

**GUIDELINES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION**  
**College of Behavioral & Community Sciences**  
**University of South Florida**

The purpose of this document is to describe the College of Behavioral & Community Sciences' (CBCS) principles and guidelines for the tenure and promotion process to be consistent with the Board of Trustees regulations USF10.105 and USF10.106, USF System policy 10.116, and the Collective Bargaining Agreement and to fulfill the intent of furthering the mission of the University. Thus, these guidelines are designed to support high academic standards in awarding promotion and tenure and to ensure a comprehensive, rigorous, and fair review of the candidate. Criteria for tenure and promotion that specify documented and measurable performance outcomes shall be developed and maintained by individual departments/schools within the College.

**I. COLLEGE OF BEHAVIORAL & COMMUNITY SCIENCES CRITERIA**

Tenure and promotion in the professorial ranks will be granted only to persons who demonstrate excellence in academic and scholarly achievement. Performance is evaluated specifically in the areas of teaching and learning, research/scholarly activity, and service.

The departments and schools of CBCS shall define criteria for tenure and promotion according to the standards of their respective fields and disciplines, with specific expectations for types and levels of achievement and how they will be measured and documented. Departments and schools in CBCS may specify more stringent standards than those articulated herein but may not specify less stringent standards. The standards/guidelines of departments and schools must appear in a document that is readily available in print, in electronic media, and on the web to all members of the department/school.

**A. Tenure**

**1. Expectations of tenured faculty**

In order for the University to perform its functions effectively, it is essential that faculty members be 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 department/school, 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 collegial citizenship.

## 2. Evaluation for Tenure

The faculty member's record must be evaluated commensurate with their assigned duties. Tenure-earning faculty should be given assignments that allow them to demonstrate accomplishments necessary for tenure.

Evaluation for tenure involves three components appropriate to the departments and schools in the college:

- a) Teaching or comparable activity (including advising and mentoring);
- b) Research/scholarly work;
- c) Service to the University, the profession, and the community.

The minimum criteria for tenure in CBCS are a display of **excellence** in both teaching and research and at least a **substantive contribution** to service. In addition, collegiality and participation as a citizen of the University are integral parts of faculty performance. 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.

Each recommendation for tenure should be accompanied by a statement of the mission, goals, and educational needs of the department or school and college as well as 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 university. Careful consideration must be given to the candidate's ability and willingness to work cooperatively within the department or school and the college.

### 2 a. Teaching

The first component in the tenure decision process is an evaluation of effectiveness in teaching or comparable instructional activity appropriate for the unit. Each candidate must present a record of effective, high quality teaching, as specified by the relevant

academic unit, that clearly reveals that the candidate is capable of sustaining a first-rate teaching program during his or her career. 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.

Effective teaching – i.e., teaching that results in learning for those taught – 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 an inspiring role model for students. To qualify for tenure, faculty members must have a consistent or steadily improving pattern of positive evaluation in teaching. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure that teaching activities are evaluated and documented and that the results be made available for review committees. Teaching performance is best judged by a comprehensive review of the teaching dossier, and it is essential that the Chair/Director and Dean also conduct an appropriate and independent evaluative review.

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

Evaluation of teaching must take into consideration several elements: an academic unit's instructional mission; an instructor's assignment of duties within 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 impact of student learning on practice, application, and policy.

## **2 b. Research/Scholarly Work**

Scholarship takes many forms, including independently conducted as well as collaboratively-generated research and scholarly projects, contributions to new knowledge, community improvement, and consensus-driven or evidence-based practice. These activities in the many different disciplines in CBCS range from research (creation and attainment of new knowledge, whether basic or applied) to the development/implementation of community-engagement activities/programs and improved standards of practice. The purpose of research and scholarly work is the substantive advancement of a field of inquiry or practice, whether by the generation of new knowledge and technologies or consensus-driven and evidence-based practices within the discipline. The record of activities leading to tenure and promotion must provide evidence of excellence in one or more of these forms.

In order to attain tenure, a faculty member is expected to have established an original, coherent, and meaningful program of research and/or scholarship, even when working in a collaborative team, and to have demonstrated and clearly documented a continuous and progressive record of research and scholarship indicative of potential for sustained contribution and distinction throughout her or his career.

The peer review process is the best means of judging quality and impact of the candidate's research and scholarship. Evaluation at both the department/school and college level should include an assessment of the quality of the candidate's work and consider discipline-appropriate evidence of the significance of research and scholarly activity as well as the candidate's assignment of duties within the department/school. A candidate may present the following kinds of documentation of a significant research program: reviews of books and articles; records of competitive honors and awards, grants, and fellowships; reviews of grant applications; citations of the candidate's work; 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.

Like teaching portfolios, the type of documentation will vary among fields, units, and individuals. Candidates should not be expected to provide forms of documentation that are not typical in their disciplines. Where appropriate, consideration will be given to external peer recognition, as demonstrated by a record of funded research, and to the demonstrable impact of research through inventions, development and commercialization of intellectual property, and

technology transfer. 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 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 be found in a wide 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 as well as international/global scholarship may be demonstrated by peer reviewed publications as well as by high-profile products such as publications/reports/formal presentations to local, national, or international agencies, or other products as designated by the department/school. For collaborative and co-authored scholarship, the evaluation should include consideration of the candidate's role and contribution to the work, consistent with standards of disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary scholarly practice.

The body of work of a candidate for tenure must be judged against the appropriate national and/or international standards within the area of research and scholarly activities, balancing the significance and quality of contributions 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 scholarly distinction and prospects for continuing and meaningful contributions.

## **2 c. Service**

The third component to be evaluated includes the categories of service to the University (which could be at the level of department/school, college, or 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, such as service on the USF Faculty Senate and Councils, as well as a wide range of academic committees, should go beyond a simple enumeration 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

department or school guidelines will include an examination of the nature and degree of engagement within the University and in the local, regional, national and global communities.

Service, as such, is differentiated from engagement with communities and external organizations undertaken in support of teaching or of research/scholarly work, the latter generally termed community-engaged scholarship. 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,] or global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.” 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.” But community engagement that is undertaken by faculty to “enhance curriculum, teaching and learning and prepare educated, engaged citizens” may also be included and evaluated as part of teaching. Community engagement undertaken to “enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity” may also be included and evaluated as part of a research/scholarly faculty assignment.

## **B. Promotion**

### **1. Evaluation for Promotion**

As is the case with tenure, the judgment of readiness for promotion to higher academic rank is based upon a careful evaluation of a candidate's contributions in teaching (or comparable activity appropriate to the unit), research/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 or school criteria for promotion that have been made available to candidates. Promotion also requires collegiality and participation as a productive citizen of the University, and because this is an integral part of faculty performance, this area is also evaluated with reference to written criteria.

### **2. Standards for Promotion**

General standards for consideration of promotion to the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor are as follows. In each category, a candidate's achievements are evaluated in relation to criteria specified by the department/school for the rank sought as well as the candidate's assignment of duties within the unit.

#### **Associate Professor**

- i. A record of excellence in teaching or other comparable activity appropriate for the unit, including, where applicable, a record of participation on thesis and/or dissertation committees, and successful direction of the work of master's and doctoral candidates.

- ii. A record of excellence in independent and/or collaborative research/scholarly work, supported by substantial, high impact, and sustained publications or their equivalent. Categories, criteria, and types of evidence for research/scholarly work may vary across departments/schools. Evaluation of applied research should consider potential or actual impact on policies and practices. The record should be sufficient to predict, with a high degree of confidence, continuing productivity in research/scholarly work throughout the individual's career, as defined in the individual's field.
- iii. A record of substantive contribution of service to the University, profession, and/or public.
- iv. For faculty on tenure-track appointments, advancement to the Associate level is made simultaneously with granting of tenure.

### **Professor**

- i. A record of sustained excellence in teaching or other comparable activity appropriate for the unit, including, where applicable, a record of participation on thesis and/or dissertation committees, and as major professor for undergraduate research/theses and/or master's and doctoral candidates.
- ii. A record of excellence in research/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/scholarly work may vary across departments/schools. Evaluation of applied research should consider potential or actual impact on policies and practices. The record should predict continuing high productivity in research/scholarly work throughout the individual's career, as defined in the individual's field.
- iii. 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/school, college and/or university. Expectations about the level of meaningful service contributions for candidates for Professor are significantly higher than those for attaining the Associate rank.
- iv. 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.

## **II. TIMING OF TENURE AND PROMOTION APPLICATIONS**

### **A. Probationary period**

Application for tenure in the College of Behavioral & Community Sciences will

typically be initiated by faculty early in the sixth year (or equivalent, when adjustments or exceptions to the standard have been made), reflecting effectively a five-year probationary period of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. Expectations of progress within normal time frames will be reflected in established annual and comprehensive review processes.

**B. Timing of applications**

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

**C. Exceptions to the standard probationary period**

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 Department Chair/School Director, Dean, and Provost. Ordinarily, extensions of more than two years beyond the college's designated probationary period will not be permitted.

**D. Tenure upon initial appointment**

In rare circumstances, tenure may be awarded upon initial appointment. In determining such an award, the guiding principle will be to follow department/school and college procedures in an expedited process that will not inordinately delay hiring decisions. Specifically, there must be a review of tenure eligibility at all levels with a recommendation forwarded to the Provost. Approval must be obtained from the Office of the Provost prior to making an offer that includes tenure without a probationary period. In support of recommendations for tenure upon initial appointment, the Provost will receive the following information:

- Written statement(s) of review of tenure eligibility at all levels (Dean, Chair/Director, department/school faculty), and rigorous reviews must occur prior to a request to the Provost to make such an offer;
- Candidate's vita;



- 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;
- Compelling statement on the unique achievements of the faculty member that support 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 appointments accompanied by academic appointments with tenure will interview with the academic unit in which tenure would be considered as well as the CBCS Dean (as is the case in all interviews for tenure-line positions). The appropriate department/school faculty bodies and administrators will make recommendations on tenure to the Provost.

### **III. REVIEWS**

#### **A. Review of progress toward tenure**

It is the responsibility of the department chair/school director 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-level criteria for tenure that have been made available to candidates. The mid-point review will be conducted by the department/school's tenure and promotion (or appointment, promotion, and tenure) committee, the department chair/school director or other appropriate administrator, the college tenure and promotion committee, and the CBCS Dean. A summary review of progress toward tenure will be forwarded to the Provost.

All mid-point reviews shall address the performance of annual assignments including teaching, research/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 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.

**B. Review of progress toward promotion**

The decision to apply for promotion from Associate Professor to full Professor is optional. Those who elect to seek this promotion will ordinarily undergo a mid-point progress review. At approximately the mid-point of the typical interval between appointment to the Associate Professor and promotion to Professor for faculty (unless a faculty member defers), the mid-point review will occur typically during the third or fourth year while at the rank of Associate Professor at USF. Faculty members will ordinarily be given a more comprehensive review of progress toward promotion, to include participation by the relevant tenure and promotion committees. A review at this stage is intended to be informative, encouraging to faculty who are making solid progress toward promotion, and instructional to faculty who may need to improve in selected areas of performance.

**C. Process for Initiating Process for Promotion to Professor**

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to inform the department chair/school director that they want to apply for promotion. Faculty who are considering applying for promotion to Professor should initiate the process by first consulting with the department chair/school director to discuss the candidate's readiness for promotion. This discussion will be based on a review of the faculty member's C.V., mid-promotion review (if available), annual evaluations, and other relevant information. If the faculty member decides to continue with the process, he or she will proceed with the application process as described in these guidelines.

**D. External letters for tenure and promotion applications**

The department chair/school director 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 of these will hold senior tenured appointments and/or will hold appointments at [AAU institutions](#), [USF national peer institutions](#), and [USF aspirational peer institutions](#). The candidate and the department chair/school director will suggest external reviewers. The department/school Tenure and Promotion Committee may also suggest external reviewers. These reviewers should have no significant relationship to the candidate (e.g., major professor, co-author, or other close associates), unless there are mitigating circumstances that would indicate otherwise (e.g., to review scholarship so specialized that few expert reviewers exist). The chair/director and the candidate will jointly select the reviewers. 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 commencement of review by the department/school Tenure and Promotion Committee.

In the interest of improving the level of candor in external reviews, units may adopt procedures to protect reviewers' privacy while at the same time ensuring a candidate's access to the substance of judgments of their work by third parties. Thus, reviewers may be advised that their names and other identifying information will be held confidentially and that candidates will have access only to the narrative content of their review letters.

## **E. Review Process for Tenure and/or Promotion at the Time of Application**

### **1. Department/School Level Review**

At the department/school level, full-time faculty will determine the role of the department/school review committee in developing recommendations for tenure and promotion. Procedures will be specified in the department/school Tenure and Promotion Guidelines and Criteria.

#### **a. Identification of Candidates**

At the beginning of each calendar year (January), chairs/directors will begin the process for tenure and promotion by announcing to the faculty the timeline and schedule for the submission of application packages and requesting all potential candidates to consult with the chair/director. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to notify the department chair/school director that the mid-tenure, tenure, or promotion processes should be initiated.

Applications for promotion and tenure shall be initiated by the candidates during the spring term preceding the tenure and promotion process that occurs the following fall term. Chairs/Directors should ensure that candidates have received current Department/School, College, and University Guidelines and the BOR-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement. Chairs/Directors should inform candidates of the materials they will be expected to provide in support of their application. Current application forms are made available by the Provost's Office in July, preceding the Fall Term submission. Dates in this document for all procedural steps are approximate and will be established by the dean's office on an annual basis.

#### **b. Tenure and Promotion Packet**

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure that his/her packet is complete, accurate, and contains all of the pertinent information and forms

(including the [CBCS summary of peer-reviewed publications](#) form). The responsibility for assisting faculty in preparing their Tenure and Promotion applications is at the department chair/school director level. The following guidelines should be used by faculty in preparing tenure and promotion applications:

1. In general, items/accomplishments should be entered in only one category, either teaching or research or service. In some instances, items may be included in two or more sections. In these circumstances, justification must be provided.
2. Articles in press should not be included in the counting of publications but should be separately stated as “in press,” e.g., Dr. Smith published 35 articles and has 5 additional articles in press. Articles that are advanced online publications count as published articles and not as “in press” articles.
3. If reporting instructional activities that are outside the typical university classroom evaluation structure (e.g., guest lecturer in other classes/departments, professional training activities), applicants need to provide documentation that these activities occurred, and where possible, evaluative feedback, and/or outcomes or influence of these activities.
4. Activities included in the section on innovative teaching practices should include a description indicating how this practice is truly innovative in the field—not just a new practice for the individual or the department.
5. In general, applications are evaluated based on assigned faculty duties. However, in some cases, the assigned duties may not align with the actual activity. In these cases, the Department Chair/School Director should include an explanation in Item III of the application packet (page 4) to describe the difference in assigned faculty duties for purposes of the tenure and/or promotion consideration and those reported in the Assigned Duties chart in the application. For example, training grants may be submitted in the teaching category even though the grants are reported as research for purposes of Assigned Faculty Duties.
6. Faculty members are responsible for completing and including the CBCS summary of peer-reviewed publications that may be found on the [CBCS Tenure and Promotion website](#).
7. Faculty members should make their strongest case for tenure and promotion; however, faculty should refrain from inappropriate self-congratulatory comments.

**c. Submission of Completed Tenure and Promotion Packet**

At the beginning of the Fall semester, candidates should submit a completed Tenure and Promotion Packet to their chair/director, including a letter from the immediate supervisor if the faculty member does not report directly to the

chair/director. When applying for tenure and/or promotion, candidates shall submit documentation of all information encompassing their professional activities which they believe supports the application. The chair/director will then add any required information relevant to the candidate's teaching and research portfolio. This information should be inserted into the application packet by early September. It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that the application packet is complete and accurate prior to its initial review by the department/school's tenured faculty. The candidate may add or update information in the packet at any time prior to the onset of the final review by the Provost's office on promotion or tenure in the Amendment Section of the application.

**d. Evaluation by Tenured Faculty of the Candidate's Department/School**

Departmental/School recommendation for or against tenure is the prerogative of the tenured faculty. Typically, three distinct recommendations for or against tenure should be made by each department. The first will be by a vote of all the tenured members of a department (with the exception of the chair/director), the second by the department/school's Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the third by the chair/director of the department/school. The vote of the department/school's T&P committee may precede the vote of the tenured faculty as a whole; the order in which these votes will occur must be specified in the department/school's governance document. In some cases, the tenured faculty as a whole may comprise the department/school tenure and promotion committee.

For applications in which the candidate is seeking promotion only, a ballot of the tenured faculty as a whole is not conducted.

For tenure candidates, the Chair/Director (or designee) shall conduct a vote by secret ballot of all tenured faculty in the department/school. Tenured faculty should be allowed a two week period to review the candidate's completed packet. All members of the tenured faculty who are eligible to vote (including the chair/director, if eligible) may participate in the secret ballot even if they have been selected to serve on the department/school and/or college Tenure and Promotion Committees. The results of the tenured faculty vote shall be included in the tenure application packet.

**e. Review by Department/School Tenure & Promotion Committee**

The department/school will create a Tenure and Promotion (T&P) Committee. The procedures for selecting members of this committee and conducting these meetings shall be specified in the department's/school's governance document. The purpose of this committee is to review applications for tenure and/or

promotion and to provide faculty recommendations to the chair/director on each application. The department/school's T&P Committee shall review and evaluate each application packet for promotion and/or tenure in accordance with the department/school criteria.

Committee members at the department/school level will confine themselves to making decisions solely upon the information provided in each candidate's official tenure and promotion file or other publicly available data. No committee member shall solicit or consider any additional information conveyed privately, through personal contact, by phone, letter, email, or other means. The entire committee may vote by a two-thirds majority to authorize the Committee Chair to solicit additional information if necessary. All requests for additional information must be in writing by the Committee Chair who will provide the candidate, the chair/director of the candidate's department/school, and the Dean with copies of the request.

Per the Collective Bargaining Agreement (2014 – 2017), if any material is added to the file after the commencement of consideration, other than the completion of the evaluation sections (including the recording of votes) of the file by the reviewing bodies/individuals, a copy shall be sent to the faculty employee within five (5) days (by personal delivery or by mail, return receipt requested). The faculty employee may attach a brief response within five (5) days of his/her receipt of the added material. The file shall not be forwarded until either the faculty employee submits a response or until the second five (5) day period expires, whichever occurs first. The faculty employee shall have the right to review the file at each stage of review (i.e., department, college) and attach a brief response to any materials, including the evaluation section(s), contained therein prior to the next stage of review. The only documents which may be considered in making a recommendation are those contained or referenced in the file.

The committee members will vote on promotion and/or tenure for each candidate application by secret ballot. A brief written evaluation and the results of the votes will be recorded as a part of the candidate's application and forwarded to the candidate's chair/director. Where a split evaluation exists, a minority report may accompany the majority recommendation.

The Chair of the T&P Committee at the department/school level shall be responsible for the following: (1) writing the evaluation of the majority opinion of the Departmental T&P Committee; (2) entering the vote of the committee and other required information into the tenure/promotion application; and, (3) signing the application on behalf of the committee. As per University guidelines, individuals serving on more than one committee (i.e., at the department/school or college level) should vote at the department/school level on candidates from

their home unit but not on these candidates at the college committee level.

If a faculty member has a special personal relationship with a candidate (for example, but not limited to, a related person as defined in [USF Policy 0-309](#), a relationship as described in [USF Policy 1-022](#), or other potential conflict of interest), that committee member will leave the room during all deliberations concerning the candidate and will abstain from making a recommendation concerning that candidate. Conversely, if a faculty member has a significant professional association with the candidate, that committee member may participate in the dialogue since they may be useful in educating the committee about the structure of the candidate's field. However, they must abstain from voting unless there are mitigating circumstances that would indicate otherwise. In such cases, the T&P Committee Chair should consult with the chair/director who should consult with the Dean's Office to make a final determination about participation.

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion may request a meeting with the department/school committee to discuss the application prior to the committee's evaluation of the packet. The purpose of this meeting is solely to inform the committee of the candidate's scholarly activities and future directions in teaching/training, research, and service. No evaluative feedback will be given to the candidate. This meeting is optional. The review and evaluation by department's T&P committee and the tenured faculty must occur by the [timeline published annually by the Dean's Office](#).

Review by the Department Chair/School Director. The chair/director shall review the application for tenure and/or promotion of each candidate, the vote of the eligible faculty, and the recommendations of the department/school committee. The chair/director will then add an evaluative letter and indicate his/her recommendation for tenure and/or promotion in the candidate's application packet. This letter must be added to the packet by the [timeline published annually by the Dean's Office](#).

The candidate shall have the right to review the file following the departmental review and attach a brief response to any materials contained therein, including the evaluation sections(s) prior to the next stage of review.

## **2. College-Level Review**

### **a. CBCS Tenure and Promotion Committee**

The CBCS will constitute a college-level Tenure and Promotion (T&P) Committee. The procedures for selecting members of this committee shall be specified in the CBCS governance document. The purpose of this committee is to review applications for tenure and/or promotion and to provide faculty advice to the Dean on each application. A representative of the Dean's office may convene the first meeting to

discuss the relevant rules, guidelines, and procedures with the committee and will provide the committee members copies of all documents pertinent to their reviews.

If a college T&P committee member is from the same department as a candidate for tenure and/or promotion, or if a member has a special personal relationship (for example, but not limited to, [USF Policy 1-022](#)) with a candidate, that committee member will leave the room during all deliberations concerning the candidate and will abstain from making a recommendation concerning that candidate. Conversely, if a faculty member has a significant professional association with the candidate, that committee member may participate in the dialogue but should abstain from voting unless there are mitigating circumstances that would indicate otherwise. In such cases, the T&P Committee Chair should consult with the Dean's Office to make a final determination on participation.

Evaluations of candidates for promotion to Full Professor must be reviewed by a committee containing at least three Full Professors. Prior to the initial meeting of the T&P Committee, the Associate Dean, in consultation with the Chair of the Faculty Council, should determine whether any temporary (*pro tempore*) members must be identified for the consideration of specific candidates during the evaluative process. The Chair of the College T&P Committee, in consultation with the Associate Dean, will be responsible for ensuring that the committee is appropriately constituted.

#### **b. College Committee Review Process**

In the tenure and promotion process, the reviewers should review and be thoroughly familiar with the documents offered to support the applications. Candidates and responsible departmental representatives should supply the committee members and the Dean with complete, clear, and accurate information.

After each member of the College's T&P Committee has reviewed the candidate's credentials, the Committee will meet to prepare its recommendations to the Dean. The Committee's deliberations will focus exclusively on how well a candidate meets department/school criteria for tenure and promotion. The Committee must not apply standards that are lower than or different than those specified in the department/school's criteria.

T&P Committee members shall confine themselves to making decisions solely upon the information provided in each candidate's official tenure and promotion file or other publicly available data. No committee member shall solicit or consider any additional information conveyed privately, through personal contact, by phone, letter, or any other means. The entire committee may vote by a two-thirds majority to authorize the T&P Committee Chair to solicit additional information, if necessary. All requests for additional information must be made in writing by the T&P Committee Chair, who will provide the candidate, the chair/director of the



candidate's department/school, and the Dean with copies of the request.

Voting on a candidate by the College T&P Committee will be by secret ballot. These ballots shall be preserved in the Office of the Dean for a minimum of one year. The committee's vote and a clear, substantive summary of the strengths and weaknesses consistent with the committee's vote must be included in the candidate's file. Where a split evaluation exists, a minority report may accompany the majority recommendation. The Chair, or designate in cases of a conflict, of the T&P Committee must sign the recommendation forms for each candidate.

In total, the Chair of the College T&P Committee shall be responsible for the following: (1) ensuring that materials being reviewed are securely held during the review process; (2) reviewing the requirement that all discussion and written narrative materials be held in confidence within the group; (3) writing (or delegating the writing to a committee member endorsed by the committee membership) the evaluation of the majority (and, if deemed appropriate, minority) opinion of the committee; (4) ensuring the accuracy of the written narrative; (5) entering the vote of the committee and other required information into the tenure/promotion application; (6) signing the application on behalf of the committee; and (6) delivering the ballots to the Associate Dean immediately following the deliberations.

The employee shall have the right to review the file following the College T&P Committee review and attach a brief response to any materials contained therein, including the evaluation sections(s) prior to the next stage of review.

### **3. Review by the Dean of the College**

After the recommendations of the College T&P Committee are final, they will be forwarded to the Dean. The Dean shall review the application for tenure and/or promotion of each candidate, the recommendations of the department/school and college committees, the recommendations of the chair/director, the results of the external review, and the vote of the eligible faculty. The Dean shall then complete the appropriate sections of the Tenure and Promotion Application Form. The Dean's recommendation shall focus exclusively on how well the candidate meets both the department/school and college criteria for tenure and promotion. The Dean's review must include justification for the Dean's recommendation. The Dean's review must be completed in time to provide the candidate with ten working days to review the recommendation and written evaluation prior to submission of the application to the Provost's Office.

The Associate Dean will inform the candidate when the Dean's evaluation is complete and will provide them with a copy of the evaluative materials associated with their application (i.e., the department/school faculty vote, the reviews by the committees, chair/director and Dean) for their review. The faculty member may request a meeting

with the Dean to discuss the recommendation and supporting materials within ten days following the completion of the Dean's review.

Unless the candidate withdraws the application, the recommendations of the department/school committee, chair/director, the College T&P Committee, and the Dean will be forwarded to the Provost. The application must be submitted to the Provost's Office by a date that will be promulgated annually, typically the first week of the spring semester.

#### **IV. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

When establishing Tenure and Promotion Committees at the department/school and college level, whenever possible and practical, the following criteria should be followed:

1. Membership on committees should be limited to faculty members who have been appointed within the unit for at least two years;
2. Committees considering candidates for promotion to Professor will comprise individuals holding the rank of Professor. If the unit lacks a sufficient number, the Chair/Director and/or Dean may appoint one or more qualified Professors from other units;
3. All committee discussions regarding the tenure or promotion application must be confidential. Violation of confidentiality will be considered a breach of the integrity of the process and will be treated as misconduct.
4. Only tenured faculty will be eligible to review and make recommendations on tenure applications;
5. Review of applications from faculty with joint appointments should reflect appropriate participation by the units to which faculty have been appointed. Thus, chairs/directors/Deans from secondary units should have proportional input on review and recommendations, and committees reviewing applications from faculty with joint appointments should have equitable representation from respective units based on the distribution of assignment. The application will be evaluated based on the department/school criteria designated as the tenure home for the faculty member.
6. Chairs/directors and Deans should neither vote nor participate on any tenure and promotion committee. This exclusion applies to Assistant/Associate Deans, Deans or other out-of-unit administrators when they participate in the tenure and promotion process in support of or as delegated by Chairs, Directors or Deans;
7. Terms of committee members should be staggered and ordinarily should not exceed three years;

8. Turnover of committee membership should be encouraged through restrictions on consecutive terms, if feasible;
9. Individuals serving on more than one advisory committee (e.g., department, school, or college) should vote at the department/school level on candidates from their home unit but not on these candidates at other committee levels;
10. All members of tenure and promotion committees are expected to review the application files prior to discussion or voting. Procedures to ensure participation by all committee members (or, as needed, alternates) in the process must be followed at all levels of review. Following a vote by secret ballot, the ballots are counted immediately in the presence of committee members and the tally is recorded.

### **Approval History**

- Approved by vote of CBCS tenure-line faculty, April 8, 2015
- Approved by Dean, April 9, 2015
- Approved by Vice Provost Kofi Glover, July 7<sup>th</sup>, 2015 with the effective implementation date of July 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016.