

**USF College of Education
Department of Leadership, Policy and Lifelong Learning**

Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

The Department of Leadership, Policy and Lifelong (LPLL) Learning provides advanced graduate study at the master's, educational specialist and doctoral levels to prepare professionals who demonstrate transformative, critical leadership in scholarship, research, service and professional development. We prepare our graduates to promote global awareness, diversity, equity and well-being in various education organizations and agencies.

LPLL is a multi-campus department; we recognize the principles of equity of assignment, resources and opportunities of faculty across a multi-campus university. The evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion is an important professional responsibility. The evaluation process should address both individual and institutional goals; reflect the complexity of faculty work; recognize faculty members' unique contributions to the department, college and university; foster career development; and take place in a spirit of collegueship and responsible citizenship.

These departmental guidelines for tenure and promotion are aligned with the University of South Florida Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion (effective July 1, 2020), the College of Education Tenure and Promotion Guidelines (2020), and the USF-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement.

A. Department Tenure and Promotion Procedures

1. Department Tenured Faculty Vote on Tenure and Promotion Applications

- a. Department tenured faculty may vote on tenure and promotion applications.
- b. Tenure and promotion committee members and the Department Chair are ineligible to participate in the department tenured faculty vote.
- c. Only tenured Full Professors may vote on candidates seeking promotion to Full Professor.
- d. Department tenured faculty should review candidate applications prior to the department tenured faculty vote.

2. Department Tenure and Promotion Committee Vote on Tenure and Promotion Applications

- a. The Chair of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will oversee the secret ballot of the department tenured faculty. Votes will be counted openly in a meeting of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee and recorded by the chair of the committee.
- b. Each member of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee is responsible for reading the materials provided by each candidate in a timely fashion and being prepared to discuss the materials in relation to department guidelines.

- c. Discussion of tenure and promotion candidates among members of the tenure and promotion committee should be limited to formally scheduled meetings and limited to content contained within the applicant's tenure and promotion materials.
- d. If a tenure and promotion committee member perceives that there is any reason he or she is not able to objectively participate in tenure and promotion proceedings relative to a specific candidate, that committee member should recuse him/herself from the process for that specific candidate and abstain from the discussion and voting. In that case, the tenure and promotion committee for that candidate will be composed of the remaining members.
- e. After members of the tenure and promotion committee deliberate, they will write their recommendations and vote if necessary. In the absence of consensus, they may write a majority and minority report.
- f. If a faculty member is serving on the department Tenure and Promotion Committee and also on the College Tenure and Promotion Committee, the faculty member can only vote once on an application and should vote at the department level. In the discussion of applications at the College level, the committee member can participate in the discussions for faculty outside of the department. The committee member may respond to questions from other committee members regarding a department application but cannot contribute to any discussion regarding the disposition of the committee's evaluation of the department application.
- g. The committee will provide a narrative statement for each candidate and submit this statement to the Department Chair in accordance with College policies. If there are dissenting views among the committee regarding the candidate, the committee may provide both a majority and minority report to the Department Chair.
- h. The Chair of the committee will submit the narrative recommendations into the FIS system and enter the vote of the eligible department tenured faculty.

3. Department Chair Evaluation of Tenure and Promotion Applications

- a. The Department Chair should independently review and evaluate each candidate's materials prior to reading the report of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee.
- b. After the independent review, the Department Chair will take into account the committee's narrative in developing his/her evaluation report.
- c. The Department Chair will submit his/her evaluation report into the FIS system and enter the recommendation for tenure and promotion.

NOTE: 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" (USF Consolidation Handbook, Volume 2, p. 20).

B. Tenure (USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines, 2020, p. 1-5)

1. Expectations of Tenured Faculty (USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines, 2020, p. 1)

In order for the University to perform its functions effectively, it is essential that faculty members are free to express new ideas and divergent viewpoints in their teaching and research. In the process of teaching and research, there must be freedom to question and challenge accepted ‘truths.’ A university must create an atmosphere that encourages faculty members to develop and share different ideas and divergent views and to make inquiries unbounded by present norms. Tenure contributes significantly to the creation of such an atmosphere.

At the same time, in providing for ‘annual reappointment until voluntary resignation, retirement, or removal for ‘just cause’ or layoff’ (USF System Regulation USF 10.105), tenure is not an unconditional guarantee of lifelong employment. The granting of tenure is a privilege that carries enormous responsibility within the academic unit (ordinarily referred to as department), the College, the University, and broader academic community. This responsibility includes maintenance of the highest academic standards, continued scholarly productivity, sustained teaching excellence, and ongoing beneficial service carried out in the spirit of University citizenship.

2. Evaluation for Tenure (USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines, 2020, p. 2)

Evaluation for tenure involves three components appropriate to the department:

- a) Excellence in teaching or comparable activity designed to promote student learning (including advising, mentoring, and community-engaged instruction);
- b) Excellence in research/creative/scholarly work (including community-engaged scholarship);
- c) Excellence in service to the University, the profession, and the community.

Because the decision projects lifetime performance from the first few years of a faculty member's career, tenure must be awarded only as a result of rigorous assessment over a period of time sufficient to judge the faculty member's documented accomplishments, ability, and probability of sustained future productivity. A judgment must be made that the faculty member's record represents a pattern indicative of a lifetime of continued accomplishment and productivity with potential for high impact on the field or society.

The USF Consolidation Handbook, Volume 2 (p. 11) indicates that tenure-earning faculty initially hired at USF St. Petersburg and USF Sarasota-Manatee with three years of tenure-earning credit on July 1, 2019 (generally those hired in Fall 2016 or earlier) will be considered for tenure under their old regional campus guidelines unless they elect *in writing 30 days prior to the beginning of tenure consideration* to use the new consolidated guidelines. This is required in Article 15.4.B of the USF-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement. If a candidate chooses to use the old regional campus guidelines, their new consolidated academic unit's T&P committee and administration will still be responsible to carry out the process.

Each recommendation for tenure should be accompanied by a statement of the mission, goals and educational needs of the department and college, and the importance of the

contributions the candidate has made and is expected to make in the future toward achieving the mission and goals and meeting the educational needs of the unit and the university. Careful consideration must be given both to the equitability of the candidate's assignment and opportunities in relation to others in the department [especially when a department spans multiple campuses], and to the candidate's ability and willingness to work cooperatively within the department, college, and/or campus.

Integral to the mission and vision of USF is commitment to engagement with its communities. As defined by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, "community engagement describes collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, [international,] global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity." While some faculty engagement may come in the form of public service as such, any of the three categories of faculty activity could entail community engagement, and any could in some way "address critical societal issues and contribute to the public good." Community engagement that is undertaken by faculty to "enhance curriculum, teaching and learning and prepare educated, engaged citizens" may be included and evaluated as part of teaching, and community engagement undertaken to "enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity" may be included as part of a research/creative/scholarly faculty assignment."

Teaching (USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines, 2020, pp. 2-3). The first component in the tenure decision process is an evaluation of excellence and effectiveness in teaching or comparable activity appropriate for the unit. Teaching effectiveness is understood to be fundamentally grounded in learning outcomes. Each candidate must present a record of excellence and effectiveness in teaching as specified by the relevant academic unit and reflected in field-appropriate learning outcomes. The record of activities leading to tenure and promotion must provide evidence of excellence in teaching. *It is therefore vital that substantial and diverse evidence of teaching effectiveness be presented as part of the tenure application.* It is also essential that the candidate describes and explains the context of teaching activities, which may include .

Effective teaching results in learning for those taught. It requires a thorough knowledge of the subject; the ability to communicate that knowledge clearly through media appropriate to the subject, discipline, and the needs of students; and the ability to work with, motivate, and serve as a positive role model for students. "The College of Education encourages all teaching strategies that enhance student learning, particularly critical thinking, higher-order reasoning, and problem-solving skills, and encourages a wide array of student learning opportunities including community engaged teaching, international experiences, and other diverse modalities and settings. Faculty members eligible for promotion and tenure should demonstrate their accomplishments as teachers and their continual efforts to improve their teaching" (College of Education Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, 2020, p. 3).

Teaching performance is best judged by a comprehensive review of the teaching portfolio, and it is essential that an appropriate and independent evaluative review is conducted by the Department Chair and College Dean.

The College of Education Tenure and Promotion Guidelines (2020, pp. 3-4) states, “Research has documented that faculty with under-represented identities (i.e., race, gender, language, religion, sexual orientation, etc.) face challenges and biases with student surveys of teaching performance (sometimes referred to as ‘evaluations’ or ‘Assessment of Instruction’) reflected both in written comments and in quantitative scores (e.g., Aruguete, Slater, & Mwaikinda, 2017; Mitchell & Martin, 2018). Therefore, it is imperative to have a multi-dimensional evaluation of each faculty member’s teaching that does not solely rely on student surveys.”

In addition to course syllabi and student evaluations, a candidate may present the following kinds of documentation of teaching effectiveness: instructional materials (such as case studies, labs, discussion prompts, group projects, online or face to face); assessment activities and products (such as papers, tests, performances, problem sets), and other material used in connection with courses; student performance on pre- and post-instruction measures and other evidence of attainment of learning outcomes; exemplary student work and outcomes; peer observations and evaluations; certifications and other formal evidence of teaching effectiveness; teaching awards; new course development, course redesign, and adaptation to new formats and media through incorporation of emerging technologies; records of advising and mentoring; supervision of teaching and research assistants; thesis and dissertation direction; and professional development activities and efforts at improvement. Approaches to teaching and concomitant sources of evidence of teaching excellence and effectiveness may vary across fields, units, and candidates; consequently, variance in candidate portfolios may also be expected.

Evaluation of teaching must take into consideration an academic unit’s instructional mission; the candidate’s assignment of duties within the unit; class size, scope, and sequence within the curriculum; as well as format of delivery and the types of instructional media utilized. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness should consider the wide range of factors that impact student learning and success. Moreover, effective teaching and its impact on learning can take place in a variety of contexts: in campus classrooms; team teaching; online; in the field; in clinical settings; workshops; panels; through service learning activities, community engagement and internships; in laboratories; within on- and off-campus communities, in organizations, in education abroad settings, such as field schools, and through mentoring of students, including undergraduate and graduate student research. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness in formats and settings outside the classroom should include consideration of the expected impact of student learning on practice, application, and policy.

Research/Creative/Scholarly Work (USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines, 2020, pp. 3-4). Scholarship takes many forms, including independently conducted research and/or

creative works and collaboratively generated contributions to the knowledge base in respective disciplines. The purpose of research and creative scholarship is the substantive advancement of a field of inquiry or practice, whether by generation of new knowledge or production of new creative works and technologies. The record of activities leading to tenure and promotion must provide evidence of excellence. In order to attain tenure, a faculty member is expected to have established an original, coherent, and meaningful program of research and/or creative scholarship and to have demonstrated and clearly documented a continuous and progressive record indicative of potential for sustained contribution throughout the candidate's career.

The peer review process is the best means of judging quality and impact of the candidate's research and creative scholarship. Evaluation at the unit level should include an assessment of the quality of the candidate's work and consider discipline-appropriate evidence of the significance of research and creative activity, as well as the candidate's assignment of duties within unit. In addition, the College of Education Tenure and Promotion Guidelines (2020, p. 4) indicates that "creative scholarly endeavors reflecting the unique roles and responsibilities of the College of Education should be recognized. Developing innovative pedagogical materials (e.g., electronic literature, learning applications, assessment tools, etc.) or working to transform an instructional paradigm (e.g., transforming a laboratory school, etc.) are a few examples of creative scholarship pioneered by educational researchers."

A candidate may present the following kinds of documentation of a significant research program: all refereed publications, book chapters, books; reviews of books and articles and other publications such as research reporting on grants; records of competitive honors and awards, grants, and fellowships; reviews of grant applications; citations of the candidate's work; presentations; evidence of impact on policy and practice; the quality and significance of journals, series, and presses by which the candidate's work is published or of other venues in which it appears; invited, refereed, or non-refereed status of publications; research awards and acknowledgements; and invitations and commissions. The College of Education Tenure and Promotion Guidelines (2020, p. 5) notes that "faculty with under-represented identities can face bias and discrimination with regard to receipt of many of the aforementioned forms of evidence of research, including grants, awards, and other recognitions that depend on visibility, nomination, and voting (e.g., Ginther et al., 2011; Whittaker et al., 2015). Therefore, it is imperative to have a holistic evaluation of each faculty member's research."

Kinds of documentation will vary among fields, units, and individuals, and candidates should not be expected to include forms of documentation that are not typical in their disciplines, but they must provide appropriate documentation to support and validate claims about their work. As noted in the College of Education Tenure and Promotion Guidelines (2020, p. 5), it is also useful for candidates to describe the context in which the work was conducted (e.g., longitudinal study in a school district partnership; case study in a high poverty, at-risk community; etc.). Where appropriate, consideration will be given to external peer recognition as demonstrated by a record of funded research or demonstrated

impact of research through inventions, development and commercialization of intellectual property, and technology transfer, including, but not limited to, disclosures, patents and licenses.

Objective peer review of the candidate's work by scholars/experts external to the University is required. In addition, the candidate's chair or director and College Dean must conduct independent evaluative reviews.

It is noted that in some areas of scholarship, publications or other products may appear only after lengthy or extensive effort and may appear in a wider range of venues, both of which can be particularly true of community-engaged and/or interdisciplinary work at the local, national and/or international levels. Community-engaged scholarship may be demonstrated by high-profile products such as reports to local, national, or international agencies and formal presentations, or by other products as designated by the department, as well as by peer review. For collaborative and coauthored scholarship, the evaluation should include consideration of the candidate's role and contribution to the work, consistent with disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary scholarly practice. The body of work of a candidate for tenure must be judged against the appropriate standards within the area of research and creative scholarship, balancing the significance, quality and impact of the contribution with the quantity of publications and other scholarly products. Recommendations for tenure should present a clear and compelling case for the merit of an application in the context of the kind of scholarship in which the candidate's work has been conducted, leading to high confidence in the candidate's prospects for continuing and meaningful contributions.

The College of Education Tenure and Promotion Guidelines (2020, p. 5) notes that "faculty from underrepresented minoritized groups often experience isolation (e.g., fewer opportunities to collaborate with colleagues) and marginalization that can adversely impact self-efficacy, sense of relevance or belonging, and ultimately expression of creativity and talent (see Zambrana et al., 2015). Norms for what is deemed rigorous research can be influenced by various social categories of identity. For example, research specific to one's own demographic group or social identity groups that have been historically marginalized can be undervalued. Such research can also be subject to bias in publishing outlets when topics are deemed too narrow (e.g., focused on underrepresented groups), use non-experimental methods (e.g., qualitative, ethnography), or are potentially controversial in that the status quo is challenged (Louie & Wilson-Ahlstrom, 2018)."

Service (USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines, 2020, pp. 4-5). The third component to be evaluated includes the categories of service to the University, the professional field or discipline, and engagement with the community. Candidates for tenure must have made substantive contributions in one or more of these areas. Evaluation of administrative and other professional services to the University, including service on the USF Faculty Senate and Councils, should go beyond a simple enumeration of committees to include an evaluation of the extent and quality of the services rendered. Public service may include

work for professional organizations and local, state, federal or international agencies and institutions. It must relate to the basic mission of the University and capitalize on the faculty member's special professional expertise; the normal service activities associated with good citizenship are not usually evaluated as part of the tenure and promotion process. Because of the diverse missions of different units and variations in the extent and character of their interaction with external groups, general standards of public and professional service will vary across units.

The College of Education Tenure and Promotion Guidelines (2020, p. 6) state that “service at the program and department/unit levels (e.g., participation with respect to program improvement, accreditation, and department committees) is an expectation of all faculty within the COEDU. Evaluation of service will include an examination of the nature and degree of engagement within the University and in the local, regional, national and global communities. Notably, some important service activities (e.g., mentoring colleagues and/or students for interpersonal, cultural, psychosocial issues; joining an additional committee to ensure diversity of committee membership) should be recognized as both time-consuming and critical in creating a more inclusive institutional community (e.g., Cobb-Roberts et al., 2017). Additionally, committee representation and mentoring loads are often heavier for faculty of color and other minoritized groups, due to their underrepresentation in higher education (Stanley, 2006).”

Service to the community is differentiated from engagement with communities and external organizations that is undertaken in support of teaching (community-engaged instruction) or of research/creative/scholarly work (community-engagement scholarship). The College of Education Tenure and Promotion Guidelines (2020, p. 6) further indicates that community-engaged service “may include faculty collaboration with professionals in their discipline (such as inservice teachers, school mental health professionals, school leaders) to provide technical assistance relevant to one’s areas of expertise. Such forms of service to local professionals may yield multiple benefits to the university including potential recruitment of students, funding streams, and initiation of partnerships for subsequent research and teaching purposes.”

C. Promotion (USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines, 2020, pp. 5-7)

1. Evaluation for Promotion (USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines, 2020, p. 5)

As in the case of tenure, the judgment of readiness for promotion to higher academic rank is based upon a careful evaluation of a candidate's contributions in teaching and student learning (or comparable expectations appropriate to the department/unit and the candidate’s appointment), research/creative/scholarly work, and service. The sections pertinent to evaluation of these factors for the tenure decision apply as well to promotion.

The evaluation refers to written department- and college-level criteria for promotion that have been made available to candidates. Promotion also requires participation as a productive citizen of the University, as this is an integral part of faculty performance and is also evaluated with reference to written criteria.

General standards for consideration of appointment to the ranks of Associate Professor, and Professor (or their equivalents) follow. In each category, a candidate's achievements are evaluated in relation to criteria specified by the unit for the rank sought as well as the candidate's assignment of duties within the unit.

a. Appointment to Assistant Professor (USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines, 2020, p. 5)

- i. Promise of continued growth and excellence in teaching, or in comparable activities appropriate for the department/unit.
- ii. Promise of excellence in independent and/or collaborative research/creative/scholarly work supported by publications or other appropriate evidence.
- iii. Promise of substantive contributions in the area of excellence in service and citizenship to the University, profession and/or public.
- iv. The doctorate or the highest degree appropriate to the field from an accredited institution.

b. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor (USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines, 2020, p. 6)

- i. A record of excellence in teaching or other comparable activities appropriate for the unit, including a record of such activities as participation on thesis and/or dissertation committees and successful direction of the work of master's, educational specialist, and doctoral candidates as major or co-major professor, where applicable to the program and/or campus. Other activities may include but are not limited to:
 - Student assessment of instruction (teaching evaluations);
 - Comprehensive professional development;
 - Positive peer observations;
 - A variety of assessments that show learning gains;
 - Civic engagement in teaching; and/or
 - Pedagogical artifacts/documents (e.g., syllabi, developed instructional materials, course handouts, examinations).
- ii. A record of excellence in independent and/or collaborative research/creative/scholarly work, supported by substantial, high impact and sustained publications or their equivalent. Categories, criteria and types of evidence for research/creative/scholarly work may vary across colleges and departments. Thus, original or creative work of a professional nature may be considered as equivalent to publications. Evaluation of applied research should consider potential or actual impact on policies and practices. Examples may include, but are not limited to:

- Refereed articles in sponsored journals of scholarly associations, preferably at national and/or international levels;
- Book-length monographs with non-predatory academic publishers;
- Book series published by non-predatory academic publishers;
- Book chapters published by non-predatory academic publishers;
- Refereed research-based presentations at the local, state, regional, national, and international level; and/or
- Refereed and invited presentations (e.g., papers, workshops, poster sessions, symposia, keynote addresses, etc.).

The record should be sufficient to predict, with a high degree of confidence, continuing productivity in research/creative/scholarly work throughout the individual's career as defined in the individual's field. In describing this record of research/creative/scholarly work, a candidate should directly address ways in which their work addresses these expectations.

- iii. Appropriate to rank, a record of contribution of service to the University, profession, and/or public.
- iv. For faculty on tenure-track appointments, advancements to the Associate level is made simultaneously with granting of tenure (with exception of a faculty appointed as associate professor without tenure, i.e., in the case of a new hire at rank).

c. Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor (USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines, 2020, p. 6)

- i. A sustained record of excellence in teaching or other comparable activities appropriate for the unit, including a record of such activities as participation on thesis and/or dissertation committees and successful direction of the work of master's, educational specialist, and doctoral candidates as major or co-major professor, where applicable to the program and/or campus.
- ii. A sustained record of excellence in independent and/or collaborative research/creative/scholarly work of at least national visibility, of demonstrated quality supported by a record of substantial publications or their equivalent. Categories, criteria and types of evidence for research/creative/scholarly work may vary across colleges and departments. Thus, original or creative work of a professional nature may be considered as equivalent to publications. Evaluation of applied research should consider potential or actual impact on policies and practices. Examples of indicators of at least national visibility may include, but are not limited to:
 - Publications in national and/or international refereed journals;
 - Books and/or book chapters published by high ranking national and/or international publishing houses;

- Collaborative research/creative/scholarly work across multiple universities;
- Invited presenter or keynote speaker at national and/or international professional association meetings/conventions/conferences;
- Appointment to national and/or international scientific committees/councils;
- Appointment to national and/or international editorial boards;
- Other forms of public recognition of recognized research/creative/scholarly expertise (e.g., awards, expert witness, legislative testimony, media feature, visiting scholar, etc.).

The record should predict continuing high productivity in research/creative/scholarly work throughout the individual's career, as defined in the individual's field.

iii. A sustained 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, the college and/or the University. Expectations about the level of meaningful service contributions for candidates for Professor are wider in scope than those that apply to candidates for Associate professor. Examples of indicators may include, but are not limited to:

- Appointment as editor or co-editor for a refereed journal;
- Appointment as editor or co-editor for a book series published by high ranking national and/or international publishing houses;
- Election as an institutional representative to the governing body of a professional organization;
- Election as an officer of the governing body of a professional organization;
- Chair or co-chair of a standing committee of a professional organization;
- Appointment to an advisory board of a community organization.

iv. Compelling evidence of significant achievement among peers in one's discipline or professional field at the national and/or international level (e.g., major award from a professional organization, recognition by external reviewers). Any recommendation for promotion to the rank of Professor must contain evidence of such distinction, as relevant to the unit.

D. Timing (USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines, 2020, pp. 7-8)

1. Probationary Period for Tenure (USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines, 2020, p. 7)

The College of Education has a six-year probationary period. Therefore, faculty normally go up for tenure in the fall of their sixth year of appointment (or equivalent, when adjustments or exceptions to the standard have been made).

Expectations of progress within the normal time frame will be reflected in established annual and comprehensive review processes, but candidates may apply when ready, as specified in the following section.

2. Timing of Applications (USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines, 2020, p. 7)

Following an initial period in rank, normally at least two years, a candidate for tenure may apply earlier than the last year of the probationary period or, for promotion, earlier than the normal point for advancement in rank, when there is clear evidence that he or she has fully met the applicable criteria and has received endorsement at both department and college levels; additional merit beyond normal criteria for advancement, specified clearly in unit tenure and promotion documents, should not be required.

Following the Collective Bargaining Agreement, if a candidate applies before the maximum probationary period, he/she may withdraw from consideration on or before January 15th without prejudice. Such withdrawal is permitted one time only. Should the candidate choose to continue with the tenure and promotion process through the Provost's Office and be denied, the candidate will not have the option of submitting an application again.

3. Exceptions to the Standard Probationary Period (USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines, 2020, pp. 7-8)

a. General Exceptions

Ordinarily, a faculty member in a tenure-earning position will either be awarded tenure at the end of the probationary period or be given one-year notice that further employment will not be offered. However, exceptions to the tenure clock may be considered, such as medical exigencies or parental situations covered by FMLA or ADA legislation or other extenuating circumstances approved by the University or as specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. A tenure earning faculty member under such circumstances may request an extension of his or her probationary period. The request must be made in writing and must be approved by the chair of the department, College Dean, and the institution's designated senior academic officer overseeing the candidate's unit. Ordinarily, extensions of more than two years beyond the college's designated probationary period will not be permitted.

b. Exceptions Pursuant to University Reorganization. The University may establish extensions to the tenure clock in response to changes in University structure that result in faculty becoming subject to substantial differences in performance expectations.

D. Tenure upon initial appointment (USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines, 2020, p. 8)

In rare circumstances, tenure may be awarded upon initial appointment. In determining such

an award, the guiding principle will be to follow department and college procedures in an expedited process that will not inordinately delay hiring decisions. Specifically, there must be review of tenure eligibility at all levels, with a recommendation forwarded to the institution's designated senior academic officer overseeing the candidate's unit. Approval must be obtained from the senior academic officer prior to making an offer that includes tenure without a probationary period.

In support of such recommendations for tenure upon initial appointment, the senior academic officer will receive the following information:

- A written statement(s) of review of tenure eligibility at all levels (College Dean, chair, department faculty); rigorous reviews must occur prior to a request to the senior academic officer to make such an offer;
- The candidate's vita;
- The official starting date for the position, a draft of the letter of offer, which has explicit mention of the tenure offer, pending Board of Trustees approval;
- A compelling statement on the unique achievements of the faculty member that serve as the basis for tenure.

Upon approval, the University President will forward the tenure recommendation to the Board of Trustees for approval at the earliest meeting at which tenure upon appointment is considered.

Persons being considered for administrative appointment accompanied by academic appointments with tenure will interview with the academic unit in which tenure would be considered; and the appropriate College Dean, the appropriate faculty bodies, and administrators will make recommendations on tenure to the senior academic officer.

E. Review of Progress toward Tenure (USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines, 2020, pp. 8-9)

It is the responsibility of the department chair or other appropriate administrator and department peer committee, where constituted, to include a progress toward tenure review as part of the annual evaluation for all faculty in the probationary period for tenure. A more rigorous and extensive pre-tenure review will be conducted at the approximate mid-point of the probationary period. The review will refer to written department- and college-level criteria for tenure that have been made available to candidates. The mid-point review will be conducted by the department tenure and promotion committee, the department chair or other appropriate administrator, the college tenure and promotion committee, and the College Dean. A summary review of progress toward tenure will be forwarded to the institution's designated senior academic officer overseeing the candidate's unit.

The mid-point review is generally based on department criteria expected to be applied for the tenure review, but the mid-tenure review but does not include external reviewer letters. All mid-point reviews address the performance of annual assignments including teaching, research/creative/scholarly activity, and service occurring during the preceding tenure-earning

years of employment. In addition, all reviews should critically assess overall performance and contributions in light of mid-point expectations. The mid-point review will be based on documentation of performance, including: a current vita; annual evaluations; student/peer evaluation of teaching; selected examples of teaching materials; products of research/scholarship/creative activity; service commitments and accomplishments; and a brief self-evaluation by the faculty member.

The mid-point review is intended to be informative and encouraging to faculty who are making solid progress toward tenure; instructional to faculty who may need to improve in selected areas of performance; or where progress is significantly lacking and apparently unlikely, bluntly cautionary about the potential for dismissal..

F. Review of Progress toward Promotion (USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines, 2020, p. 9)

The annual performance review for a faculty member holding a rank below that of Full Professor should include an evaluation of progress toward promotion. At approximately the mid-point of the typical interval between appointment to the Associate Professor level and promotion to Full Professor for faculty in the department, the faculty member will ordinarily be given a more comprehensive review of progress toward promotion, to include participation by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Department Chair, and COEDU Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee. The materials provided for review should include a current CV and brief descriptions of accomplishments of teaching, research, and service as well as a projection (with timeline) for teaching, scholarly productivity, and service goals from mid-point to anticipated application to Full Professor (College of Education Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, 2020, p. 9). The candidate may request additional review by a more senior academic officer, such as the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. A review at this stage is intended to be informative; to be encouraging to faculty who are making solid progress toward promotion, and instructional to faculty who may need to improve in selected areas of performance. An Associate Professor can elect to opt-out of their department's typical mid-point review toward promotion to Full and request the review procedure to commence in a later year or not at all (College of Education Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, 2020, p. 10).

G. External Letters for Tenure and Promotion Applications (USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines, 2020, pp. 9-10)

The department chair ordinarily will include in the tenure and promotion packet a minimum of three letters (but not exceeding six) from external reviewers who are recognized experts in the individual's field or a related scholarly field inside or outside of academe; ideally, some or all of these will hold senior tenured appointments within at least aspirational peer institutions.

External reviewers should be selected carefully and have no significant relationship to the candidate (e.g., major professor or co-author) unless there are mitigating circumstance (e.g., review of scholarship so specialized that few expert reviewers exist). No conflict of interest or nepotism should be present.

The candidate and the department chair will suggest external reviewers, and either may identify individuals on the list of reviewers who should be disqualified for professional reasons. The list of potential reviewers is then sent for review and feedback to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and the College Dean. The chair and the candidate then jointly select the reviewers from the list approved by the Associate Dean and College Dean. In the event of disagreement, each party will select one-half the number of qualified reviewers to be utilized.

The content of all solicited letters that are received from external reviewers should be in the candidate's file prior to the final recommendations by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee.

H. Department Tenure and Promotion Committee (USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines, 2020, p. 10)

The tenure review process includes review by a departmental committee, the department chair, the College Tenure and Promotion Committee and the College Dean. In the documentation of an applicant's work, the committee must take into consideration the applicant's assignment in all three areas of teaching, research, and service. In tenure and promotion cases for faculty members on branch campuses, "all tenure and promotion reviews are initiated in a faculty member's academic department, flow through the department committee, Department Chair, through a school committee/Director (where appropriate), and college committee, to the Regional Chancellor (with support from the regional vice chancellor, or associate vice chancellor, for academic affairs), then to the College Dean for recommendation to the Provost" (USF Consolidation Handbook, Volume 2, p. 20).

Each member of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee is responsible for reading the materials provided by each candidate in a timely fashion and being prepared to discuss the materials in relation to department guidelines. Each candidate must be considered independently for his or her own merits, not relative to other candidates being reviewed by the committee. Members of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee are also responsible for keeping candidate materials and discussions about evaluations of candidates confidential.

References

- Aruguete, M. S., Slater, J., & Mwaikinda, S. R. (2017). The effects of professors' race and clothing style on student evaluations. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 86(4), 494-502.
- Cobb-Roberts, D., Esnard, T., Unterreiner, A., Agosto, V., Karanxha, Z., Beck, M., & Wu, K. (2017). Race, gender and mentoring in higher education. In D. A. Clutterbuck, F. K. Kochan, L. Lunsford, N. Dominguez, & J. Haddock-Millar (Eds.), *Sage Handbook of Mentoring* (pp. 374-388). London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Ginther, D. K., Schaffer, W. T., Schnell, J., Masimore, B., Liu, F., Haak, L. L., & Kington, R. (2011). Race, ethnicity, and NIH research awards. *Science*, 333(6045), 1015-1019.
- Louie, V., & Wilson-Ahlstrom, A. (2018). *Moving it forward: The power of mentoring, and how universities can confront institutional barriers facing junior researchers of color*. New York, NY: William T. Grant Foundation.

- Mitchell, K. M., & Martin, J. (2018). Gender bias in student evaluations. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 51(3), 648-652.
- Stanley, C. A. (2006). Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominantly White colleges and universities. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(4), 701-736.
- Whittaker, J. A., Montgomery, B. L., & Acosta, V. G. M. (2015). Retention of underrepresented minority faculty: Strategic initiatives for institutional value proposition based on perspectives from a range of academic institutions. *Journal of Undergraduate Neuroscience Education*, 13(3), A136.
- Zambrana, R. E., Ray, R., Espino M.M., Castro, C., Cohen, B. D., & Eliason, J. (2015). “Don’t leave us behind”: The importance of mentoring for underrepresented minority faculty. *American Educational Research Journal*, 52, 40–72.