

GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT

Approved by the WGS Faculty June 2020,
Consolidation Language Approved by Dean's Office, April 20, 2020

Table of Contents

Preamble	2
Mission Statement	2
Membership, Voting Rules, & Meetings	2
Administration of WGS	3
Chair	
Director of Graduate Studies	
Director of Undergraduate Studies	
Internship Director	
Committees	5
Graduate Studies	
Undergraduate Studies	
Faculty Evaluation Committee	
Tenure and Promotion Committees	
CAS and University Committee Membership	
Faculty Hiring Procedures	5
Tenure and Promotion	6
Faculty Annual Review	6
Merit Salary Increases	8
Teaching Assignments, Releases, Banking, & Summer	8
Commencement Attendance Policy	9
Grievances	9
Procedures to Amend this Document	10

Preamble

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; 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. WGS recognizes the principles of equity of assignment, resources and opportunities of faculty across a multi-campus university.

Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of Women's and Gender Studies at the University of South Florida is feminist education, research, and practice. We promote social justice by engaging students in the discovery and production of knowledge that emerges from feminist perspectives on culture and society.

- We teach students to use the analytic skills that emerge from engaging the intersections of gender, race, ethnicity, class, sexuality, ability, and nation in order to promote responsible citizenship in a diverse transnational environment.
- We expose limits in traditional higher education caused by excluding women and other marginalized groups and create knowledge that is transformative and inclusive. We aim for knowledge that will better all people's lives, not just the lives of a few.
- We connect our work as academics with the social, political, and economic world outside the university to educate our students about social inequalities that result from sexism, heterosexism and homophobia, racism, classism, able-ism, and ethnocentrism. We link knowledge, research, teaching, and activism.

We seek to empower students through a feminist critique of social, cultural, and institutional structures that enables them to think more critically about their own lives and that inspires them to work as active citizens for social change.

Membership, Voting Rules, & Meetings

The Women's and Gender Studies Core Faculty includes all full-time faculty on any USF campus whose appointments are more than 49% in the department and are in continuing appointments (i.e., either tenure-track or continuing instructor). Phased retirement faculty who have appointments of 49% or more in WGS and who maintain active participation in the service-life of the department will also have voting privileges. WGS Core Faculty members on leave, or who are serving in interim administrative positions who intend to return to the department retain voting rights. Faculty on leave or who have legitimate reasons for missing faculty meetings may vote via email. Typically, retired faculty will not retain voting rights. Visiting, affiliated, and less than 50% jointly appointed faculty members may consult with and advise the department faculty members, but do not have

voting rights on issues of governance or personnel. Department decisions will be made by a majority vote. Voting will require a quorum of two-thirds of the faculty casting a vote (either in person or via email or secret ballot).

Affiliate Faculty status is open to USF faculty members who are doing feminist / queer / womanist work in their scholarship, teaching, or activism, no matter which campus is their primary campus home. People who wish to be affiliate faculty may ask for this status at any time by submitting a CV and a letter describing their WGS-related work. The department will also issue a university-wide call for affiliates at least every other year. Affiliate candidates will be reviewed by interested WGS faculty members; if there is an objection to an applicant, that potential affiliate will be reviewed and voted on by the WGS Core faculty. Decisions will be made based on a majority vote.

The department will typically meet once a month during the school year. If there are no significant action items that require discussion, department meetings may be held as “e-meetings” via email, with an understanding that such meetings will usually not comprise more than a third of department meetings. When faculty members cannot attend in person, meetings may be held virtually by video-conference; individual faculty members may opt to attend a faculty meeting virtually if the meeting is not held on their home campus and/or the faculty member has a compelling reason they cannot attend in person. Otherwise, faculty members are expected to attend in person. A schedule of all regular department meetings for a given semester will be distributed early in the semester; other meetings may be called as needed, and email notification of all meetings will be provided with at least 48-hours notice. Department meeting minutes will be made available to all faculty members via a shared online folder.

Administration of WGS

Chair

Selection. When there is an impending vacancy, all Associate and Full Professors and Instructors at the second and third levels will be eligible to self-nominate for the position. Nominees will make presentations to the faculty regarding department leadership. The faculty will vote by secret ballot and the results of that vote will be forwarded to the College Dean, who may appoint the department’s choice or direct the department to make a new choice.

Term. The Chair will typically serve for a four-year term that will be renewable, pending the approval of the faculty and the College Dean.

Duties. The Chair is the chief administrative and academic office of the department and is responsible for maintaining the policies of the department, the college, and the university. The Chair is also the primary link between the department and other academic and administrative units on campus, and will serve as the representative of the faculty, staff, and students of WGS to the university. While the Chair has primary and final responsibility for all internal activities, the Chair should adhere to votes of the faculty except under the

most unusual circumstances, and must explain decisions that contradict faculty votes to the faculty.

The faculty will review the Chair once a year via a questionnaire distributed by the CAS Associate Dean of Faculty, and an *ad hoc* committee will summarize that report for inclusion in FAIR. The faculty may request that the College Dean remove the chair for cause if 60% of the faculty agree.

Chief duties of the Chair include:

- Managing and maintaining the department budget in consultation with the faculty, including resource allocation;
- Overseeing faculty teaching assignments;
- Making office assignments and overseeing space maintenance issues;
- Evaluating faculty annually, including working with the faculty to establish models for assigning merit increments to pay raises;
- Coordinating tenure and promotion reviews, including contacting external reviewers and (if needed) arranging for *ad hoc* promotion committees;
- Encouraging faculty research and teaching, including mentoring junior faculty and/or assigning mentors, and creating opportunities for funded research and teaching improvements;
- Attending College and Provost-level Council of Chairs meetings and keeping the faculty apprised of important developments;
- Handling student grievances in conjunction with the Directors of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies, following approved college guidelines for such grievance petitions;
- Supporting feminist scholarship on campus to the extent that resources allow;
- Building networks within and outside the university, including among: affiliated faculty and other departments at USF; other Women's and Gender Studies faculty across the country; local Tampa Bay community groups and other external stakeholders;
- Approving all publications that emanate in the name of the Women's and Gender Studies department;
- Working with development officers to encourage financial support of the department and college.

Director of Graduate Studies

Appointment and term. The Director of Graduate Studies is appointed for a four-year, renewable term by the department Chair in consultation with the faculty.

Duties. The Director of Graduate Studies is the chief administrator of the Graduate program and the Graduate Certificate whose duties include:

- Overseeing all graduate recruiting;
- Advising all first-year M.A. students and second-year students who have not chosen a thesis-director, internship supervisor, or portfolio advisor;
- Providing orientation each semester as relevant to all new graduate students;

- Meeting with all graduate students each semester to discuss progress toward graduation;
- Working with the Chair on teaching assistant assignments;
- Working with faculty to mentor new teaching assistants;
- Coordinating graduate SACS assessments annually;
- Collaborating activities with the Graduate Program Coordinator;
- Maintaining the *Graduate Program Handbook*;
- Submitting new graduate courses to the CAS Graduate committee.

Director of Undergraduate Studies

Appointment and term. The Director of Undergraduate Studies is appointed for a four-year, renewable term by the department Chair in consultation with the faculty.

Duties. The Director of Undergraduate Studies is the chief administrator of the undergraduate program whose duties include:

- Proofing of catalog copy;
- Submitting new undergraduate courses to the CAS UG curriculum committee, and attending CAS UG Committee meetings when our proposals are being considered, if needed;
- Working with the Chair and faculty to monitor the major and make sure the curriculum is current and meeting the students' needs;
- Working with the Chair on overseeing undergraduate SACS assessment;
- Participating in recruiting majors;
- Acting as liaison with University Honors;
- Meeting with other undergraduate directors when our curriculum interfaces with another department's or program's curriculum (e.g., a new minor or certificate that might include our department or be housed in our department).
- Offering a series of student-success and student-engagement workshops and events.

Committees

Until the WGS Core faculty reaches 10 members, **Graduate Studies** and **Undergraduate Studies** will operate as a committee of the whole, and the business of those committees will take place at regular faculty meetings. When the faculty reaches 10 members, we will revisit this document and decide, by a majority vote, whether and how to constitute membership in these committees. Until that time, the faculty as a whole may decide to create *ad hoc* special subcommittees to work on specific projects.

The **Faculty Evaluation Committee** will rotate yearly by turns, and will include one tenured faculty member and one untenured/instructor-track faculty member, who will review faculty members' annual reports and review the Chair's evaluations of faculty. Faculty members will not review their own evaluations; FEC members will be replaced on an

ad hoc basis for their own reviews, usually by the people who most recently served on the committee. The WGS Core faculty may decide, on a year-by-year basis, to operate as a committee-of-the-whole, though the Chair will not participate.

Tenure and Promotion Committees will be formed on an *ad hoc* basis for mid-tenure review, and for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and for promotion to Professor or to Instructor 2 or 3. Department promotion and tenure committees will be formed on an ad hoc basis, and will include all tenured faculty when considering tenure and promotion to the Associate Professor rank, and will include all Professors when considering promotion to Professor. Instructor promotion committees will include three to five faculty members from the tenure-line faculty and/or Instructor-line faculty who have been promoted to Level 2 (for considering Level 2 promotions) or Level 3 (for considering Level 3 promotions). If there are Instructors who are qualified to serve on the committee, at least one should be appointed to the committee. In all cases, such committees should include at least three faculty members; if there are not enough WGS Core faculty of appropriate rank to form a committee, such committees will include members of the Affiliate Faculty sufficient to constitute a viable and legal committee. The College Dean makes the decision about which Affiliate Faculty members to include in this committee, in consultation with the department chair; the chair will, during this consultation, ensure that the candidate's disciplinary background is fairly represented to the College Dean. Until there are more than five faculty members at any given rank, committees will consist of all faculty at a given rank. When the department exceeds five faculty in rank, this document will be revised.

CAS and University Committee Membership will be by volunteer, with an understanding that typically members of the department will offer to serve on one CAS committee / year (though they may not be selected by CAS).

The WGS department will hold elections whenever the **Faculty Senate** seat for the department is vacant; the result will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Office.

Faculty Hiring Procedures

Each year, the department will discuss (in a faculty meeting or via email) the department's priorities for new faculty lines and the department Chair will present those priorities to the College Dean. In the event that the College Dean authorizes a search, the Chair will form a search committee to be made up of at least three full-time or jointly-appointed faculty members and at least one graduate or undergraduate student; affiliated faculty may be asked to serve in addition to the formally appointed members of the department. The committee will determine who should chair the search committee; the department Chair may, but need not, also serve as chair of the search. Regional Chancellors or their designee will serve as a voting member on all search committees for faculty hiring on branch campuses.

The Search Committee will meet to:

- Write the job description;
- Develop the search plan in accordance with CAS rules and recommendations about conducting searches.

If there is sufficient time, the Search Committee should circulate the job description to the faculty and revise based on their input, if the revisions seem appropriate.

The Search Committee will be responsible for reviewing application materials and constructing a short-list of candidates to interview via phone, video conference, or at a conference venue. Once the committee has formed a short list, it should make the application materials of the candidates on that list available for review by all the faculty in the department. Faculty members may review those materials, make suggestions of questions for the first round of interviews, and raise concerns about the make-up of the short list. The Search Committee should carefully consider any serious concerns raised by the faculty.

After the candidates on the short list have been interviewed, the Search Committee will make recommendations to the department Chair of a smaller group of candidates to be invited for campus visits, and the Chair of the Search Committee will be responsible for organizing those campus visits, if campus visits are authorized, or further video-conference interviews, if campus visits are not possible. Campus visits should include at least one public presentation and should afford all members of the department with a chance to interact with the candidate.

After the campus visits, the Search Committee will hold a meeting open to the whole faculty to discuss candidates and the WGS Core faculty should vote (by secret ballot if the group chooses) on candidates, and should rank candidates based on those votes. Only faculty who have met with the candidates and participated in departmental discussions are eligible to vote. The student and affiliated faculty member(s) of the committee may advise the department but do not formally vote. The department Chair will present the list of ranked candidates in a hiring proposal to the College Dean and negotiate with candidate(s) on the final offer.

Tenure and Promotion

Tenure and Promotion Guidelines are set out in Appendix A. For all faculty evaluations—annual reviews, tenure, and promotion—spouses and partners must be recused per university regulations.

Faculty Annual Review

Each year, faculty members will meet with the department Chair to determine their goals for the year and to agree on their percentages for workload and effort assignments. Faculty will also upload their annual reports into the university-designated review system for evaluation; faculty may upload supplemental materials to the system or provide them

directly to the Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Annual reports should include narratives describing teaching, research, and service; copies of student teaching evaluations; and copies of publications. Annual report packets may also include other evidence of teaching effectiveness, innovation, and improvement as well as copies of scholarly work in progress. Tenure-line faculty who want to have work in progress count toward their annual research productivity should plan to submit that work. Specific guidelines for annual reviews are set out in Appendix B.

Evaluations will be based on material included in the annual report materials and will be entered into the university-designated review system. Faculty will be reviewed, typically, on their teaching, research, and service; in some cases, faculty may have other responsibilities that should be evaluated (such as administration), but these will be stated in their annual workload and effort statements. Evaluation packets supporting the annual report may include (but is not limited to):

- Teaching Evidence
 - Material prepared for courses, including syllabi, reading lists, online presentations, etc.;
 - Reports on class visitations, when appropriate;
 - Student evaluations;
 - Documents showing the development of new courses and/or the adoption of new teaching methods, technologies, or techniques;
 - Lists of graduate student committees (specifying whether MA or PhD, whether director or member), lists of undergraduate Honors Thesis committees (specifying director or member); and any directed research, readings, or internships;
 - Other evidence demonstrating teaching in non-traditional formats or situations.
- Research Evidence
 - Research, creative, and scholarly publications that appear during the year;
 - Letters of acceptance for publications that are forthcoming;
 - Manuscripts of long-term, ongoing projects or manuscripts that have been submitted;
 - Grants and contracts accepted and awarded;
 - Grants and contracts solicited and/or submitted, whether in process or unfunded;
 - Papers, symposia, posters, presentations, or performances at professional meetings/colloquia, including invited addresses;
 - Other work representing scholarly effort, including reports, op-ed articles, and documents related to community engagement.
- Service Evidence

- Listings of any professional service and/or department-related community service organizations on which the faculty member has served;
- Any evidence from those organizations indicating the level of service;
- A list of committees on which the faculty member has served;
- Documents from those committees that represent extraordinary service effort.

The Chair is responsible for review of the faculty by a deadline set by the College of Arts and Sciences and/or Academic Affairs. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will write a separate evaluation that will also be uploaded into the university-designated review system. Faculty members who find any part of their evaluations unacceptable should contact both the Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee, and ask for a reevaluation. Faculty members may provide additional materials to supplement the evaluation if it seems that something was overlooked in the original evaluation. The Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee should come to a consensus regarding the reevaluation; should that prove impossible, both the Chair and the committee will forward a written report to the Associate Dean for Faculty stating their positions concerning the evaluation. The College Dean will therefore have final say. “Regional Chancellors or their designee will provide formal written input prior to a College Dean or Vice President completing the performance appraisal” for faculty on the St. Petersburg or Sarasota/Manatee campuses.

Merit Salary Increases

Merit salary increases are often determined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and will be subject to the terms laid out in the CBA; special merit raises are sometimes determined by the College of Arts and Sciences. As a set of general principles, however, if the Chair is asked to determine merit raises, the department holds that

- salary increases should endeavor to keep all members of the department who have been maintaining “Strong” and “Outstanding” performance above or as near to the average salary at our peer institutions + 10% as possible;
- and that we value pay equity among faculty members with equivalent rank and seniority.

We also subscribe to the spirit of the *five-year rule* to offset the vagaries of lean-year/fat-year salary increase distributions. Merit increases should be retrospective to the extent that they insure that one colleague is not punished for having a particularly productive year when there are no or very small raises, while a similarly productive colleague is rewarded handsomely for happening to have had a good year in a year when raise pools are large. It is the intent of this statement of principle that faculty evaluations for merit raises reflect this concern for parity over the long term. Further, we recognize that publication of a major work may have been preceded by several years during which it appears that the scholar is relatively unproductive; a major publication therefore will carry with it at least four years of

credit on annual evaluations of research. (This provision is for the purposes of assigning merit increases only; tenure-earning faculty members are expected to maintain a *sustained* record of scholarship during their tenure-earning years, and not rely on one large project that appears near the end of the probationary period.) During the years that a major work is underway, faculty members should submit work in progress to demonstrate that progress.

Finally, while College doctrine holds that the Chair is responsible for the awarding of merit raises, the Chair should work with the faculty to establish criteria for those awards.

Teaching, Research, & Service Assignments, Releases, Banking, and Summer

Tenured and tenure-track faculty in Women's and Gender Studies will typically be assigned to teach five courses or the equivalent per year; continuing Instructors will typically be assigned to teach eight courses or the equivalent per year. Teaching releases may be established for research time, departmental administration, or other work agreed on by the faculty member and the department Chair; certain teaching responsibilities may be understood to count as more than one "course." Faculty workloads will be determined during the annual consultation between the Chair and the faculty member about faculty assignments and the Chair and the department as a whole will work toward a principle of equity of assignment, resources, and opportunities for all faculty, irrespective of home campus. All teaching releases are subject to the terms of contracts and to the approval by the College Dean's office.

The Chair is responsible for scheduling faculty courses and for making course assignments; as a principle, the Chair should endeavor to make those assignments equitable across categories of faculty (i.e., Instructors should have assignments that are roughly equal to other Instructors and tenure-line faculty should have loads that are roughly equivalent). The Chair should also, within the constraints of university rules about scheduling, attempt to accommodate faculty members' preferences for teaching schedules. Faculty members are responsible for bearing their fair share of the burden of service courses and less-than-ideal teaching slots.

Faculty members may, subject to the needs of the department and the terms of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, "bank" courses: that is, teach an overload for one or more semesters to save up (a) teaching release(s) for future semesters. (There is no back-pay for faculty who leave the university before they use the releases.) This should be done with the approval of the department Chair.

Summer teaching is determined by student need, by the teaching budget for the summer session, and the student credit hour targets determined by the College of Arts and Sciences. Within the limitations of those constraints, however, the department values spreading the opportunity for extra summer remuneration as widely across the faculty as possible, so faculty members who have not taught in the past two summers have priority in the assignment of summer classes, *so long as they are willing to teach a class with historically*

high demand and so long as the summer budget can accommodate their salaries. If there are not enough courses and/or budget to accommodate all faculty requests for summer teaching, decisions on who will teach will be made based on the following criteria (in order): considerations of constraints (demand, budget, SCH targets); ability to teach high-demand courses; and who has not taught most recently. Graduate Assistants will be assigned to summer duties based on a combination of seniority and quality of faculty evaluations of the quality of their assistant duties during the school year.

Commencement Attendance Policy

While we recognize that we are a small faculty on whom regular attendance at graduation ceremonies can place a relatively high burden, we also recognize the importance of the achievement to many of our students. Therefore, the Department should have a representative at one graduation ceremony per term (May, August, and December). The Chair will represent the Department at least once per year at commencement ceremonies. Attendance should rotate through the faculty for ceremonies at which the Chair cannot be present, and for which there is not a volunteer.

Conflict Resolution and Grievances

All members of the department are expected to comply with USF policies and procedures, therefore all grievance procedures function within the context of College, University, and USF-UFF procedures. Faculty members who feel they have a grievance case should consult the appropriate handbook and guidelines.

Following the CAS procedure for grievances, students with grievances against instructors should first attempt to work out their disagreement with the instructor. If that proves impossible or unproductive, students should, in accordance with the CAS procedure, bring their cases to the Chair, who will also consult the faculty member involved. If neither the faculty member nor the Chair can resolve the student's grievance, then the student will be directed to CAS-GUS to follow College and University grievance procedures.

All members of the department are expected to maintain professional behavior and should seek to resolve conflicts before they become disruptive to the department's functioning. In the event of a conflict between faculty members or between graduate assistants that rises to the level of disruption of the workplace, the Chair (or the Director of Graduate Studies, in the case of graduate assistants) will try to mediate the conflict and/or refer the parties involved to appropriate university conflict-resolution resources. Conflicts between a faculty member and the Chair that cannot be resolved through discussion may be referred to the College Dean for mediation. All conflicts that disrupt the workplace are subject to the policies outlined in the faculty handbook and by the Human Resources department.

Procedures to Amend this Document

This document must be thoroughly reevaluated at least once every five years and/or when the number of voting faculty reaches ten. It should be subject to annual review at the beginning of each academic year. Faculty members who wish to revise, add, or delete a provision should draft a proposal and bring it to the faculty in September for discussion. If a change is approved by 60% of the faculty, this document may be amended. Any amendments must be approved by the CAS Dean's Office.

This document was approved by the WGS faculty on October 14, 2015 by a vote of 7-0 on a secret ballot.

This document was revised in Spring 2020 and approved on May 4, 2020 by a vote of 7-0. Minor consolidation language was added per requirement of the Provost's Office June 19, 2020.

This document was approved by the College of Arts and Sciences Dean's Office on: March 21, 2018.

The revised consolidation language was approved by the College of Arts and Sciences Dean's Office on: April 20, 2020.

This document will be formally reviewed every five years (on years ending in 0 or 5). It may be revised at any time if a majority of full-time faculty members vote to revise it.

Appendix A: Tenure and Promotion Criteria

USF Department of Women's and Gender Studies Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion Guidelines

May 2020

The guidelines articulated in this document do not supersede The State University System guidelines on tenure, the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the University of South Florida's Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion, the CAS Procedures for Mid-Tenure Review and for Tenure and Promotion, or the guidelines for promotion for Instructors (all of which may be found on the USF Provost's or CAS websites). The provisions in this document are compatible with those university- and college-wide guidelines and adapt them to support and reward the interdisciplinary work of Women's and Gender Studies as articulated in *Women's Studies Scholarship: A Statement by the National Women's Studies Association Field Leadership Working Group*.¹ The goal of these guidelines is to build on USF and SUS guidelines and to clarify what our discipline values in teaching, research, and service. These guidelines should be reviewed on a regular basis by the department faculty to ensure their continued relevance and applicability.

The Department of Women's and Gender Studies recognizes the principles of equity of assignment, resources and opportunities of faculty across a multi-campus university.

In general, the following guidelines aim to support the NWSA Working Group's assertion that we should "widen the scope" of "what 'counts' as models of research teaching and service" (WSS 2013, p. 9).

Mission of the Department

The mission of the Department of Women's and Gender Studies at the University of South Florida is feminist education, research, and practice. We promote social justice by engaging students in the discovery and production of knowledge that emerges from feminist perspectives on culture and society.

- We teach students to use the analytic skills that emerge from engaging the intersections of gender, race, ethnicity, class, sexuality, ability, and nation in order to promote responsible citizenship in a diverse transnational environment.
- We expose limits in traditional higher education caused by excluding women and other marginalized groups and create knowledge that is transformative and inclusive. We aim for knowledge that will better all people's lives, not just the lives of a few.
- We connect our work as academics with the social, political, and economic world outside the university to educate our students about social inequalities

¹ Dill, Bonnie Thornton, Vivian M. May, et. al. NWSA, 2013. Hereafter cited in the text as WSS 2013.

that result from sexism, heterosexism and homophobia, racism, classism, ableism, and ethnocentrism. We link knowledge, research, teaching, and activism. We seek to empower students through a feminist critique of social, cultural, and institutional structures that enables them to think more critically about their own lives and that inspires them to work as active citizens for social change.

Overall Tenure and Promotion Expectations

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, demonstrated excellence in teaching and research as well as a record of sustained service are expected for tenure and promotion. For promotion to Professor, demonstrated excellence in teaching and research as well as a record of substantial service and leadership are expected. For promotion for Instructors, demonstrated excellence in teaching is expected, and a record of sustained service will be important in the decision. Below, we articulate what “excellence” in Women’s and Gender Studies means to the department and to our understanding of the discipline.

I. Teaching

Excellence in teaching is expected for all candidates for tenure and/or promotion.

As a department, we take great pride in our teaching and value both quality and innovation. We recognize, however, that “given the field’s overtly political approach to knowledge and power, women’s and gender studies scholars often face resistance in the classroom.... For example, teaching evaluations may reflect students’ discomfort with challenges to their preexisting modes of thinking about the world around them, especially if the candidate teaches required courses” (WSS 2013, p. 9). We therefore agree with both the NWSA Working Group’s and USF’s recommendations that we should employ not just student evaluations but alternative evaluations of teaching.

To achieve excellence in teaching, we expect candidates to demonstrate:

- **Innovation and curricular currency:** we expect candidates to be able to teach several different courses successfully and to different student populations (for example, to both majors and non-majors, and/or to lower-level and upper-level or graduate-level students) within both their substantive areas and the core curriculum; candidates should keep courses up-to-date and should respond to student- or peer-critiques with new materials, assignments, or teaching methods. Candidates should also contribute to curricular development and course redesign. Development or management of courses or units that contribute to the engagement of our students outside the classroom are highly desirable.
- **Effective classroom teaching:** we expect candidates to provide evidence of student learning, effective classroom management, and rigor of instruction. While we prefer that teaching evaluations meet or exceed college averages and require all candidates to submit the reports of student evaluations, Women’s and Gender Studies will weigh a diversity

of measures of effective teaching. Because student evaluations of teaching are often biased against women faculty, faculty of color, and faculty who challenge the ideological status quo, and because the current use of online evaluations yields statistically irrelevant returns, student evaluations cannot be the sole measure of teaching excellence. Peer evaluations, reviews of teaching portfolios, and faculty reflections will be considered alongside student evaluations of teaching.

- **Successful mentoring and advising of students:** we expect candidates to successfully mentor and advise students. Candidates for Associate Professor and Professor should document their ability to successfully work with undergraduate and graduate students in supervising internships, directing theses, serving on graduate committees, supervising teaching assistants, and/or directing individual study. Candidates for Instructor promotion should document mentoring of undergraduate student success (e.g., advising on career and/or further graduate study; supervising internships; supervising Honors theses) and mentoring graduate student teaching assistants.

Candidates should, in consultation with the department chair and/or a faculty mentor, craft teaching narratives and compile evidence of teaching excellence that outlines how they have met department expectations. We invite candidates to provide, and expect committees to consider, evidence of teaching effectiveness that may include: peer teaching observations and evaluations (noting that peer observations should comply with the CBA and with department guidelines for teaching observations); new course design; adaptation and revision of existing courses, including incorporation of new technologies; syllabi, assignments, and other instructional materials; evidence from courses of teaching effectiveness (including student performance on pre- and post-instruction measures); evidence of teaching improvement activities; exemplary student work; evidence of advising and mentoring; and Honors- and MA-thesis or internship direction.

While the majority of WGS teaching evaluation will be based on classroom, mentoring or online experiences, we also affirm the value of service-learning and alternative learning formats, and recognize here the importance of alternative teaching venues: supervision and mentoring of teaching assistants; learning communities, panels, workshops, community organizations, and study-abroad. We value and recognize team-teaching and understand that in interdisciplinary teaching, collaboration may be more valuable to students, but also more challenging for faculty members. The NWSA has asserted that community engagement and activism can and should be acknowledged as both teaching and research.

II. Research

Excellence in research is expected for all candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. Women's and Gender Studies expects that all candidates for promotion will publish scholarship in high-impact venues appropriate to their specialty. Candidates for Associate Professor will be able to

demonstrate an emerging national reputation, and candidates for Professor will be able to demonstrate a national or international reputation; such reputations can be documented by invitations to present research or contribute research, by citation, by awards and grants, or by other professional recognitions. Candidates may elect to be considered by either the School of Humanities or the School of Social Sciences. As of 2014-15, successful applications for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor within the School of Humanities typically include a scholarly book (or its equivalent) plus three or four substantial scholarly articles; successful applications within the School of Social Sciences typically include 10 – 12 refereed scholarly publications.

Given the interdisciplinary nature of Women's and Gender Studies, tenure and promotion committees considering WGS candidates must recognize that candidates are likely to contribute to several "fields" as they are traditionally defined. While candidates should articulate the coherence of their work to those committees, members of the committees must also recognize that "divergent and diverse contributions should not be approached as a 'watering down' of rigor or as 'making exceptions to excellence,'" as it is a disciplinary standard that WGS "was established, in part, to transgress institutional norms in higher education" (WSS 2013, p. 9-10).

We acknowledge USF's goal to maintain pre-eminent status as an institution, and expect faculty to engage in high-impact scholarly work. USF generally recognizes scholarly peer review as the best means to judge the quality and impact of scholarship and outlines in its tenure and promotion document the various kinds of peer review that are deemed appropriate; USF also recognizes, however, that the impact of community-engaged scholarship may take other forms. For WGS, candidates are expected to publish in peer-reviewed scholarly venues, but committees should accept that high-impact scholarly records may include other forms of research in addition to peer-reviewed scholarly venues. In the discipline of WGS, high impact work takes place within scholarly journals and academic presses. It may also originate from activism, applied research, creative efforts or pedagogy, and may take the form of policy or research reports, performances, community action projects, consulting, and field-defining statements and textbooks; high impact scholarly work may be produced in more accessible forums, including open access online journals, blogs, op-eds or other forms of social media. For promotion to full professor, a record of positively received grant applications or successful funding (from internal or external sources) may also be considered an indicator of high-impact scholarly work. Candidates should also take seriously the value USF places on a *sustained* record of scholarship; one large project or a flurry of several projects at or near the end of a probationary period does not show that *sustained* record.

Because WGS is itself an interdisciplinary field, and because some candidates may work more or less directly within a traditional discipline that is not familiar to all members of the department, candidates will provide evidence of the scholarly rigor of their publication venues. For traditional scholarly journals and presses, this will include impact factors and/or the publications' circulation and selectivity statistics; for non-traditional forums, candidates should provide evidence of the publications' impact and intended audience. All candidates should provide whatever evidence they can amass

documenting citations, use of materials in courses at other universities, or “real-world” use of research in community change and activism.

WGS values collaborative work. During the tenure-earning period, however, the majority of publications should be single- or first-authored. Candidates should document their individual contributions to collaboratively published research in the context of the other authors’ contributions to the work. Papers and works coauthored with collaborators other than former mentors helps to establish the independence of the candidate’s research program. Coauthoring papers and works with the candidate’s own students provide additional evidence of an independent research program and may contribute to the candidate’s record of teaching.

WGS is a field devoted to challenging the politics of the production of knowledge itself. Candidates engaged in this activity may face a larger burden of documenting peer-recognition than those who work within the boundaries of traditional knowledge structures. As the NWSA Working Group puts it, “Critical awareness of inclusions and exclusions in knowledge production is foundational” to our field (WSS 2013, p. 16). Tenure and promotion committees in WGS must take the politics of knowledge production into account when making recommendations to the college.

III. Service

WGS, because of our small size and our collaborative governance model, expects that service will include active and cooperative participation in department meetings and in departmental committees, but sets a goal of not overburdening faculty with service requirements. We also recognize the interdisciplinary nature of our department, and value contributions to the larger University community, including college- and university-level committees, as well as to the larger community as well. We recognize feminist work in the community as contributing to our larger departmental mission. We also value service to the profession, including MS reviews and active service to professional organizations. We expect all candidates for promotion to demonstrate sustained service within the department, the university, and the profession.

USF defines service as contributing to the University, the professional field or discipline, or the public, but requires that it relate to the mission of the University to be considered for tenure and promotion, rather than being the sort of service that individuals perform as private citizens. USF also distinguishes service from the work undertaken as part of scholarly or pedagogical community-engagement, and urges candidates to “count” that work as either teaching or research. We concur; our recognition of such activities under both Teaching and Research above represents our valuation of such activities within candidates’ dossiers.

IV. Full Professor Promotion Criteria

Candidates for promotion to full must meet or exceed the criteria for tenure and promotion in terms of teaching, research and service.

Excellence in teaching is expected for all candidates for promotion to full, and candidates are encouraged to use diverse evidence to illustrate and document their teaching. Mentoring of graduate students, in particular, is an important expectation of candidates for full.

There are numerous strategies by which candidates for full may demonstrate substantial service at USF, including but not limited to: assuming department, college, or university leadership roles; sharing expertise across multiple domains to diverse audiences; and working to improve the academic community.

Candidates applying for promotion to full in WGS are further expected to demonstrate a record of high-quality scholarship during the period under review, whether single-/co-authored or single-/co-edited:

- Books, monographs, anthologies, edited collections, and textbooks
- Journal articles
- Chapters in edited collections and anthologies, including introductions and conclusions
- Externally funded grants as PI or Co-PI
- New and updated editions of previous work
- Community-engaged scholarship leading to substantive products
- Encyclopedia entries related to the discipline or sub-discipline(s)

Candidates coming up under the School of Social Sciences typically will include 8-10 scholarly publications; candidates coming up under the School of Humanities will typically have either 8-10 scholarly articles or will have a scholarly monograph and 2-4 articles. Scholarly articles are usually 8000-10,000 words and monographs are typically 90,000 – 100,000; items particularly shorter or longer than average should be noted and considered as part of the well-rounded program of research, and should be discussed in terms of measured impact of the work. Candidates should discuss edited works with the FEC and/or department chair to agree on equivalence(s) to other published work.

We anticipate that candidates for Full Professor, more frequently than candidates for tenure and promotion, will engage in collaborative research reflective of their greater scholarly connections. We also anticipate that such candidates will merge their mentoring and scholarly activities by engaging in collaborative work with students and junior scholars. WGS values such collaborative approaches to research and scholarship. We encourage candidates to discuss their contributions to projects in addition to the projects themselves in their research statements.

Finally, successful applications for promotion to full will demonstrate that candidates interacted as members of their academic communities in ways that garnered a national reputation or national or international visibility. Evidence of national/international visibility might include the following recognitions or types of work within the candidate's disciplinary field and sub-field(s):

- National or international awards, honors, fellowships, institutional appointments, etc.
- Invited work in journals or national or international contexts, including plenaries, symposia, assemblies, etc.
- Work produced in collaboration with scholars/researchers in other countries or with scholars/researchers working externally to the University of South Florida
- Reprints of previously published work, such as journal articles reprinted as book chapters
- Editorships of national or international journals or publishers
- Editorial board service for national and international journals or publishers
- Guest editing for special issues of journals
- Organizing or planning national or international conferences or conference programs for the discipline or sub-discipline(s)
- Holding office in national or international organizations
- Doing program reviews and/or evaluations for national and international organizations
- Contracts and consultancies for national or international organizations
- External reviewing of application dossiers for tenure and promotion, awards, grants, etc.

Activities listed above achieved within relevant subfields are considered indicators of national reputation. Candidates are not required to meet all of the listed criteria, and the list is not exhaustive.

V. Instructor Promotion

Candidates for promotion on the instructor track should refer to the document "USF Instructor Promotion Guidelines, 2020."

VI. Procedures

A. Committee Formation

For the purposes of tenure and promotion, “WGS faculty” will include tenure-line and instructor-line faculty with appointments of 49% or greater in the department of Women’s and Gender Studies. Emeritus and affiliated faculty will only be considered “faculty” in the circumstances outlined below. Faculty on sabbatical are not required to take part in tenure and promotion reviews, but are allowed (and encouraged) to do so.

1. Tenure-earning and Tenured Faculty

WGS will follow all procedures as outlined by the College and University. Department promotion and tenure committees will include all tenured faculty when considering tenure and promotion to the Associate Professor rank, and will include all Professors when considering promotion to Professor. In all cases, such committees should include at least three faculty members; if there are not enough WGS faculty of appropriate rank to form a committee, such committees will include members of the Affiliate Faculty sufficient to constitute a viable and legal committee. The Dean of CAS makes the decision about which Affiliate Faculty members to include in this committee, in consultation with the department chair; the chair will, during this consultation, ensure that the candidate’s disciplinary background is fairly represented to the Dean. Until there are more than five faculty members at any given rank, committees will consist of all faculty at a given rank. When the department exceeds five faculty in rank, this document will be revised.

Mid-tenure review is similar to tenure review except that letters are not required.

2. Instructor Promotion

WGS will follow all procedures as outlined by the College and University. The Instructor Promotion Committee will be formed on an as-needed, *ad hoc* basis, and will include three to five faculty members from the tenure-line faculty and/or Instructor-line faculty who have been promoted to Level 2 (for considering Level 2 promotions) or Level 3 (for considering Level 3 promotions). If there are not enough WGS faculty of appropriate rank to form a committee, such committees will include members of the Affiliate Faculty sufficient to constitute a viable and legal committee. The Dean of CAS makes the decision about which Affiliate Faculty members to include in this committee, in consultation with the department chair; the chair will, during this consultation, ensure that the candidate’s disciplinary background is fairly represented to the Dean. The Instructor Promotion Committee will consider applications and will make recommendations to the Department Chair and College Dean; the Department Chair will make a separate recommendation to the College Dean.

B. Committee Procedures

1. Votes and Recommendations

The T&P committee will vote on tenure and promotion recommendations at a meeting and will write a committee evaluation of the candidate; the vote will be recorded in the candidate's applications. The Chair will make a separate recommendation and will write a separate evaluation. All recommendations will be available to candidates in their files.

Regional Chancellors will provide a formal review in promotion and tenure cases for faculty members on branch campuses prior to a College Dean completing and forwarding a recommendation to the Provost (see USF Consolidation Handbook).

2. Required and Recommended Materials

a. Required: Tenure application with annual evaluations in the university-designated review system, course evaluations in the university-designated review system, mid-tenure evaluations at all levels.

b. Recommended: Faculty narratives should concisely provide a rationale for understanding the candidate's teaching and research trajectory and the coherence of their scholarly and pedagogical project(s); the narrative should strive to present the candidate's work in language that would be understandable to non-specialist academics, should highlight major achievements, and should provide a context for the quality of publications and teaching endeavors. The narrative should explain any gaps, anomalies, or apparent irregularities, but should not serve as an *apologia*.

Supplementary materials should include copies of publications, letters of acceptance/contracts for publication, syllabi and other relevant teaching documentation, including peer evaluations.

3. External Evaluators

Candidates will work with the Chair to develop the list of external evaluators, following CAS procedures. Candidates should strive to recommend evaluators who understand the nature of research institutions and the place of Women's and Gender Studies within such institutions. Candidates and Chairs should attempt to include evaluators from universities that could be considered USF's peers or aspirational peers.

The original draft of this document was approved by the WGS faculty on February 13, 2019 by a vote of 7-0. Slight revisions to tenure and promotion to full professor standards were approved by the tenured faculty on February 4, 2020 by a vote of 4-0.

This document was approved by the College of Arts and Sciences Dean's Office on: January 7, 2020 and by the Provost's office on June 19, 2020.

This document will be formally reviewed every five years (on years ending in 0 or 5). It may be revised at any time if a majority of full-time faculty members vote to revise it.

Appendix B: Annual Review Guidelines

Faculty Annual Review

Each year, faculty members will meet with the department Chair to determine their goals for the year and to agree on their percentages for workload and effort assignments. Faculty will also upload their annual reports into the university-designated review system for evaluation; faculty may provide supplemental materials to the Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Annual reports should include narratives describing teaching, research, and service; access to student teaching evaluations; and copies of publications. Annual report packets may also include other evidence of teaching effectiveness, innovation, and improvement as well as copies of scholarly work in progress. Tenure-line faculty who want to have work in progress count toward their annual research productivity should plan to submit that work.

Evaluations will be based on material included in the annual report materials and will be entered into the university-designated review system. Faculty will be reviewed, typically, on their teaching, research, and service; in some cases, faculty may have other responsibilities that should be evaluated (such as administration), but these will be stated in their annual workload and effort statements. Evaluation packets supporting the annual report may include (but are not limited to):

- Teaching Evidence
 - Material prepared for courses, including syllabi, reading lists, online presentations, etc.;
 - Reports on class observations, when appropriate;
 - Student evaluations;
 - Documents showing the development of new courses and/or the adoption of new teaching methods, technologies, or techniques;
 - Evidence of ongoing teaching improvement, including (but not limited to) teaching workshops and seminars;
 - Lists of graduate student committees (specifying whether MA or PhD, whether director or member), lists of undergraduate Honors Thesis committees (specifying director or member); and any directed research, readings, or internships;
 - Other evidence demonstrating teaching in non-traditional formats or situations.
- Research Evidence
 - Research, creative, and scholarly publications that appear during the year;
 - Letters of acceptance for publications that are forthcoming;
 - Manuscripts of long-term, ongoing projects or manuscripts that have been submitted;
 - Grants and contracts accepted and awarded;

- Grants and contracts solicited and/or submitted, whether in process or unfunded;
- Papers, symposia, posters, presentations, or performances at professional meetings/colloquia, including invited addresses;
- Digital or internet-based research, including online exhibits, professional blog-postings, publication in online journals and professional magazines;
- Professional publications like book reviews, short encyclopedia entries, or professional responses;
- Other work representing scholarly effort, including reports, op-ed articles, and documents related to community engagement.
- Service Evidence
 - Listings of any professional service and/or department-related community service organizations on which the faculty member has served;
 - Any evidence from those organizations indicating the level of service;
 - A list of committees on which the faculty member has served;
 - Documents from those committees that represent extraordinary service effort.

The Chair is responsible for review of the faculty by a deadline set by the College of Arts and Sciences and/or Academic Affairs. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will write a separate evaluation that will also be uploaded into the university-designated review system. Faculty members who find any part of their evaluations unacceptable should contact both the Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee, and ask for a reevaluation. Faculty members may provide additional materials to supplement the reevaluation. Faculty members who find any part of their re-evaluations still unacceptable, should follow procedures outlined in the CBA. “Regional Chancellors or their designee will provide formal written input prior to a College Dean or Vice President completing the performance appraisal” for faculty on the St. Petersburg or Sarasota/Manatee campuses.

Annual Review Expectations and Standards

Teaching. Faculty members are expected to fulfill all of their teaching obligations with integrity, to meet departmental teaching needs, and to provide rigorous and up-to-date courses to their students. Those courses should be well organized with clear learning outcomes and ample opportunities for students to demonstrate that they have met those learning outcomes.

Evaluations of teaching should include a recognition of workload and consider all of the evidence presented by the faculty member and should not rely solely on teaching evaluations (unless the faculty member does not offer other evidence). Student evaluations may be used to demonstrate achievement in any or all of the categories below, but other evidence may be as or more pertinent. Factors to consider when assessing a faculty member’s teaching include, but are not limited to:

- Meeting department needs, including
 - Teaching courses that fulfill General Education, major or minor, and/or graduate requirements
 - Teaching large-enrollment courses or in multiple modalities
 - Curriculum development, new courses, course proposals, including developing proposals that will meet college and university initiatives or requirements (such as General Education)
 - Stimulating interest in WGS (recruiting majors/minors and/or graduate students; sponsoring student organizations concerned with WGS; attending recruiting events and/or preparing material for such events, etc.)
- Meeting student needs, including:
 - Course materials are organized, thorough, and well-presented
 - Course content is rigorous and appropriate to the level of the course
 - Providing support to at-risk or underrepresented students
- Mentoring
 - Involvement in one-on-one instruction and/or mentoring as appropriate to position (directing/serving on thesis committees, portfolio committees, directing internships, directed readings, advising, etc.)
 - Supervising graduate teaching assistants
 - Participation in course observation, as observer or observed
 - Individual student mentoring, including career and graduate school guidance, letters of recommendation, and other emotional labor
- Instructional Professional Development, including:
 - Innovative methods
 - Significant course revisions
 - Leading or participating in teaching workshops/seminars
 - Publication or conference presentation on pedagogy

Evaluations should take into account teaching awards and recognitions, unusually heavy teaching loads, and other extraordinary circumstances of teaching.

Criteria:

Outstanding (5): A faculty member demonstrates excellence in two or more categories above with pedagogical activities in multiple (though not all) sub-categories.

Strong (4): A faculty member demonstrates excellence in one category above and will have pedagogical activities in multiple sub-categories.

Satisfactory (3): A faculty member has fulfilled all of their teaching obligations with integrity, met departmental teaching needs, and provided rigorous and up-to-date courses to their students. Those courses are well organized with clear learning outcomes and ample opportunities for students to demonstrate that they have met those learning outcomes.

Needs Improvement (2): A faculty member has fulfilled all basic teaching obligations, but may be providing courses that need more rigor, organization, or updating. There may be evidence of not meeting department or student needs in some minor ways.

Poor (1): A faculty member has not fulfilled one or more basic teaching obligations.

Research. Faculty members with a research assignment are expected to contribute to the discovery of new knowledge, the development of new educational techniques, and/or to take part in creative activities. The WGS Tenure and Promotion Guidelines outline the level of research productivity that is expected for promotion to Associate Professor and to Professor and the different ways that a faculty member can achieve excellence when being considered for promotion. Annual evaluation standards for quantity of productivity should match those standards, broken down to an annual basis. Evaluation standards for quality are explained in the WGS Tenure and Promotion document and will guide annual evaluations. Impact in WGS does not have to be demonstrated by the impact-factor of a publication venue, but should be validated by evidence if the venue is not peer-reviewed and rated by outside sources.

Since WGS is often a book- or monograph-based discipline, faculty members will be given significant latitude toward working on long-term projects. To substantiate the record of publication in years when one's primary research output is otherwise undocumented (i.e., when there is no contract, correspondence with a press, or other external evidence), the faculty member should submit the parts of the MS completed in that year and/or a description of the work undertaken in that year (e.g., travel to an archive, interviews of research subjects, working with authors as an editor of a collection, etc.). Productivity on a larger but unpublished MS in each year should exceed, in quantity, the amount expected in published materials, given that publication requires additional steps (working with editors, revisions, copy-editing, etc.).

Grant-work in WGS may face specific complexities, given that few grants are available for individual researchers working on purely WGS projects, and that those that are tend to be less lucrative. Faculty members working on grants as part of a larger team should be understood to be working on long-term projects, and should substantiate their work on those projects following the same process as those working on books or monographs.

Finally, when productivity is measured quantitatively, adjustments must be made for percentage of appointment. In semesters when a faculty member has administrative appointments or unusually heavy teaching or service commitments, research productivity measures should be prorated to match the assignment.

Evaluations should take into account research awards and recognitions or other extraordinary research circumstances.

Criteria:

Outstanding (5): A faculty member has maintained a level of research equal to promotion guidelines broken down to an annual basis *or* has produced research that merits special consideration for quality or impact.

Strong (4): A faculty member has maintained a level of research that equals half (or more) of the promotion guidelines on an annual basis *or* research that merits special consideration for quality or impact.

Satisfactory (3): A faculty member has evidence of ongoing research of high quality (as defined in our tenure and promotion document) and demonstrates involvement in presenting or attempting to publish that work.

Needs Improvement (2): A faculty member has some evidence of ongoing research, but does not demonstrate involvement in presenting or attempting to publish that work.

Poor (1): A faculty member does not provide evidence of ongoing research.

Service. Faculty members are expected to provide service to the department and, if appropriate, to the college, university, profession, and community as explained in the tenure and promotion guidelines. Service expectations should be in line with the assignment of faculty workloads. Faculty members in tenured and tenure-earning positions are expected to include service to the profession and university or college; faculty members in teaching positions may include professional, university, or college service.

Evaluation of service should include consideration of the extent of a faculty member's service commitments; the quality of their work on committees (if this can be judged); and the value of the service to the department, college, university or profession.

Criteria:

Outstanding (5): A faculty member has exceeded expectations for service in at least two categories: extent, quality, and/or value.

Strong (4): A faculty member has exceeded expectations for service *either* in extent, quality, or value.

Satisfactory (3): A faculty member has done service to the department as a member of the committee as a whole, will have attended faculty meetings regularly, and will have participated in departmental activities. Tenured faculty members will have performed some college- or university-level service; tenured and tenure-earning faculty members will have done some professional service.

Needs Improvement (2): A faculty member will have done service to the department and will have attended faculty meetings regularly. They may not have performed service at all levels appropriate to their workload and/or job description.

Poor (1): A faculty member will not have met even minimal service obligations.

This document was approved unanimously by the faculty of Women's and Gender Studies in November 2022.