

**Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion**  
**University of South Florida**  
**Department of Chemical and Biomedical Engineering**

## **Preamble**

The Tenure and Promotion Committees of the Department of Chemical and Biomedical Engineering (ChBME) at the University of South Florida (USF) follow the USF tenure and promotion guidelines and policies when evaluating faculty tenure and/or promotion cases (see <https://www.usf.edu/provost/faculty/tenure-promotion.aspx>). The following information is intended to help guide faculty in the department regarding the factors that are taken into consideration when evaluating a candidate for tenure and/or promotion. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion within the faculty of the Department are also encouraged to seek out mentors both inside and outside the ChBME department and to discuss their progress towards tenure and/or promotion with the ChBME Department Chair.

This document shall not be construed in any manner so as to conflict with the Laws of the State of Florida, the policies of the State University System Board of Governors, the rules, regulations, and policies of the University of South Florida, the regulations and policies of the University of South Florida College of Engineering, or the UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement.

The Department of Chemical and Biomedical Engineering is not currently a multi-campus unit. If future faculty are hired by the Department at branch campuses we will modify our Tenure and Promotion procedures and documents, including those in these departmental governance documents, to ensure that those faculty are included in matters of Tenure and Promotion and to ensure they have a voice in promotion issues.

We recognize the principles of equity of assignment, resources and opportunities of faculty across a multi-campus university.

**Last Revised: April 30, 2020**

**Approved: May 7, 2020**

## **Introduction**

The Department of Chemical and Biomedical Engineering at the University of South Florida is a research-intensive, nationally-ranked department. We are judged as a department by our peers and other stakeholders based upon many factors, but two particularly important factors are: (1) the research productivity of the department and its faculty and (2) the quality of the preparation of our graduates at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to contribute towards the productivity, national and international reputation and visibility, and ranking of the department. Granting of tenure within the department is a privilege that carries with it enormous responsibility within the department including the continued maintenance of the highest academic standards, continued and increasing levels of scholarly productivity, sustained teaching excellence, and ongoing substantive service to the department, college, university, community, and profession. Likewise, granting of promotion in academic rank to a faculty member is a privilege that recognizes an individual faculty member's continued growth in their academic career and the achievement of increasing levels of accomplishment in research, teaching, and service activities. The following broad guidelines reflect the expected performance requirements for faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure within the department.

## 1. General Criteria and Procedures

- 1.1. The procedures for appointment of the Tenure and/or Promotion Committees within the ChBME department and the rules on voting on tenure and promotion cases are specified in the ChBME Faculty Governance Document.
- 1.2. Evaluation criteria regarding tenure and/or promotion are based upon USF guidelines. Candidates should also familiarize themselves with the University Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, the College of Engineering Tenure and Promotion Procedures, and the relevant sections of the faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement. The guidelines in this document are in addition to those specified in the university guidelines.
- 1.3. Tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty members submit annual reports each year and are given annual evaluations based on their performance with regard to research, teaching, and service. During tenure and/or promotion deliberations, the Department Chair and the relevant tenure and/or promotion committees will carefully consider these annual evaluations, but they are not bound by them since a holistic evaluation of each candidate for tenure and promotion will be conducted.
- 1.4. In accordance with university and college requirements, candidates for tenure and/or promotion are expected to demonstrate excellence in research, excellence in teaching, and substantive service. It is recognized that due to the diverse research, teaching, and service contributions of faculty, the specific criteria for evaluation of a particular faculty member could differ, and each case must be assessed individually. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide convincing evidence of quality in each portion of the tenure and/or promotion portfolio.
- 1.5. An extensive mid-tenure review will be conducted, typically during the third tenure-earning year, for tenure-track faculty. For individuals credited with tenure-earning service at the time of initial appointment, the review will be conducted at the approximate mid-point of the probationary period. The mid-tenure review will be conducted by the department's Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Department Chair, the College Faculty Governance Committee, and the Dean.

All mid-tenure reviews shall address the candidate's performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service occurring during the preceding tenure-earning years. All reviews will utilize the department and college criteria for tenure and promotion and will assess overall performance in light of mid-point expectations.

The materials required for this review will consist of the same types of materials used for tenure review including, but not limited to, a current vita; annual evaluations; student/peer evaluation of teaching; selected examples of teaching materials; documentation of learning outcomes and measures of teaching success; products of research/scholarship/creative activity; service commitments and accomplishments; and a brief self-evaluation by the faculty member.

The mid-tenure review is intended to be informative: to be encouraging to faculty who are making solid progress toward tenure and instructional to faculty who may need to improve in selected areas of performance. Where progress is significantly lacking and apparently unlikely going forward, nonrenewal may result.

## 2. Criteria for Tenure

### 2.1. Research Criteria for Tenure

- 2.1.1. Faculty in the ChBME department are expected to conduct high-quality research and produce scholarly works from that research that are recognized at national and international levels.
- 2.1.2. The candidate for tenure can provide evidence that they can meet these research expectations at the level appropriate to the faculty's rank through the following research products including (but not limited to):
  - a. Publications in peer-reviewed journals
  - b. Publications in peer-reviewed conference proceedings
  - c. Review articles in peer-reviewed journals
  - d. Books, book chapters, and monographs
  - e. Publications in other forms such as non-refereed conference proceedings and published abstracts
  - f. Presentations at national and international conferences
  - g. Invited seminars and talks
  - h. Patents for research-related inventions
  - i. Scientific software, codes, and/or databases
  - j. Scientific instruments
- 2.1.3. Research productivity of a candidate should be consistent with the expectations of faculty members at the same rank at other leading departments in peer institutions who are in the relevant field(s) of research in which the candidate engages and conducts their research work. Research productivity can be demonstrated by a significant number of peer-reviewed journal articles published with a USF address and with the candidate as a senior or corresponding author during their tenure earning years (e.g. an average of 2-3 peer-reviewed publications per year for an Assistant Professor, an average of 5 or more peer-reviewed publications per year for an Associate Professor, and an average of 7 or more peer-reviewed publications for a Full Professor over the tenure-earning time period being considered would be considered typical, thus equating to an approximate minimum of 10 peer reviewed publications for faculty hired at the Assistant Professor level with a tenure earning period of 5 years). To be considered as a high-quality, peer-reviewed journal during evaluations of tenure and/or promotion cases, a peer-reviewed journal must be indexed by ISI (Institute of Science Index) and/or Scopus.
- 2.1.4. A candidate needs to establish a clear record of independent research effort. While collaborations are encouraged, it is expected that a substantial number of publications over the tenure-earning years would result from research efforts led by the candidate and for whom the resulting scholarly products would have the candidate as a principal author, defined as being either first author or the recognized driver of the work (often communicating, senior or last author). It is

expected that a candidate will publish most of their articles in the tenure-earning period with a USF address and with their students and postdocs as co-authors.

- 2.1.5. A candidate may submit evidence of the relevance and importance of published work in the form of citation data, journal impact factors, highlights in the popular press, or other similar such measures and data.
- 2.1.6. The letters of external reviewers provide independent judgements of the quality and importance of a candidate's research and will be carefully considered.
- 2.1.7. A candidate should secure extramural funding at a level sufficient to sustain the candidate's research and should demonstrate the ability of the candidate to continue to sustain their research program at a nationally competitive level into the future. Nationally competitive peer-reviewed research grants as PI or co-PI are expected during the tenure-earning years. At least one such grant should be as PI. Examples of nationally competitive grants are from federal agencies such as NSF, NIH, DOD, DOE, etc.
- 2.1.8. A candidate for tenure should provide evidence of a significant and sustained effort to secure funding through submission of grant proposals.
- 2.1.9. Active dissemination of research results through regular presentations at national and international professional meetings is expected.
- 2.1.10. Invited talks at peer institutions and departments, invited presentations and talks at major conferences, and prizes from professional societies and other organizations recognizing the scholarly work of a candidate bring prestige to the to the candidate, the department, and to the university and will be viewed as an additional demonstration of research productivity and impact.

## **2.2. Teaching Criteria for Tenure**

- 2.2.1. The goal of teaching in the department is to promote students' learning, intellectual development, and career preparation. Towards this goal, candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to achieve excellence in teaching as evidenced by a successful track record of classroom teaching, mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students, and active participation in curricular development and/or innovation in engineering education.
- 2.2.2. All faculty are expected to demonstrate their proficiency in classroom teaching. Materials evaluated may include:
  - a. Course syllabi and samples of instructional materials (e.g. tests, lectures, etc.)
  - b. Numerical student evaluations and narratives of students' comments
  - c. Evidence of student learning outcomes
  - d. Peer evaluations
  - e. Scholarly publications regarding pedagogical advances and research

- f. Teaching awards and other recognitions of teaching accomplishments
  - g. Documentation of innovative teaching methods, and attendance at teaching workshops
  - h. Documentation of incorporating educational research findings in courses taught
- 2.2.3. Generally, a candidate should have taught at the undergraduate level during their tenure earning years and may have had the opportunity to teach at the graduate level as well. These teaching duties will include required courses in the undergraduate curriculum and may involve teaching some of these courses multiple times.
- 2.2.4. A candidate may demonstrate significant teaching accomplishments during their tenure-earning period including:
  - a. Publishing a textbook(s)
  - b. Developing and teaching a new course(s)
  - c. Being awarded a teaching-related, peer-reviewed grant(s)
  - d. Scholarly papers published on teaching and engineering education
- 2.2.5. During the tenure-earning period, the candidate is expected to have acted as the major professor for a number of Ph.D. students commensurate with the rank of the candidate during the tenure-earning period as would be signified by being consistent with an average of Ph.D. students advised and graduated by their peers in similar research fields at their same professorial rank at leading peer departments and institutions. For example, for faculty hired in as an Assistant Professor and who complete their tenure-earning years at that rank, it would be expected that the candidate would advise a minimum of 2 graduate students and have them successfully defend their Ph.D. degrees by the point in time at which tenure would be granted.
- 2.2.6. In addition to supervision of graduate students, candidates are encouraged to have also supervised undergraduate research students and post-doctoral researchers.
- 2.2.7. It is also expected that candidates will have served on the thesis and dissertation committees for graduate students within the department.

### **2.3. Service Criteria for Tenure**

- 2.3.1. The service component of a successful tenure package should be commensurate with the activities and performance expected of the current rank of the candidate. It is expected that all successful tenure packages will have some level of service at the national and/or international level, with the appropriate amount and stature of such service external to the university increasing with rank of the candidate.
- 2.3.2. The types of service activities expected of a candidate for tenure who have completed their tenure-earning years as an Assistant Professor include:

- a. Active performance in departmental committees.
- b. Regular reviews of manuscripts for peer-reviewed journals.
- c. Membership on review panels for grant proposals to external funding agencies.
- d. Service to national and international professional societies in fields relevant to chemical engineering (e.g. American Institute of Chemical Engineers). Types of service appropriate at this level include participation in national level conferences as session chairs and other similar early leadership positions.

2.3.3. The types of service activities expected of a candidate for tenure who have completed their tenure-earning years as an Associate Professor include:

- a. Active performance in departmental, college, and university committees.
- b. Regular reviews of manuscripts for peer-reviewed journals.
- c. Membership on review panels for grant proposals to external funding agencies.
- d. Service to national and international professional societies in fields relevant to chemical engineering (e.g. American Institute of Chemical Engineers). Types of service appropriate at this level are expected to go beyond early leadership roles (e.g. such as participation in national level conferences as session chair) to include roles such as major officer positions and other similar high-level leadership positions within such professional societies.
- e. Membership on journal editorial boards.

2.3.4. The types of service activities expected of a candidate for tenure who have completed their tenure-earning years as a Full Professor include:

- a. Active performance in departmental, college, and university committees.
- b. Regular reviews of manuscripts for peer-reviewed journals.
- c. Membership on review panels for grant proposals to external funding agencies.
- d. Service to national and international professional societies in fields relevant to chemical engineering (e.g. American Institute of Chemical Engineers). Types of service appropriate at this level are expected to go beyond mid-level leadership roles (e.g. such as participation as Area Chairs within Divisions of AIChE) to include roles such as major officer and board positions (e.g. AIChE Division Officer, AIChE Operating Council Member, etc.) and other similar high-level leadership positions within major professional societies in fields related to chemical engineering.
- e. Membership on journal editorial boards and/or holding the position of Chief Editor or the equivalent of such boards.

### **3. Criteria for Promotion**

#### **3.1. Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor**

- 3.1.1. A record of excellence in research, teaching, and service that has led to significant national recognition for the candidate and their work amongst their peers at leading institutions and departments around the country is the overarching requirement for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. This record of excellence should support and predict a further increase in the productivity of the candidate and the impact and recognition of their work in the years ahead.
- 3.1.2. A record of excellence in research and scholarship is signified by a track record of continued research funding through extramural research funding (e.g. externally peer-reviewed grants from federal agencies such as NSF, NIH, DOE, etc. and/or industrial grant funding of work leading to publication of scholarly products), a significant list of invited presentations (e.g. at conferences, other academic departments, etc.), and a strong record of peer-reviewed publications (e.g. an average of at least 2-3 peer-reviewed publications per year as an Assistant Professor with the candidate as a senior or corresponding author would be considered a typical publication record). Patents and commercial licensing of such patents will also be viewed positively in terms of demonstration of research productivity if such patents result from extramurally funded research and the underlying research work leads to other scholarly products. National recognition of the research excellence and scholarship of a candidate for promotion to Associate Professor may be demonstrated through a variety of means including citations of their work, invitations to present at major national scientific meetings and/or national research laboratories or academic departments, funding of peer-reviewed and/or industrial grants, and receipt of awards from journals, professional societies, conferences, industry, and/or other scholarly bodies (e.g. early and mid-career awards for research). Letters from external reviewers who are highly distinguished in the candidate's field(s) of research and who can comment on the importance and impact of the candidate's scholarly work are a critical element to supporting and justifying the award of promotion for a candidate.
- 3.1.3. A record of excellence in teaching can be demonstrated through a variety of means including: student teaching ratings of the candidate on par with the average ratings within the Department and/or College of Engineering, peer evaluations of teaching, data demonstrating that students are achieving learning outcomes of the courses which the candidate has taught, receipt of awards by the candidate for their teaching and/or pedagogical work and innovations, receipt of research awards by undergraduate and graduate students whom the candidate serves as a mentor/advisor for their research, and creation of new courses and/or course products such as textbooks.
- 3.1.4. The candidate should show some reasonable, though perhaps modest, level of initiative to serve their professional community and the university beyond their assigned duties. These initiatives may be demonstrated through, for example, taking leadership roles within the department; taking the role of an Associate Editor and/or Guest Editor in a respected scientific or engineering journal;

organizing regional and/or national meetings and workshops; standing for election in committees in national professional organizations, etc. Service activities that aid in further establishing the national reputation and visibility of the candidate and the Department are particularly encouraged at this level. One example that is common for candidates being promoted to Associate Professor within the Department is that they will have served as session chairs or in similar positions of leadership within AIChE at this point in their careers (or other similar organizations which have significant involvement by faculty from the chemical engineering community). Community engagement may also be considered.

### **3.2. Standards for Promotion to Full Professor**

- 3.2.1. A record of sustained excellence in research, teaching, and service that has led to significant national and international recognition for the candidate and their work amongst their peers at leading institutions and departments around the world is the overarching requirement for promotion to the rank of Full Professor.
- 3.2.2. A record of sustained excellence in research and scholarship is signified by a track record of continued research funding through extramural research funding (e.g. externally peer-reviewed grants from federal agencies such as NSF, NIH, DOE, etc. and/or industrial grant funding of work leading to publication of scholarly products), a significant list of invited presentations (e.g. at conferences, other academic departments, etc.) and keynote/plenary presentations (or their equivalent), and a strong record of peer-reviewed publications (e.g. an average of at least 5-6 peer-reviewed publications with the candidate as a senior or corresponding author per year as an Associate Professor would be considered a typical publication record). Patents and commercial licensing of such patents will also be viewed positively in terms of demonstration of research productivity if such patents result from extramurally funded research the underlying research work leads to other scholarly products. National and international recognition of the research excellence and scholarship of a candidate for promotion to Full Professor may be demonstrated through a variety of means including citations of their work, invitations to present at major national and international scientific meetings and/or research laboratories and academic departments around the world, continued funding of peer-reviewed and/or industrial grants, and receipt of major awards from journals, professional societies, conferences, industry, and/or other scholarly bodies (e.g. significant mid-career level awards for research from national and international organizations, being recognized as a Fellow of professional societies such as AIChE, ACS, AAAS, etc.). Letters from external reviewers who are highly distinguished in the candidate's field(s) of research and who can comment on the importance and impact of the candidate's scholarly work are a critical element to supporting and justifying the award of promotion for a candidate.
- 3.2.3. A record of excellence in teaching can be demonstrated through a variety of means including: student teaching ratings of the candidate on par with the average ratings within the Department and/or College of Engineering, peer evaluations of teaching, data demonstrating that students are achieving learning outcomes of the courses

which the candidate has taught, receipt of awards by the candidate for their teaching and/or pedagogical work and innovations, receipt of research awards by undergraduate and graduate students whom the candidate serves as a mentor/advisor for their research, and creation of new courses and/or course products such as textbooks.

- 3.2.4. The candidate should show a significant level of initiative to serve their professional community and the university beyond their assigned duties. These initiatives may be demonstrated through, for example, volunteering for committee assignments and substantial involvement in committees beyond what is considered regular faculty participation; taking leadership roles at the department, college or university levels; taking the role of an Editor or Associate Editor in one or more respected scientific or engineering journals; organizing international meetings and workshops; standing for election in high-level committees and leadership positions within major professional organizations, etc. One example that is common for candidates being promoted to Full Professor within the department is that they will have served as a Division Officer or similar position of major leadership within AIChE at this point in their careers (or other similar organizations which have significant involvement by faculty from the chemical engineering community). Community engagement may also be considered.

### **3.3. Standards for Promotion to Instructor II**

- 3.3.1. To qualify for promotion to Instructor II, a non-tenure track Instructor I is generally expected to have 5 or more years of experience as a Level I Instructor. Earlier eligibility may be considered for exceptional candidates, but a minimum of 3 years of experience as a Level I Instructor is required. Exceptional candidates for early promotion will be identified through excellence and efforts that rise well above the normal assigned responsibilities of the candidate and which positively impact the department, its students, the broader student community within the College of Engineering and the University of South Florida, and/or the profession of engineering and engineering education. After the appropriate period of service, Instructors may apply to the department to be considered for a promotion on the basis of meritorious performance.
- 3.3.2. In evaluating a candidate for promotion from Instructor I to Instructor II, the departmental Promotion Committee for the candidate will consider and rate all portions of the candidates assigned duties which, as averaged over the years of service being considered while in the Instructor I rank, constitute more than 10% of their total assigned duties during the evaluation period (i.e. for duties which have an average FTE greater than or equal to 0.10). The scale used in rating performance in each of the areas of assigned duties considered will use 5 ratings which (in order of decreasing ranking) are: Outstanding, Strong, Satisfactory, Fair, and Weak. In addition to review of annual evaluations in making decisions about the overall rating assigned to an assigned duty area, a comprehensive review of evidence provided by the candidate that demonstrates their performance in the assigned duty areas which exceed 10% of their effort

over the time period being evaluated shall be conducted to assess the individual's holistic contributions to the department.

- 3.3.3. Excellence in the principal assigned duty for the Instructor applying for promotion is required. The candidate must earn an overall and holistic rating of "Outstanding" in that principal assigned duty. Such excellence can be demonstrated by (and the associated rating informed from) various information supplied by the candidate, but this evaluation should be in concert with (though not solely determined by) the last five years of annual evaluations (or total number of yearly evaluations available if being considered early). If an individual has equal primary FTE assignments over the time period being considered, one must be designated as the primary area and ratings assigned accordingly. That is, the primary assigned duty area must be evaluated overall as "Outstanding."
- 3.3.4. An overall rating of "Strong" is required on any additional areas of assigned duties that average more than 0.10 FTE during the last five years of annual evaluations (or total number available if being considered early).

#### **3.4. Standards for Promotion to Instructor III**

- 3.4.1. To qualify for promotion to Instructor III, a non-tenure track Instructor II is generally expected to have 5 or more years of experience as a Level II Instructor. Earlier eligibility may be considered for exceptional candidates, but a minimum of 3 years of experience as a Level II Instructor is required. It is expected that for an Instructor II to be promoted to Instructor III that the individual will have achieved significant efforts and accomplishments in areas relevant to their assigned duties or which otherwise contribute to the mission of the department, college, and/or university. Examples of such accomplishments that recognize excellence in the candidate's efforts include, but are not limited to, receiving awards concerning their relevant efforts, publishing material in professional outlets (especially when receiving positive external attention), and developing innovations that have had a demonstrably positive effect in promoting the mission of the university. Exceptional candidates for early promotion will be identified through excellence and efforts that rise well above the normal assigned responsibilities of the candidate and which positively impact the department, its students, the broader student community within the College of Engineering and the University of South Florida, and/or the profession of engineering and engineering education. After the appropriate period of service, candidates at the rank of Instructor II may apply to the department to be considered for a promotion on the basis of meritorious performance.
- 3.4.2. In evaluating a candidate for promotion from Instructor II to Instructor III, the departmental Promotion Committee for the candidate will consider and rate all portions of the candidates assigned duties which, as averaged over the years of service being considered while in the Instructor II rank, constitute more than 10% of their total assigned duties during the evaluation period (i.e. for duties which have an average FTE greater than or equal to 0.10). The scale used in rating performance in each of the areas of assigned duties considered will use 5

ratings which (in order of decreasing ranking) are: Outstanding, Strong, Satisfactory, Fair, and Weak. In addition to review of annual evaluations in making decisions about the overall rating assigned to an assigned duty area, a comprehensive review of evidence provided by the candidate that demonstrates their performance in the assigned duty areas which exceed 10% of their effort over the time period being evaluated shall be conducted to assess the individual's holistic contributions to the department

- 3.4.3. Excellence in the principal assigned duty for the Instructor applying for promotion is required. The candidate must earn an overall and holistic rating of "Outstanding" in that principal assigned duty. Such excellence can be demonstrated by (and the associated rating informed from) various information supplied by the candidate, but this evaluation should be in concert with (though not solely determined by) the last five years of annual evaluations (or total number of yearly evaluations available if being considered early). If an individual has equal primary FTE assignments over the time period being considered, one must be designated as the primary area and ratings assigned accordingly. That is, the primary assigned duty area must be evaluated overall as "Outstanding."
- 3.4.4. An overall rating of "Strong" is required on any additional areas of assigned duties that average more than 0.10 FTE during the last five years of annual evaluations (or total number available if being considered early).

#### 4. Amendments

Any faculty member may propose amendments to these departmental Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion. A proposed amendment must be submitted in writing to the Department Chair and the Bylaws Committee Chair for further consideration. The Bylaws Committee will then present the proposed amendment, an analysis of the impact of the proposed amendment, and any recommendations for amendment of the proposed amendment to the faculty at a faculty meeting along with a recommendation on whether to accept or reject the amendment. This review of the proposed amendment and its presentation to the faculty at a faculty meeting by the Bylaws Committee must be completed within 8 weeks of the original submission of the proposed amendment to the Department Chair and the Bylaws Committee Chair, unless that 8 week period ends outside of the normal Fall and Spring academic semesters, in which case it must be completed within the first 4 weeks of the next available Fall or Spring academic semester. Once presented to the faculty at a faculty meeting, a vote on the amendment will be taken at the next faculty meeting which occurs at least one week later than the meeting at which it was presented by the Bylaws Committee. The vote should be by secret written ballot. A 2/3 vote of all voting faculty members is necessary to pass such amendments. Faculty not in residence may submit their votes via mail or other equivalent means.

#### Revision History

DATE	DESCRIPTION
Feb. 10, 2016	First version of the document was created and approved by the faculty.
Apr. 27, 2020	First revision of the document created and submitted to Bylaws Committee.
Apr. 30, 2020	New revision of document created and submitted to Bylaws Committee.
May 1, 2020	Revised document submitted to ChBME faculty for review
May 7, 2020	Revised document approved by departmental faculty