees, special task forces</p> <p>Serving in leadership roles in university and/or professional association committees</p> <p>School-related community engagement - e.g., presentations to or consulting for community, library, government organization and/or serving as officer or board member of civic organization.</p>			
---	--	--	--	--

--

Approved by Faculty 10/24/22

Approved by the Provost's Office 10/25/22

