School of Information

Faculty Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

I. Introduction

**USF SI Mission:**

The mission of the School of Information is to prepare engaged leaders for dynamic professions that serve current and emerging informational and lifelong learning needs of a diverse, global society, and to contribute to the body of theoretical and applied knowledge of the discipline.

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

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

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

II. Procedures

1. **Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**
   a. The School of Information (SI) Faculty Affairs Committee recommends a departmental tenure and promotion committee (T/P Committee) composed of at least 3 full-time tenured faculty members. The recommended T/P Committee must be approved by the SI Director.
      i. The T/P Committee is responsible for reviewing the candidate’s package; recommending external reviewers; and making a written recommendation (including a minority opinion) supporting or opposing tenure and promotion for the candidate.
b. A meeting of all tenured faculty is organized by the SI Director at which the T/P Committee presents their recommendation for the candidate. After discussion, all tenured faculty physically present at the meeting, or remotely present if the T&P package has been fully reviewed, then vote via a secret ballot to accept or reject the recommendation of the T/P Committee. The full tenured faculty vote and minority opinion (if needed) is included with the T/P Committee recommendation.

c. The Director performs an independent assessment of the candidate’s package and makes a written recommendation supporting or opposing tenure and promotion.

d. The recommendations of the department (SI) T/P committee and the Director, accompanied by a clear, substantive summary of reasons for both positive and negative votes, will be forwarded to the School of Social Sciences Tenure and Promotion Committee. A copy of the Department’s (SI) criteria for tenure and promotion should also be included.

2. Promotion to Professor.

   a. The procedures for promotion to Professor are similar to those used for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, however the promotion Committee recommended by the School of Information (SI) Faculty Affairs Committee may only be composed of full-time tenured faculty who hold the rank of Professor and may be smaller than 3 people. This Promotion Committee helps select external reviewers and itself reviews the promotion package of the candidate, finally making a recommendation supporting or opposing promotion, including a minority opinion if needed.

   b. The SI Director organizes a meeting of all tenured faculty at the rank of Professor. After discussion, all tenured faculty at the rank of Professor physically present at the meeting or remotely present if the Promotion package has been checked out previously, then vote via a secret ballot to accept or reject the recommendation of the T/P Committee. The full tenured Professor rank faculty vote and minority opinion (if needed) is included with the Promotion Committee recommendation.

   c. If appropriate, meaning that the Director is of Professor rank, the Director will perform an independent analysis of the candidate’s package and make a recommendation supporting or opposing promotion.

   d. The recommendation of the department (SI) Promotion Committee, along with the recommendation of the Director if appropriate, accompanied by a clear, substantive summary of reasons for both positive and negative votes, will be forwarded to the School of Social Sciences Tenure and Promotion Committee. A copy of the Department’s (SI) criteria for promotion to Professor should also be included.
III. Required and Recommended Materials to be Submitted

1. Required materials:
   a. Tenure/Promotion application,
   b. Curriculum Vitae,
   c. Narratives
      i. A research narrative outlining the applicant’s research area and activities
      ii. A teaching narrative outlining teaching activities and pedagogy
      iii. A service narrative
   d. Annual evaluations from FAIR,
   e. List of research outputs (published and accepted articles, research grants submitted, research grants won, other publications and research outputs)
      a. Table of courses taught and course evaluations from FAIR, and a spreadsheet, prepared by the Office Manager, or other staff member, aggregating the student assessment of teaching, and
   f. (for Tenure applications only) Mid-tenure evaluations (all levels).

2. Recommended materials:
   2) Research
      a. Copies of publications. For materials “in press”, provide external documentation regarding the status of the work or paper (e.g. correspondences from journals, editors, status updates, etc.).
      b. Evidence of submitted grant proposals or projects, including reviewer summary statements provided by the funding agency.
      c. Information on the impact of the applicant’s research. Impact should include scholarly impact, as measured by bibliometric indices from Web of Science, Social Science Citation Index, Science Citation Index, etc., but may include evidence of broader impacts on influence, thinking and practice within the discipline. Broader impacts may include evidence of readership, use of the applicant’s work/materials by other scholars, and applied use of the applicant’s work/materials to guide practice.
      d. Documentation of research awards and acknowledgements, competitive awards, grant, and fellowships.
   3) Teaching
      a. Course syllabus from each distinct course taught during the evaluation period.
      b. Any other course materials that a faculty member wishes to report.
      c. Evidence of curriculum design: new course creation, significant course modification, moving a course from classroom to online instruction.
d. Student written evaluations (a faculty member may supplement this section by adding any information pertinent to the review of student evaluations)
e. Other communications from students related to courses and/or outcomes
f. Exemplary student work and outcomes.
g. Peer evaluations of teaching.
h. Documentation of attendance at workshops or other training to enhance teaching effectiveness, course design, or other pedagogic factors.
i. Documentation of students advised and/or thesis/dissertation committee membership/leadership.
j. Documentation of teaching awards

4) Service
   □ Evidence of professional/public service activities, including minutes, any products from the committee’s work, etc.

IV. Evaluation for Tenure
Evaluation for tenure involves three components appropriate to the unit:
   □ Research/creative/scholarly work;
   • Teaching or comparable activity (including advising and mentoring);
   • Service to the University, the profession, and the community

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

□ Research

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

The normal expectation of candidates for tenure is an average of at least two research/scholarship outputs per year, with at least half of these being in high quality outlets. The expectation for promotion to Professor is an international reputation and continued scholarly output production averaging two outputs per year, with at least half of these appearing in high quality outlets.
The School recognizes that a candidate can contribute to the University’s research mission through multiple forms of scholarship, including:

- High Quality Outlets and Forms of Scholarship
- Books, chapters in refereed books, monographs
- Articles in refereed academic or refereed professional journals
- External grants and contracts awarded
- Medium Quality Outlets and Forms of Scholarship
- External Grant/contract applications
- Internal grants and contracts awarded
- Papers, symposia, and posters at refereed professional meetings/colloquia
  - Invited addresses
- Lower Quality Outlets and Forms of Scholarship
- Technical reports
- Un-refereed articles
- Un-refereed conference papers, symposia, posters, and presentations
  - Book reviews, commentaries etc.
- Instructional computer programs, videotapes, and other instructional materials
  - Web sites

Assessments of quality are evaluated in the School of Information through a relatively standardized process of professional judgment. Journal article quality assessment includes but is not limited to factors such as: is journal peer reviewed, ranking of the journal, acceptance/rejection rate of the journal, the apparent difficulty in conceptually framing and pursuing the study, estimates of the contribution made by the author (both in relationship to other authors in multiple authored pieces as well as the contribution to the field as viewed by the evaluators), the degree to which published works have been cited as measured by the relevant citation indices or scholarly communication analysis tools, and other measures of scholarly influence and applied impact. Conference papers are evaluated on the basis of the stature of the meeting and the distinction of the presentation, including specially invited addresses to professional/academic groups, the review process and acceptance rate, whether the proceedings are indexed in major databases, and citation rate for the paper.

Teaching
The School of Information expects candidates to establish a record of effectiveness in teaching, so that students master the body of theory, knowledge, and skills held essential to function as effective information professionals. To achieve “excellence” in teaching, candidates for tenure and also promotion are expected to demonstrate exemplary quality, through indicators like student evaluation ratings, results of peer review, implementation of innovative teaching methods, and development of new curricula.
The School considers the teaching role to be multi-faceted, and evaluations of its effectiveness includes more than students’ quantitative and narrative evaluations of the instructor. The School looks closely at those evaluations, but also considers such factors as student advising, office hours and availability to students, participation in the School’s curriculum activities, development of new courses and continuous improvement of existing courses, student engagement, innovative teaching methods, teaching load and credit hour productivity, and professional development in subject area and pedagogic methods.

For evaluating teaching expectations, the following will be examined:

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

2) Instruction-Related
   • Advising and mentoring ○ Academic advising, including office hours and availability to students ○ Writing letters of recommendation for, and assisting students with scholarships, internships, and job placement
     ○ Mentoring and involving students in professional activities, research, and publication, including support (as Director or Committee Member) of student Honors Theses or Doctoral Dissertations
   • Other teaching ○ Guest lectures in SI and outside classes ○ Seminars/workshops for faculty and/or students in the School ○ In-service seminars/workshops for professional constituency
   • Engaged scholarship with teaching/learning components ○ Textbooks/Scholarly papers published on teaching in your field and not counted as research
• Professional development for improving teaching or subject matter expertise
• Training grants
• Other

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

### Service

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

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

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

1) Departmental Service

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

2) University Service Outside of Department

• Collaborative programs with other disciplines
• College-wide and university-wide committees
• Other organizations such as faculty governance or working groups appointed by the Faculty Senate, Provost, or University President.

3) Professional
• Relevant Organizations
  o Professional offices and committees
  o Regional offices and committees
  o State and local
• General Academic
  o Editorships of professional/academic journals, service on Editorial Boards, and ad-hoc journal reviews
  o Participation in grant review boards, national policy making, journal editing, program evaluation and similar activities.
  o Organizing or in other ways facilitating conferences, workshops, or symposia.
  o Officer or committee work such as AAUP, Beta Phi Mu, at national, regional, state, and local levels.

4) Community

• Public lectures relevant to discipline
• Media coverage--community issue oriented papers in the popular press.
• Activities on behalf of local, state, and federal agencies

V. Evaluation for Promotion

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

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

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

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

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

Approved by faculty vote on Oct. 7, 2015.
Approved by Dean’s Office on October 9, 2015.
Approved by Provost on June 1, 2016.
Effective June 1, 2017.