

### **Clarifications of Tenure and Promotion Process Guidelines in CBCS**

1. Faculty should consult with their department chair/director when preparing their tenure, promotion, or mid-tenure documents.
2. External reviewers are required for tenure and promotion but not for mid-tenure reviews. When preparing the list of potential external reviewers for the Dean, include the name, current institution, and rank of the individual. While efforts should be made to obtain some reviewers from AAU institutions, not all top-ranked researchers are at AAU institutions so a mixture of institutional representation may be submitted as long as all reviewers from universities are from RU-VH institutions. In addition to a brief biographical sketch and rationale for nominating the reviewer, a current CV (or link to a current CV) must be included.
3. In the letters inviting external reviewers, the chair/director should highlight the need for the invited reviewer to clearly specify any significant relationship s/he may have had with the candidate, e.g., publications (co-authorship, edited book, other), grant activity, paid contractual relationships, prior mentorships, other... If there is a significant relationship, the individual may not be used for the review.

**Clarification regarding book chapter contributions:** If the individual served as the Editor of the book, the individual would be considered to have a potential conflict of interest. However, if the faculty member authored a chapter in a book, other contributors to the book would not be considered to have a conflict assuming they did not serve as co-authors with the faculty member seeking tenure and/or promotion.

4. Ideally, all reviewers should hold the rank of Professor including those who are reviewing applications for promotion to Associate Professor. However, Associate Professors who have extraordinary careers and/or expertise may serve as reviewers for tenure/Associate Professor promotion applicants. All reviewers should be active in scholarly productivity, have grant experience, and have peer-reviewed publications.
5. Individuals who have previously served as a reviewer for an applicant at a previous stage of tenure and promotion should not be invited to serve as a reviewer for a subsequent application. For example, if someone served as a reviewer for the applicant when he/she was promoted to Associate Professor, that individual should not be asked to be a reviewer for the promotion to the rank of Professor.

**Use of Prior Reviewers:** If a faculty member seeking promotion withdraws the application prior to being sent to the Provost's Office or if the faculty member is denied promotion, some of the same external reviewers may be invited to review subsequent applications for promotion for the same faculty member. It is advisable to include some new reviewers along with those who submitted previous external reviews.

6. The Chair/Director is responsible for preparing a narrative describing the quality of journals and publications of the faculty member. This narrative must be signed by the department

chair/director. For tenure applications, the chair should include all journals in their analysis of faculty publications. For applicants seeking promotion only, the emphasis should be placed on the last five years but may include additional years. This narrative must be signed by the department chair/director.

7. Application packages should include the summary form for listing their peer-reviewed publication citations and impact factors. This form and the directions for completing the form are located at: <http://intra.cbcs.usf.edu/TenurePromotion/>
8. 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. At each review level, the counts described in the narratives should be consistent.
9. Chairs/Directors should review all prepared tables to ensure accuracy.
10. Items should only be entered in one category, either teaching or research or service.
11. If reporting instructional activities that are outside the typical university classroom evaluation structure, applicants need to provide documentation that these activities occurred and where possible, evaluative feedback, e.g., guest lecturer in other classes/departments, professional training activities.
12. 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 for the department.
13. If applicants attended workshops to enhance their teaching such as those provided through ATLE, documentation of attendance/completion must be included, for example, a certificate of attendance, email confirmation of enrollment, etc.
14. Training grants may be submitted in the teaching category even though the grants are reported as research for purposes of Assigned Faculty Duties and in FAIR. The Department Chair/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.
15. The applicant should enter "Not Applicable" or "None" in any category in the application for which there is no entry. The purpose of this is to ensure that the applicant did not inadvertently miss a category.
16. Before submitting their packet, the applicant should make a copy for their own future reference and next promotional opportunity. The Dean's Office does not save copies of the applications.