The number of full-time faculty members is adequate to support the mission of the institution and to ensure the quality and integrity of each of its academic programs.  

(Faculty)

Compliance Status: Compliant

Report

The number of full-time faculty members is adequate to support the mission of the institution and to ensure the quality and integrity of each of its academic programs.  

(Faculty)

Non Compliance

The University of South Florida has adopted the Florida State University Systems definition and provides definitions of full-time faculty according to their principal responsibility of teaching, research, public service, or administrative functions.  Faculty are further categorized by teaching and load and are considered full-time instructional faculty, part-time instructional faculty, or graduate teaching assistants.  Student-faculty ratio is also defined through the use of a Common Data Set.  The number of full-time faculty is determined through strategic planning initiatives and academic program approval processes.  For the spring 2014 semester, a total of 2,006 instructional faculty taught courses at the University of South Florida (1,530 full-time and 476 part-time faculty).  Student-faculty ratio was calculated to be 24:1 in fall 2012 which demonstrated an improvement from fall 2009.  Teaching, Research, and Service workload are divided by the department chair or appropriate University administrator and is reported through a workload form in the Faculty Activity Information Reporting System.  Processes are in place to ensure continued sufficiency of faculty to support the mission of the University.  A Departmental Performance Assessment is completed annually and is based on the last three years of information from the departmental dashboard indicators which include number of full-time faculty, student-faculty ratios, cost per FTE faculty, and faculty semester credit hour production.  Data presented for the College of Arts and Sciences 2014 review of the past 3 years shows the percent of full-time faculty for each department.  Percentage of full-time faculty providing undergraduate instruction is below 60% in 12 of 27 departments.  However, from the material presented, the reader is unable to determine the actual percentage of full-time and part-time faculty providing instruction for the other colleges/programs, off-campus instruction, or by mode of delivery.  In addition, faculty allocation and teaching productivity are examined annually as part of the budget review process.  The mission of the University also incorporates research and service.  From the materials presented, the reviewers are unable to determine the adequacy of full-time faculty supporting these initiatives.

Response

The University of South Florida (USF) employs and systematically deploys a sufficient number of faculty to support its mission and to ensure the quality and integrity of its academic programs.  

USF uses multiple interrelated processes to determine the adequacy of faculty needed to support its mission.  Faculty members receive their assigned duties and responsibilities in writing at the beginning of each academic term from the department chair or other appropriate University administrator.  The administrator generally divides faculty assignments among instruction, research, and service.  A Workload Form (AFD-FAR Form[1]) in the Faculty Activity Information Reporting System (FAIR)[2] is used to record faculty workload assignments at the beginning of the academic year and then, at the conclusion of each term, reconcile the assignments with the actual activities performed.  This assignment and reconciliation process ensures that the faculty member's assignment and actual activities include a balance of teaching, research and service activities appropriate to the mission and goals of the college, the department, and the University.  Redacted examples of AFD-FAR forms from the FAIR system are provided from the College of Arts and Sciences[3], College of Business[4], College of Education[5], College of Engineering[6], and College of The Arts[7].
Teaching

**Student Credit-Hour Production**
As mandated by Florida Statute 1012.945[8] and the USF Faculty Handbook[9], full-time faculty are required to produce 12 contact hours per week. While some faculty have release time for research and/or service, full-time faculty members remain fully engaged in the teaching process. Details of the SCH produced by full and part-time faculty for all academic programs are provided for the Fall 2013[10] and Spring 2014[11] terms. Overall, for these terms, full-time faculty generated more than 67% of undergraduate and 84% of graduate student credit hours (SCH) across USF’s academic programs. Although the College of Medicine MD program[12] does not produce SCH in a manner consistent with other colleges (“units” rather than “credit hours”), full-time faculty conduct the overwhelming majority of unit productivity.

**Distance Education**
USF’s distance-education program extends the reach of the Colleges’ credit-bearing courses. In Fall 2013 and Spring 2014[13], about 9% of undergraduate and 10% of graduate courses were delivered online. In addition, all courses offered online are also offered as traditional face-to-face classes. As shown by the following tables, the large majority of undergraduate and graduate Student Credit Hours (SCH) was taught by full-time faculty regardless of the mode of delivery (Undergraduate Fall 2013[14] & Spring 2014[15]; Graduate Fall 2013[16] & Spring 2014[17]).

**Off-Campus Sites**
USF currently offers 50% or more of the credit hours toward a degree at two off-campus sites. The College of Business partners with Broward College and the Center for American Education at the Universidad San Ignacio de Loyola in Lima, Peru to offer an undergraduate degree in Business Administration. In Fall 2013 and Summer 2014[18] (no classes were offered in the spring term), 75% of the student SCH was generated by full-time USF instructors.

The USF College of Nursing offers a Master's degree for Nurse Anesthetists[19] at the Center for Advanced Medical Learning and Simulation (CAMLs) in Tampa, Florida. Courses are taught by USF faculty and specifically selected adjuncts.

Research

Research is an important part of USF’s 2013-2018 Strategic Plan. Goal 2 of the Strategic Plan[20] states that “USF will generate new knowledge and solve problems through high quality research and innovation to change lives, improve health, and foster positive societal change.” To accomplish this goal, research proformance is tracked in a variety of ways.

Similar to the faculty teaching assignements, faculty research effort[21] is assigned as part of the Assigned Faculty Duties (AFD) and reconciled through the Faculty Activity Report (FAR) in the FAIR system (described above) and is part of the annual review for each faculty member.

Research productivity is also an important part of faculty review for tenure at USF. Research expectations are described in the USF Tenure and Promotion Guidelines[22]. As shown by this example[23], research productivity is specifically addressed as part of the tenure review.

Aggregate research productivity is tracked by USF's Office of Decision Support (ODS) and included in the college annual review conducted by the Provost. Below are examples of college review annual reports on research productivity from across the campus.
- College of Arts and Sciences[24]
- College of Behavioral and Community Sciences[25]
- College of Business[26]
- College of Education[27]
Faculty research is tracked at the individual faculty level by the Office of Sponsored Research. A detailed report of research activity is produced each fiscal year and made available through a website and in printed form. The report includes the amount of funding received for each researcher by college and academic program or other academic unit (e.g., Research Institute or Center).

Evidence of the adequacy of the USF faculty to fulfill the research mission is also tracked through the USF Strategic Plan Planning, Performance and Accountability Matrix. As shown in this matrix, performance metrics are defined and targets set for each year. Overall, USF has met or exceeded its goals for research funding.

Service

“Service to the University, the professional field or discipline, and engagement with the community” is required of all USF faculty and is a component of the annual evaluation and the tenure and promotion process. Candidates for tenure must have made substantive contributions in one or more of the service areas cited above. An example of a tenure review illustrates how the faculty member’s service activities are evaluated. Like teaching and research, faculty service effort is assigned as part of the Assigned Faculty Duties (AFD) and reconciled through the Faculty Activity Report (FAR) in the FAIR system and is part of the annual report.

Balancing Teaching, Research, and Service

In addition to reviewing teaching, research and service as separate faculty activities, USF pays significant attention to aligning these efforts with the University’s mission. The Office of Decision Support provides data on the distribution of these assignments for all academic programs. These data assist chairs, deans and other administrators in adjusting faculty loads to ensure the requirements for teaching, research and service are fulfilled. Examples of these reports are provided below.

Faculty Effort by Academic Program, Fall 2013, Office of Decision Support
Faculty Effort by Academic Program, Spring 2014, Office of Decision Support

2.11.1 The institution has a sound financial base and demonstrated financial stability to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services. (Financial resources)

Compliance Status: Compliant

Report

2.11.1 The institution has a sound financial base and demonstrated financial stability to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services.

The member institution provides the following financial statements: (1) an institutional audit (or Standard Review Report issued in accordance with Statements on Standards for Accounting and Review Services issued by the AICPA for those institutions audited as part of a systemwide or statewide audit) and written institutional management letter for the most recent fiscal year prepared by an independent certified public accountant and/or an appropriate governmental auditing agency employing the appropriate audit (or Standard Review Report) guide; (2) a statement of financial position of unrestricted net assets, exclusive of plant assets and plant-related debt, which represents the change in unrestricted net assets attributable to operations for the most recent year; and (3) an annual budget that is preceded by sound planning, is subject to sound fiscal procedures, and is approved by the governing board. (Financial resources and stability)

Non Compliance
A June 30, 2014 financial statement audit and management letter from the Florida Auditor General was not provided; neither was a statement of financial position of unrestricted net assets, exclusive of plant assets and plant-related debt.

The University of South Florida maintains an appropriate financial organizational structure with oversight provided by the BOG and the BOT, along with annual financial audits from the FL Auditor General, to allow for financial stability. Standards & Poor’s and Moody’s Investor Service ratings of AA- and Aa2 respectively, demonstrate financial strength.

State appropriations have decreased during the past five years; however, tuition and fee increases have effectively helped to stabilize revenue. Financial ratios support financial stability and a strong financial base. Unrestricted net assets are 36% of annual operating expenses and unrestricted resources to debt are higher than Moody’s median for similarly rated universities.

The USF Foundation (USFF) manages gifts for funding activities directly related to the University’s mission. Endowment and operating pools of more than $391M and $73M respectively existed at June 30, 2013.

The University’s annual budget process is appropriately collaborative and linked to the University’s mission. The June 30, 2014 budget was approved by the BOT at the June 5th BOT meeting.

Response

At the time of submission of the reaffirmation document, the June 30, 2014 financial statement audit and management letter as well as the statement of unrestricted net assets was not available. The State of Florida Auditor General provides these reports annually between November and January while our reaffirmation submission date was September 10, 2014. We received the required documents in November 2014 and can now submit the financial statement audit and management letter [1] and the financial position of unrestricted net assets [2] for the required period. We also include the full financial audit for the year ending June 30, 2014 [3].

3.2.13 For any entity organized separately from the institution and formed primarily for the purpose of supporting the institution or its programs, (1) the legal authority and operating control of the institution is clearly defined with respect to that entity; (2) the relationship of that entity to the institution and the extent of any liability arising out of that relationship is clearly described in a formal, written manner; and (3) the institution demonstrates that (a) the chief executive officer controls any fund-raising activities of that entity or (b) the fund-raising activities of that entity are defined in a formal, written manner which assures that those activities further the mission of the institution. (Institution-related entities)

Compliance Status: Compliant

Report

3.2.13 For any entity organized separately from the institution and formed primarily for the purpose of supporting the institution or its programs: (1) the legal authority and operating control of the institution is clearly defined with respect to that entity; (2) the relationship of that entity to the institution and the extent of any liability arising out of that relationship is clearly described in a formal, written manner; and (3) the institution demonstrates that (a) the chief executive officer controls any fund-raising activities of that entity or (b) the fund-raising activities of that entity are defined in a formal, written manner which assures that those activities further the mission of the institution. (Institution-related entities)

Non Compliance

Several entities organized separately from The University of South Florida exist to support the University. The University of South Florida maintains policies specifying the University’s legal authority
and operating control, including fund raising, for these type of entities; however, separate entity documentation was only provided for the USFF, and not the following: USF Alumni Association; University Medical Services Association, Inc.; USF Medical Services Support Corporation; USF Health Professions Conferencing Corporation; USF Research Foundation, Inc.; USF Financing Corporation; USF Property Corporation; and the Sun Dome, Inc. Thus, it is not possible to determine that the entities mentioned above (except USFF) have documentation to demonstrate their legal authority and operating control by University of South Florida and the relationship and extent of any related liability.

Response

In the reaffirmation document, the reference for legal authority and bylaws outlining the relationship of Direct Support Organizations to the institution was submitted under the umbrella of Florida Statute 1004.28[1]. However, documentation including articles and bylaws for each DSO was not included. These documents can be found in the table below which provides the name of each DSO, its articles of incorporation, and its bylaws.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Support Organization</th>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Bylaws</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USF Alumni Association</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Medical Services Association</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USF Medical Services Support Corporation</td>
<td>[6]</td>
<td>[7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USF Health Professions Conferencing Corporation</td>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USF Florida Research Foundation</td>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>[11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USF Financing Corporation</td>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>[13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USF Property Corporation</td>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>[15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USF Sun Dome</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>[17]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.1.5 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in the following area:

community/public service within its mission, if appropriate. (Institutional Effectiveness)

Compliance Status: Compliant

Report

3.3.1.5 community/public service within its mission, if appropriate

Non Compliance

The office of Community Engagement and Partnerships (OCEP) sets objectives and ensures that these objectives are evaluated systematically and that continuous improvement occurs based on the evaluation of established mutually beneficial and reciprocal University-Community partnerships founded on community-engaged scholarship and service-learning pedagogy. The Center for Leadership & Civic Engagement (CLCE) works to produce learning-centered experiences for all students. Each experience is intentionally developed and includes outcomes linked to those of Student Affairs at USF. CLCE sets objectives and ensures that these objectives are evaluated systematically and that continuous improvement occurs based on the evaluation. An annual CLEC assessment report is maintained in the USF System of Assessment Management (SAM). Faculty engagement in service is a key requirement for tenure and promotion. Specific professional/public services assignments for faculty are tracked by the Office of Decision Support and used as part of the faculty member's annual evaluation. The University is also designated as community-engaged by the Carnegie Foundation.
The extent to which assessment data are used for improvement is not clear in the materials provided. Examples of assessment data include programs and initiatives in which the target for participation or positive responses were met or exceeded. No examples were given of actions taken for improvement.

**Response**

As requested by the Off-Site Review Committee, the following is additional documentation regarding the extent to which assessment data are used for the continuous improvement of community and public service activities of the Office of Community Engagement and Partnerships and the Center for Leadership and Civic Engagement.

**Use of Results for Improvement - Office of Community Engagement and Partnerships (OCEP)**

A key activity of the Office of Community Engagement and Partnerships (OCEP) is to conduct a series of thematic forums designed to “…foster dialogue and collaboration between the university and the community in order to break through the invisible distance between university researchers and activists in the trenches.” Assessments of each of the forums are conducted and the results used for the direct improvement of subsequent forums.

The Spring 2014 forum “The Poverty of Poverty Intervention: Doing More with Less” provides a specific example of how assessment results are used to improve this important community service. The executive summary[1] and complete report[2] documents the response to the community regarding the assessment of the forum including specific action steps OCEP is taking to improve their services.

A second example of using assessment information to improve services is illustrated by the September 2014 Community Engaged Summit held by OCEP. The summit was initiated as a result of assessment data showing that OCEP had fallen short of meeting its targets. The summit involved current USF faculty and administrators as well as participants from the 2009 Provost’s Task Force on Community Engagement. The central purpose of this summit was to use the data that revealed the shortcomings of past activities to set OCEP on a new course to achieve strategic goals.

Summit participants reflected on progress made with respect to the university’s commitment to community engagement and participated in a SWOT analysis (identifying strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) of community engagement activities. A summary of the results of this analysis includes recommendations[3] for specific actions to be undertaken that will improve USF’s engagement with the community. OCEP is currently implementing the “next steps” defined in the recommendations – developing an operational plan that will, first be presented to the Community Engagement & Partnerships Advisory Committee and related bodies supporting university-wide community engagement efforts, and then used to improve USF’s community engagement activities.

**Use of Results for Improvement - Center for Leadership and Civic Engagement (CLCE)**

Based on assessment data reported annually in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness System for Assessment Management (SAM), USF’s Center for Leadership and Civic Engagement (CLCE) undertook a comprehensive departmental review[4] in 2012 that lead directly to actions for improvement.

The results of this review include specific recommendations for actions that are being implemented by the CLCE to improve services. In response to the review, the CLCE’s Strategic Plan[5] was revised to address the recommendations.

3.4.1 The institution demonstrates that each educational program for which academic credit is awarded is approved by the faculty and the administration. (Academic program approval)

**Compliance Status:** Compliant
3.4.1 The institution demonstrates that each educational program for which academic credit is awarded is approved by the faculty and the administration. *(Academic program approval)*

**Non Compliance**

The University of South Florida places primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty, with review and approval by the faculty and administration, as evidenced by an established process. In addition, a statewide approval process by the SUS Council of Academic Vice Presidents work group is in place to determine duplication, need and demand for the proposed program. A full-proposal for a new program also goes through an approval process with the University of South Florida Board of Trustees or the Board of Governors in order for the program to be added to the university system degree inventory. While samples of graduate program approval process (Graduate Council Curriculum Meeting Agenda and Graduate Council Meeting Minutes) were included, no undergraduate program examples were included other than a list of new undergraduate programs submitted to the Office of Decision Support.

**Response**

As noted by the off-site committee review, USF's response to this requirement included an example a new graduate program proposal making its way through the steps of the approval process as detailed in the New Academic Degree Program Authorization Guidelines[1]. However, the response did not include an example of an undergraduate program going through the same process. It should be noted that an undergraduate program example was not included in the initial submission because no new undergraduate programs were approved during the 2013-14 academic year (The academic year generally covered by the compliance report). To address this omission, the most recently approved undergraduate program is used to illustrate the approval process in the narrative below.

**New Academic Approval Process (Undergraduate Program Example)**

The goal of the new academic program approval process[2] is to have the proposed academic program approved by the USF Board of Trustees (BOT) or the Florida Board of Governors (BOG) (doctoral program) and added to the State University System (SUS) degree inventory.

**Faculty Initiated Steps**

The proposing faculty develop a new program proposal using a SUS template[3] approved by the Florida BOG. The department chair and college dean must approve the proposal. Once approved, the Undergraduate or Graduate Council (UGC/GC) reviews and approves the proposal (e.g., Undergraduate Council, Curriculum Mtg. Agenda, November 28, 2011[4] & Undergraduate Council Mtg. Mins., November 28, 2011[5]).

**University Administrative Steps**

Prior to developing a new program proposal, the proposer(s) must attend a mandatory Proposal Workshop conducted by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE). Once the proposer completes the workshop, he or she prepares the proposal and garners the department, college and council level approvals (see above). Following approval by the undergraduate council, proposals are submitted to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) for vetting. Two institutional-level councils then review the proposal: the Academic Program and Policy Coordinating Committee (APPCC)[6] and the Academics and Campus Environment Advisory Council (ACEAC)[7], (ACEAC Agenda from March 19, 2012[8]). (The APPCC is a new committee that was not operating at the time the example proposal was approved.)

Following successful review by the councils, the proposal is reviewed by the Academics and Campus Environment Work Group (ACE)[9] (a subcommittee of the BOT) (ACE Work Group Agenda from April 19, 2012[10]). With approval from ACE, (ACE Work Group Minutes from April 19, 2012[11]) the proposal is forwarded to the full BOT as a consent agenda item. The BOT Meeting Agenda from June
Statewide Administrative Steps

Once the University process is completed, the proposal is submitted to the BOG. If the proposal is for an undergraduate or master’s degree program, the BOG vets only for accuracy of information, then includes the new program on the SUS Degree Inventory. If the proposal is for a new doctoral degree program, it is reviewed by the BOG staff before being included as an action item on the full BOG meeting agenda.

A full proposal[14] and notification[15] of the addition of a program to the degree inventory provide evidence of this process at work.

3.5.4 At least 25 percent of the course hours in each major at the baccalaureate level are taught by faculty members holding an appropriate terminal degree—usually the earned doctorate or the equivalent of the terminal degree. (Terminal degrees of faculty)

Compliance Status: Compliant

Report

3.5.4 At least 25 percent of the course hours in each major at the baccalaureate level are taught by faculty members holding an appropriate terminal degree—usually the earned doctorate or the equivalent of the terminal degree. (Terminal degrees of faculty)

Non Compliance

More than 25% of the course hours earned in each undergraduate major is taught by faculty holding a terminal degree, with one exception. No justification is offered for the low percentage (19.7%) for the Childhood Language Arts/Reading program in fall 2013. The acceptable terminal degree is defined by the departments in their respective credentialing statements.

Response

There are three reasons why the percentage of undergraduate SCH produced by faculty with terminal degrees in Childhood Education & Literacy Studies was below 25% during the Fall 2013 term.

1. Childhood Education and Literacy Studies offers the largest program in the College with more than 400 students and includes extensive field-based experience courses[1]. The large number of field-based experience courses have a significant impact on the percentage of SCH produced by faculty with a terminal degree. (see #2 below for details of this impact)

2. Consistent with SACSCOC credentialing requirements, instructors of field-based supervision courses have a master’s degree and 18 hours of appropriate coursework. In many cases, instructors are doctoral students who provide instruction as a core part of their preparation to become university teacher educators. In addition to being guided by SACSCOC accreditation, teacher education programs in the College of Education are guided by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)[2] and the Florida Department of Education (FDOE)[3]. Both CAEP and FDOE outline key indicators for high quality teacher education programs, including the integration of extensive field-based experiences, both practica and internship, in K-12 school settings. To facilitate this objective, the COEDU employs a larger number of individuals to supervise these field-based experiences according to Florida State Statute 1004.04 [4]– Public Accountability and State Approval for Teacher Education Program (see below):
"(5) PRESERVICE FIELD EXPERIENCE.— All postsecondary instructors, school district personnel and instructional personnel, and school sites preparing instructional personnel through preservice field experience courses and internships shall meet special requirements. District school boards may pay student teachers during their internships.

(a) All individuals in postsecondary teacher preparation programs who instruct or supervise preservice field experience courses or internships in which a candidate demonstrates his or her impact on student learning growth shall have the following: specialized training in clinical supervision; at least 3 years of successful, relevant prekindergarten through grade 12 teaching, student services, or school administration experience; and an annual demonstration of experience in a relevant prekindergarten through grade 12 school setting as defined by State Board of Education rule."

3. The low number of undergraduate SCH produced by faculty with a terminal degree[5] in the Fall 2013 term was an anomaly. The percentage of SCH generated by faculty with terminal degrees exceeded 25% for both terms in the preceding academic year and for the Spring 2014 term.

### 3.7.1 The institution employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the mission and goals of the institution. When determining acceptable qualifications of its faculty, an institution gives primary consideration to the highest earned degree in the discipline. The institution also considers competence, effectiveness, and capacity, including, as appropriate, undergraduate and graduate degrees, related work experiences in the field, professional licensure and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes. For all cases, the institution is responsible for justifying and documenting the qualifications of its faculty. (Faculty competence)

**Compliance Status:** Compliant

### Report

**3.7.1** The institution employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the mission and goals of the institution. When determining acceptable qualifications of its faculty, an institution gives primary consideration to the highest earned degree in the discipline. The institution also considers competence, effectiveness, and capacity, including, as appropriate, undergraduate and graduate degrees, related work experiences in the field, professional licensure and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes. For all cases, the institution is responsible for justifying and documenting the qualifications of its faculty. (See Commission guidelines “Faculty Credentials.”) (Faculty competence)

### Non Compliance

The University of South Florida faculty credentialing is guided by policies and procedures that are in place with faculty information entered into an information system that was developed internally. The University ensures that faculty are qualified through the implementation of hiring practices (USF Policy 10.102), annual evaluations, and system-wide credentialing requirements (USF Policy 10-115 Faculty Credentialing for Teaching Undergraduate and Graduate Courses). The University provides evidence that the vast majority of the faculty providing instruction in their schools have the appropriate expertise for their assignment and meet standards for competence. While it is clear that the University has regulations and processes in place to recruit and appoint qualified faculty, it is not possible to verify these qualifications or credentials with the documentation provided. In addition, in the cases of exceptions made, although statements of explanation were provided, there was no evidence supporting
the claims that they are acceptable to external agencies in their respective disciplines. Additional clarifying information is requested for the faculty listed. (See the Request for Justifying and Documenting Qualifications of Faculty at the end of this report).

Response

As stated in the off-site review, the University of South Florida (USF) utilizes appropriate policies and procedures for hiring competent faculty members. Although faculty members’ teaching credentials may be subject to review by external agencies in their respective disciplines, the USF faculty credentialing policy does not accept such review in lieu of USF credentialing procedures. The Off-Site Committee noted that additional documentation was needed for some instructors of record in order to justify their teaching assignments.

USF’s Focused Report Faculty Roster[1] provides additional information related to credentialing for each instructor noted by the committee. Additional academic coursework or degrees used for justification that were not included in the original roster appear on the Cited Faculty Roster as appropriate. Links to Curriculum Vitae are provided for full-time and part-time faculty for whom other qualifications besides academic credentials were used to support the credentialing decision. In one case, a link to a course syllabus is also provided for the faculty member to allow matching of the instructor’s qualifications with the specific course content.

Of the instructors cited, 69 were graduate teaching assistants. Of those, 68 required confirmation that the graduate credit hours reported in their field of study were equivalent to 18 graduate credit hours (or more). This was validated for all 68 cases. For the other case, an incorrect master's degree was reported in the self-study roster. The correct master's degree is included in the Focused Report Faculty Roster.

The off-site committee also requested additional information for some full-time or part-time faculty members. The requested information has been supplied for all but one of these faculty members. In the single outstanding case, the instructor taught a University Experience course for freshmen and had been qualified under previous guidelines for these courses. However, after further review, the faculty member’s credentials were insufficient under current guidelines so this individual was not re-hired to teach this course.

3.7.2 The institution regularly evaluates the effectiveness of each faculty member in accord with published criteria, regardless of contractual or tenured status. (Faculty evaluation)

Compliance Status: Compliant

Report

3.7.2 The institution regularly evaluates the effectiveness of each faculty member in accord with published criteria, regardless of contractual or tenured status. (Faculty evaluation)

Non Compliance

The University of South Florida regularly evaluates faculty in accordance with Board of Governors Regulations 5.001(5)(a) and 10.108. The Faculty Handbook and the United Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement establish the procedures and guidelines for faculty evaluation. Additional documents provided evidence of established policies and procedures at the system level for regular faculty evaluation. However, it is not clear in the materials provided whether the policies are implemented, nor is there evidence of local/campus policies or guidelines. No examples were provided for the different levels of faculty evaluations.

Response

All faculty at the University of South Florida (USF), regardless of contractual or tenured status, are
evaluated on an annual basis.
The following are the USF definitions for faculty categories used in this narrative:

**Full-time Faculty:** USF defines "faculty" through USF Regulation 10.100(3)[1] as "Positions assigned the principal responsibility of teaching, research, or public service, or for administrative responsibility for functions directly related to the academic mission. Faculty members of the USF System comprise those persons who have been hired as faculty members, who receive financial compensation to perform services for and whose work is directed and controlled by the USF System."

**Part-time Instructional Faculty:** USF also uses the SUS's definition of "part-time faculty[2]" as required by the Common Data Set. "Part-time instructional faculty" are therein defined as “adjuncts and other instructors being paid solely for part-time classroom instruction.” This definition also includes full-time faculty teaching less than two semesters, three quarters, two trimesters, or two four-month sessions. Employees who are not considered full-time instructional faculty but who teach one or more non-clinical credit courses may be counted as part-time faculty."

**Graduate Teaching Assistant:** For a position to be classified as a graduate assistantship[3] and for the employee to be eligible for benefits afforded to qualifying graduate assistants (GAs), the duties performed must directly contribute to the graduate student’s program of study. The GA must perform duties under the supervision of at least one faculty member and/or University employee experienced in the discipline. As a GA the employee must receive planned, periodic written evaluations. A student must meet ALL Office of Graduate Studies eligibility requirements to be hired as a GA.

### Annual Performance Evaluation Process

**USF Faculty**

USF Regulation 10.108[4] requires that all faculty members receive a regular performance evaluation. (It should be noted that USF System policies apply to USF Tampa, USF St. Petersburg and USF Sarasota-Manatee, each of which holds separate SACSCOC accreditation; thus system policies serve for all “local/campus” polices although local procedures may vary.) The only exceptions to the evaluation requirement are for certain visiting faculty, faculty in non-reappointment status, and faculty on a one-term contract. Section 10.3.A of the Faculty Handbook[5] and Article 10[6] of the USF/United Faculty of Florida Collective Bargaining Agreement[7] also govern faculty annual evaluations.

Normally, the department chair and a faculty committee conduct annual faculty evaluations. This process is guided by forms/reports that are made available through the USF Faculty Academic Information Reporting (FAIR) System[8]. These forms/reports include the following:

1. **Assigned Faculty Duties (AFD)/Faculty Activity Report (FAR) Form:** At the beginning of each academic year, the department uses the AFD/FAR form[9] in the FAIR system to assign duties for each faculty member. The assigned faculty duties typically include teaching, research, and service. At the conclusion of each semester, the department must reconcile the duties assigned (AFD) with the actual duties performed by the faculty member (Faculty Activity Report (FAR)).

2. **Workload Report:** The result of the reconciliation between the AFD and FAR information becomes a “Workload Report” in the FAIR system. An example of a Workload Report[10] illustrates how these data are collected in the FAIR system.

3. **Effort Report:** At the conclusion of the calendar year, all full-time faculty must also complete an “Annual Effort Report”[11] (using the FAIR Effort Report Module[12]) on the prior year’s activities.

4. **Annual Report:** The information from the workload and effort reports is summarized in an Annual Report in the FAIR system. As part of this report, the department chair/faculty
committee provides a written statement on the faculty member’s performance[13]. The faculty member can also provide a written response.

5. **Student Assessment of Instruction:** Instruction at USF is also evaluated by means of a USF Student Assessment of Instruction survey[14] conducted for each class section each academic term. The assessments are conducted online through the eXplorance Blue system with the results, including written student comments, provided through FAIR. Examples of student comments can be seen in the example evaluations provided below.

**Part-time Instructional Faculty and Graduate Teaching Assistants**

In accordance with USF Policy 10.108[4], evaluations are provided on a regular basis. In addition to student evaluations of instruction conducted for all course sections each semester, department chairs review the classroom performance of part-time faculty and GTA’s who are Instructors of Record for a course.

Following are examples of full and part-time faculty and GTA evaluations from academic programs across the campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Full-time Faculty</strong></th>
<th><strong>Part-time Faculty</strong></th>
<th><strong>Graduate Teaching Assistants</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing[27]</td>
<td>Classics[28]</td>
<td>Communication[29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education[33]</td>
<td>Cultural Studies[34]</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning[35]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering[36]</td>
<td>Public Affairs[37]</td>
<td>Japanese[38]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering[39]</td>
<td>Economics[40]</td>
<td>Sociology[41]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.9.3** The institution provides a sufficient number of qualified staff - with appropriate education or experience in the student affairs area - to accomplish the mission of the institution. (Qualified staff)

**Compliance Status:** Compliant

**Report**

**3.9.3** The institution provides a sufficient number of qualified staff—with appropriate education or experience in the student affairs area—to accomplish the mission of the institution. **(Qualified staff)**

**Non Compliance**

The University of South Florida provides a qualified and appropriately credentialed student affairs staff at the senior level consistent with the institution’s mission. A review of these staff members’ job responsibilities, educational and experience credentials, and continuing professional development
activities meets this standard. It is not clear if appropriate numbers of staff are associated with the various programs and services across the Student Affairs unit. The question remains whether they are deployed appropriately given that lack of information in either the narrative or organizational chart.

Response

Student Affairs, led by the Vice President of Student Affairs, is divided into five cohesive clusters: Community Development & Student Engagement; Health & Wellness; Residential Experience & Learning; Student Services & Facilities; and Career Services. These clusters are directed by the Student Affairs Leadership Team (SALT) comprised of the senior leadership from each cluster. SALT manages the employees within the respective clusters to include an administrative professional team of 156 employees[1] ranging from Associate Directors to Student Program Coordinators and a staff of 235 employees[2] ranging from Executive Administrative Specialists to Custodial Workers.

The breadth of programs and services as well as the systematic deployment of student-affairs professionals across the organization[3] demonstrates the institutional focus placed on student success, community engagement and globalization which are key strategic planning goals of the University of South Florida.

3.13.1 The institution complies with the policies of the Commission on Colleges. (Policy compliance) "Accrediting Decisions of Other Agencies"

Applicable Policy Statement. Any institution seeking or holding accreditation from more than one U.S. Department of Education recognized accrediting body must describe itself in identical terms to each recognized accrediting body with regard to purpose, governance, programs, degrees, diplomas, certificates, personnel, finances, and constituencies, and must keep each institutional accrediting body apprised of any change in its status with one or another accrediting body.

Compliance Status: Compliant

Report

3.13.1 The institution complies with the policies of the Commission on Colleges. (Policy Compliance) (Note: Institutions are responsible for reviewing the following Commission policies and providing evidence of Compliance with those that are applicable. Those that have asterisks are policies that include a federal mandate.)

*3.13.1. “Accrediting Decisions of Other Agencies”

Applicable Policy Statement. Any institution seeking or holding accreditation from more than one U.S. Department of Education recognized accrediting body must describe itself in identical terms to each recognized accrediting body with regard to purpose, governance, programs, degrees, diplomas, certificates, personnel, finances, and constituencies, and must keep each institutional accrediting body apprised of any change in its status with one or another accrediting body.

Documentation: The institution should (1) list federally recognized agencies that currently accredit the institution or any of its programs, (2) provide the date of the most recent review by each agency and indicate if negative action was taken by the agency and the reason for such action, (3) provide copies of statements used to describe itself for each of the accrediting bodies, (4) indicate any agency that has terminated accreditation, the date, and the reason for termination, and (5) indicate the date and reason for the institution voluntarily withdrawing accreditation with any of the agencies.

Non Compliance

Most academic programs eligible for specialized accreditation are accredited and in good standing. The institution provided a table with each accrediting body and the date of the next review as well as sample accreditation documents. No statements were provided indicating the way the institution
described itself to each accrediting body.

**Response**

Many specialized accreditation agencies request information which is program-specific and does not require generalized statements about the institution as a whole. Program reaffirmation standards often require limited statements involving university-level operations. For example, Dance Performance and Dance Studies, as well as Studio Art and Art History, must meet the standards of the National Association of Schools of Dance (NASD) and the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) with little discussion of institution-level operations. Each of the accrediting bodies has a requirement to discuss the programs’ purposes within the overall institution, but beyond that there is no requirement to link the program to the broader institutional context. The remaining standards focus on the program itself. Music programs, other than Music Education which is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), have a similar requirement and are focused on programmatic issues within the context of the requirements of the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). Pharmacy programs have no standards related to the broader institutional context. Standard one of the Accreditation Council of Pharmacy Education (ACPE) starts with the college or school mission and all subsequent standards are related specifically to pharmacy programs. Those which do provide institution-level responses are not necessarily required to respond to every area of institutional structure (institutional summary, institutional purpose, governance, program/degrees/certificates, personnel, finances, and constituencies) referenced in the SACSCOC requirement.

The included matrix provides responses[1] to DOE-approved accreditors made by USF programs during their most recent reaffirmation. Statements relevant to the SACSCOC required categories were extracted from accreditation documents and included in this matrix. The statements include information about the University as well as the individual programs and provide examples of the consistency of institutional-level descriptions. Links are also provided to the most recent full reaffirmation reports and the responses by specialized accreditors.

Further efforts have recently been undertaken to assure ongoing compliance with Comprehensive Standard 3.13.1. A policy (USF Policy 10-064[2]) has been promulgated which requires all programs subject to specialized accreditation to submit their reaffirmation documents through the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Academic Planning and Review (OIE). This office, in conjunction with the Office of Communications and Marketing, is charged with the assurance of the consistent representation of the institution in all reaffirmation documents. In compliance with USF Policies 0-209 [3] and 0-207[4], the Office of Communications and Marketing provides specific guidelines for all documents released to external parties.

**4.5** The institution has adequate procedures for addressing written student complaints and is responsible for demonstrating that it follows those procedures when resolving student complaints. (Student complaints)

**Compliance Status:** Compliant

**Report**

*4.5* The institution has adequate procedures for addressing written student complaints and is responsible for demonstrating that it follows those procedures when resolving student complaints. (See the Commission policy “Complaint Procedures against the Commission or its Accredited Institutions.”) (Student complaints)

**Non Compliance**

Student grievance policies and procedures for both undergraduate and graduate students are clearly documented and exist in both academic and non-academic domains. There are multiple ways in which complaints can be brought forward. These policies and procedures can be found on various
websites, in the Undergraduate and Graduate catalogs, and in the Student Handbook.

As already noted, there are multiple procedures/forms that can be used across all areas of complaints, but the institution did not provide sufficient examples of how they follow procedures when resolving complaints. The only two examples provided related to insufficient funds for an international student and an academic dishonesty charge in the College of Nursing.

It is obvious from documentation provided that the institution defines student complaints in a very broad manner which is commendable but not always easy to manage. What is not clear is whether the complete documentation of complaints could easily be located. For example, in the Student Grievances at the University Level 2009-14 and the Office of Graduate Studies logs, there is no reference to a student name, id number, or case number that could link the log to actual documentation.

In the Dean of Students Complaint Log, the subheading is Summer 2013-Spring 2014 Student Incidents. This log makes it difficult to determine which entries are complaints vs. incidents (that are handled on a daily basis by the Dean’s Office) and whether appropriate resolution was reached in those entries that are complaints. In some cases, there is no link to a student id number and documentation would be difficult to locate. In other cases, there are actions listed that do not actually explain the resolution. “Referred” does not speak to a resolution and if all non-academic complaints are logged by this office, then a resolution must be captured somewhere.

All elements that need to be a part of a complaint log are included in the logs shared with the off-site committee, but the essential elements are not included on every log. Developing a standard log format for the institution would seem to minimize some omissions.

Response

In response to the off-site team review, the following narrative provides additional and more specific examples of student complaints and how they progress through the complaint process established by USF policy. In addition, information contained in the logs of student complaints is presented in a more consistent format allowing the reviewer to determine both how records of student complaints are recorded by the responsible offices and how the log records are tied to detailed documentation through the student's name (redacted) and ID number. In this way, all information connected to an individual complaint can be easily located as needed.

As stated in the original response to this requirement, student complaints at USF are managed in their respective areas (i.e., academic complaints are managed by Academic Affairs; student conduct complaints are managed by Student Affairs; discrimination complaints are managed by the Office of Equal Opportunity Programs; and general student complaints are managed by the University Ombudsman). Whenever possible, student academic complaints are resolved at the department or college level. When they move beyond the college level, academic complaints are deemed "grievances" and referred to the Office of Undergraduate Studies (undergraduate students) or the Office of Graduate Studies (graduate students) (USF Policy 10-002[1].)

Non-academic complaints are submitted to the Office of the Student Ombudsman and/or the Office of the Dean for Students. The Ombudsman acts as a confidential, independent, neutral service that directs students to appropriate offices and advises on proper procedures. The Office of the Dean for Students receives student complaints from all areas of the University, provides referrals, and assists in achieving resolutions.

Adherence to policies and procedures for addressing student complaints is demonstrated by the following documentation.

Examples of Adherence to Student Complaint Processes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Complaints</th>
<th>Non-academic Complaints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>Office of Dean for Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Complaint Logs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Administration</th>
<th>Academic Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education[15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering[16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medicine &amp; Public Health[17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing[18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Arts[19]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to the off-site committee's suggestion that a standard complaint log format be developed, USF has initiated the development of an on-line intake system[20] that achieves this standardization. All student complaints will be submitted through this system which will be monitored by the Office of the Student Ombudsman. In this manner, student complaints will be tracked from intake to resolution.