



SCHOOL OF AGING STUDIES

GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT

June, 2012

Director: Cathy McEvoy, Ph.D.

June 22, 2012

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Cathy McEvoy". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

The following statement describes the working protocol for the School of Aging Studies. It is recognized that this document may not contravene the constitutions and laws of the state of Florida; rules, regulations, and policies of the Florida Board of Governors; rules, regulations, and policies of the University of South Florida; and any applicable collective bargaining agreement or legislatively-mandated management right. The foregoing authorities will govern in the event that any provision of a local governance document is inconsistent with or in conflict with them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PREAMBLE AND MISSION STATEMENT	4
I.	MEMBERSHIP.....	5
II.	MEETINGS.....	7
III.	ADMINISTRATION	8
	A. SCHOOL OF AGING STUDIES DIRECTOR.....	8
	1. Selection.....	8
	2. Term of Office	8
	3. External or Internal Search	9
	4. Duties	9
	B. ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR	10
	C. DIRECTOR, FLORIDA POLICY EXCHANGE CENTER ON AGING	10
	1. Selection.....	10
	2. Term of Office	10
	3. Duties	11
	D. DIRECTOR OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES.....	11
	E. DIRECTOR OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS	11
	F. DIRECTOR, PH.D. IN AGING STUDIES PROGRAM	12
	G. ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS	12
	H. DIRECTOR OF STUDENT INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS.....	12
	I. ACTING DIRECTOR	13
	J. MULTIPLE APPOINTMENTS.....	13
IV.	STANDING COMMITTEES	14
	A. FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE	14
	B. TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE	14
	C. HONORS AND AWARDS COMMITTEE.....	15
	D. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.....	16
V.	AD HOC COMMITTEES.....	17
	A. FACULTY SEARCH COMMITTEE	17
	B. FACULTY SEARCH COMMITTEE:	
	DIRECTOR OF PHD IN AGING STUDIES PROGRAM	18
VI.	SCHOOL OF AGING STUDIES POLICIES.....	20
	A. FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY	20
	1. Principles.....	20
	2. Procedures	22

B. FACULTY TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICY	26
1. Basic Philosophy.....	26
2. Procedures	27
3. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion - Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty.....	28
4. Criteria for Promotion - Instructor Career Path.....	29
C. GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY ASSIGNMENTS	31
1. General Principles	31
2. Assigned Duties.....	33
VII. REVIEW OF AND AMENDMENTS TO THIS DOCUMENT	35
VIII. APPENDIX, SPECIFIC POLICIES AND PROCEDURES RELEVANT TO THE SCHOOL OF AGING STUDIES	36
A. ACADEMIC GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES	36
B. PROFESSIONAL CONFLICT RESOLUTION	37
C. POLICY FOR DETERMINATION OF MERIT SALARY INCREASES	37
D. POLICY ON ALLOCATION OF SUMMER TEACHING FUNDS	38

PREAMBLE AND MISSION STATEMENT

In accordance with the requirement of the College of Behavioral and Community Sciences (CBCS) at the University of South Florida, the following provisions represent the Governance Document of the School of Aging Studies (SAS). Unless amended, as provided for herein, these provisions shall serve as rules or guidelines for the conduct of the major routine or contingent activities that constitute the normal operation of the SAS.

The primary mission of the SAS is excellence in applied aging research and education. The SAS conducts research that is aimed at improving the well-being of older adults; provides educational programs that prepare students for careers in aging research, practice, administration, and policy; and provides service by disseminating the latest knowledge in applied aging.

The SAS is home to the Florida Policy Exchange Center on Aging, the policy-related research and analysis arm of the School. The School also promotes campus-wide excellence in aging research, education, and service at the University of South Florida, with support from the USF Collaborative on Aging, contingent on the availability of funds.

The school carries out its mission through five major areas of emphasis.

Research: The faculty and students of the SAS conduct applied, basic, and policy research that improves our knowledge of the aging process, age-related problems, and programs and policies, which can improve the well-being of older persons. Research findings are communicated to the scientific community through scholarly publications and presentations.

Education: The SAS educates the next generation of gerontologists so that they can promote the well-being of older persons and advance the field of gerontology through the development and administration of appropriate services and programs and through the conduct of significant applied, basic, and policy research in gerontology and geriatrics. The SAS educates students specializing in other academic and professional areas about aging issues, and educates practicing professionals about important issues in the fields of gerontology and geriatrics. Students gain knowledge of key gerontological content, and the ability to communicate this knowledge in both oral and written formats. Professionals in the field gain knowledge of current best practices and updates about the field through continuing professional education programs.

Service: The faculty and students of the SAS share their knowledge and expertise related to aging via service to individuals, community organizations, professional societies, state and federal agencies, and other units at the University of South Florida. Service activities include lectures, workshops, consultations, memberships on boards and committees, and other efforts to promote knowledge about aging and improve the well-being of older persons. Our highest priority for service activities are those that enhance our primary mission of recognition as a center for excellence in applied aging research and education.

Florida Policy Exchange Center on Aging: FPECA is a research center housed within the SAS, charged with informing policymakers, media representatives, students, researchers, and advocates on policies, programs, and services for older adults. The activities of the FPECA include developing training programs, consulting with stakeholders at the state and national level, and conducting applied research, policy analysis and program evaluation related to older adults, especially older Floridians. FPECA disseminates knowledge generated by the SAS, CBCS, and the University in practical, useful forms that can improve quality of life for older adults.

USF Collaborative on Aging: USF has extensive research, educational, and service programs devoted to aging, based in units throughout the USF campus, including both the Academic Affairs and USF Health divisions, among others. The Collaborative is hosted by the SAS and works to enhance USF's capacity and national and international reputation as a center for excellence in aging research, education, and service. When funding is available, the Collaborative sponsors the Distinguished Lecture Series, a campus-wide listserv, a faculty directory, and encourages collaboration between SAS faculty and scholars from diverse disciplines and across traditional academic boundaries.

I. MEMBERSHIP

- A. Voting membership in the SAS shall include all individuals at the ranks of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor, with primary appointments in the SAS who have at least .5 FTE appointments in the School. The SAS Director remains a voting member of the faculty, except where specifically excluded in this document.
- B. Those faculty in the above categories, who have joint appointments with other units, shall be considered voting members of the SAS if 50% or more of their budgeted salary is administered through the SAS. Individuals holding other faculty appointments, including Courtesy Joint Appointments, Courtesy Appointments, Visiting Appointments, Administrative Faculty Appointments, and Adjunct Faculty Appointments, may be invited to attend faculty meetings but will not have voting rights. Such faculty members will not participate in the School's regular annual evaluation process.
- C. Faculty members on leave from the SAS shall retain voting rights in all matters if they can attend meetings, in person or by electronic means from a remote location. If unable to attend meetings or attending remotely, they may vote by providing their written proxy to the SAS Director, except in discussions on the retention or appointment of SAS Director. In discussions on the retention or appointment of the SAS Director, written proxies will be delivered to the Chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee.
- D. The SAS Director may, at his/her discretion, request votes by e-mail on certain occasions. In such instances, faculty will have one week to register a vote, and

the final vote (including a listing of individuals' votes if not unanimous) will be distributed after the one week period. If any faculty member objects to the use of an e-mail vote, the issue will be tabled and voted upon at the next faculty meeting.

- E. Faculty wishing to transfer their primary faculty appointment to Aging Studies must be approved by 50% of the voting faculty.
- F. Any faculty member unable to attend a meeting, in person or remotely, can leave a written statement for distribution at the meeting outlining the faculty member's views on the issues under discussion.
- G. The Director of the SAS will have the authority to offer faculty with primary appointments in other USF units Courtesy Joint appointments, and to review the reappointment of such individuals. The Director of the SAS will also have the authority to offer other individuals Courtesy faculty appointments, but will advise the faculty of any such appointments under consideration by distributing copies of their curriculum vitae. The Director will consider faculty input about such appointments if concerns are raised by the faculty but votes will not be required to offer such appointments.

II. MEETINGS

- A. Regular meetings of the SAS shall be held at least 3 times during each of the Spring and Fall semesters.
- B. Other meetings may be called at other times by the SAS Director or by any three members of the faculty.
- C. Notification of all meetings, regular and special, will be by written memorandum or e-mail, distributed to all members of the SAS at least one week before the meeting. The agenda of the meeting will be included in the notice. Upon the request of any faculty member, the Director will add items to the proposed agenda at the next faculty meeting.
- D. Meetings will be postponed unless a majority of the voting faculty members are present.
- E. A majority vote of all voting faculty members in attendance is required for all major issues as designated by the SAS Director, e.g., curriculum changes, hiring of new faculty. If a vote is requested for any issue by at least three faculty members, a vote will be taken. All votes will be taken publicly via a show of hands, unless otherwise noted in this document.
- F. Minutes of each SAS meeting will be distributed by the SAS Director, or his/her designee, within one calendar week after each meeting. Minutes should include a list of all present, a summary of all issues discussed, and the tally of any votes taken, and actions for follow up.
- G. Faculty should be informed of and involved in major policy decisions of the SAS. Faculty members must approve revisions to the curriculum and policies related to academic programs.

III. ADMINISTRATION

A. SCHOOL OF AGING STUDIES DIRECTOR

1. Selection:

The SAS Director, who should be a tenured faculty member at the Associate Professor level or higher, will be selected by the Dean of the College from: 1) a national external search, in accordance with standard USF procedures, and/or 2) an internal search whereby a senior faculty member of the SAS may be recommended by the faculty. SAS faculty will provide input to the CBCS Dean as described in detail below.

2. Term of Office:

The normal term of office for a SAS Director will be three years. A SAS Director is eligible to succeed him or herself if (s)he so desires, the faculty members so indicate, and the Dean concurs.

During the penultimate year of the SAS Director's term in office, the Faculty Evaluation Committee will meet during the Spring Semester to consider a recommendation for reappointment. If such consideration does not occur during the penultimate year, it should be undertaken as early as possible in the final year of the SAS Director's term.

During the Faculty and Evaluation Committee meeting, the Committee shall entertain nominations for SAS Director, including the name of the current SAS Director. All tenured members are eligible to be nominated but may withdraw their names for consideration. If there are no nominees other than the current SAS Director, the Faculty Evaluation Committee will have a discussion, followed with a vote by secret ballot on the reappointment of the current SAS Director. The results of this vote (including any proxies as described in SECTION I, subsection C) will be communicated to the SAS Director and the Dean.

If other candidates for SAS Director are nominated, discussion of each candidate will be conducted, with the current SAS Director and all other candidates present for discussion of all nominees but themselves. A secret ballot will be taken, and the candidate receiving the most votes (including any proxies as described in SECTION I, subsection C) will be recommended to the Dean.

In addition, any faculty member may request a vote of confidence in the SAS Director during the Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee Review. This vote will be taken publicly via a show of hands, with the results communicated to the SAS Director and the Dean. To the extent possible, any faculty members on leave will

be consulted and given the opportunity to vote by proxy as described in SECTION I, subsection C.

In the event that the Dean does not reappoint the SAS Director, or a vacancy occurs for other reasons, the Dean will determine whether an external search is to be authorized, or whether an internal search will be used to fill the vacancy.

3. External or Internal Search:

In circumstances in which the faculty wish to recommend an Internal Search, the tenured and tenure-earning voting members of the SAS (including the SAS Director) will submit to the Dean of the College of Behavioral and Community Sciences a list of no more than 3 full-time, tenured senior faculty members (Associate Professor and above) of the SAS qualified to serve as SAS Director. These may be listed in order of preference. The Dean will view this list as advisory. The faculty may also request a meeting with the Dean to discuss this matter; the CBCS Dean may also request a meeting with the faculty to discuss the issue.

In cases in which the faculty recommends that the Dean authorize an External Search for a Director, the faculty will prepare a memorandum outlining their rationale for such a search, and submit this to the Dean. The faculty and the CBCS Dean may also request a meeting with the Dean to discuss this matter.

4. Duties of the Director include:

- a. Serving as the chief administrative officer of the SAS. The SAS Director shall administer the operation of the SAS by implementing the policies established by the University, the College, and SAS faculty members.
- b. Being the liaison between higher levels of university administration and the faculty.
- c. Reporting at least monthly to the SAS faculty, summarizing the business of his/her office and the business of SAS members. Such reports may be provided by email. The SAS Director shall make available on a regular basis any information which (s)he and/or the faculty deems appropriate to the efficient operation of the SAS.
- d. Overseeing the budget. The Director should present budget information for review by the faculty at least once per year.
- e. Appointing *ad hoc* committees.
- f. Proposing course offerings and faculty assignments after consulting with the faculty.
- g. Leading the SAS Executive Committee.

B. ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

The SAS Director will appoint an Associate Director of the SAS for a renewable term of three years. The Associate Director will not have decision-making authority concerning academic affairs.

The duties of the Associate Director include:

1. Participating in the SAS Executive Committee
2. Serving as an Advisor to the Director when requested.
3. Assuming additional duties as designated by the Director.

C. DIRECTOR OF FLORIDA POLICY EXCHANGE CENTER ON AGING

1. Selection:

The Director of the Florida Policy Exchange Center on Aging, who should be a tenured faculty member at the Associate Professor level or higher, will be selected by the Director of the SAS from a national external search, in accordance with standard USF procedures, or an internal search whereby a senior faculty member of the SAS may be selected.

2. Term of Office:

The normal term of office for the Florida Policy Exchange Center on Aging (FPECA) Director will be three years. An FPECA Director is eligible to succeed him or herself if (s)he so desires, and the Aging Studies Director concurs.

During the penultimate year of the FPECA Director's term in office, the SAS Director will prepare an evaluation of FPECA Director and make a decision regarding reappointment. If such consideration does not occur during the penultimate year, it should be undertaken as early as possible in the final year of the FPECA Director's term.

In the event that a vacancy occurs in the FPECA Director's role, the Aging Studies Director will determine whether an external search, an internal search or combined search will be used to fill the vacancy in consultation with the Dean of the College of Behavioral and Community Sciences.

3. Duties of the Director of the FPECA include:
 - a. Serving as the chief administrative officer of the FPECA. The FPECA Director shall administer the operation of the FPECA consistent with the policies of the University, the College, and the School.
 - b. Promoting the applied research, policy analysis, program evaluation, and training activities of students and faculty of the School, College, and University.
 - c. Supervising the administration of all Centers within the FPECA.
 - d. Developing and maintaining working relationships with policymakers and administrators at all levels of government, with representatives of the media, with private sector providers of health and long-term care services, housing and employment services, social services and with advocates for the elderly. These relationships, including consultation with stakeholders, should be designed to identify high priority policy issues and serve as a conduit for the dissemination of research findings and policy recommendations from the FPECA.
 - e. Preparing an annual report for the Provost and College Dean on FPECA.
 - f. Preparing an annual report on all FPECA research, information dissemination and education and training activities for review by the SAS Director as a part of his/her Annual Faculty Evaluation.

D. DIRECTOR OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

The Director of Undergraduate Studies shall be appointed by the Director of the SAS. The Undergraduate Studies Director will be responsible for overseeing the undergraduate program, including overseeing advising of undergraduate students. These duties may be delegated to SAS staff as appropriate. The Undergraduate Studies Director will also develop and maintain undergraduate student handbooks, policies, and procedures, and be responsible for the monitoring of enrollment, curriculum, and advertisement for the Undergraduate Program.

E. DIRECTOR OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS

The Director of Graduate Programs shall be appointed by the Director of the SAS, and will be responsible for organizing the graduate program, including the M.A. in Gerontology and Graduate Certificate Programs in Gerontology, and will

assign advisees to faculty members. These duties may be delegated to SAS staff as appropriate. The Graduate Programs Director will also develop and maintain graduate student handbooks, policies, and procedures. In addition, the Graduate Programs Director is responsible for the selection of Admissions and Comprehensive Exam Committees, as well as the monitoring of enrollment, curriculum, and advertisement for the Graduate Programs.

F. DIRECTOR, PH.D. IN AGING STUDIES PROGRAM

The PhD in Aging Studies Program will develop its own job description for the PhD Program Director. The PhD Program Director may be, but is not required to be, the Director of Graduate Programs.

G. ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

The Assistant Director for Academic Affairs (ADAA) will assist the Director of the SAS in the completion of academic administrative duties. These will include drafting documents such as teaching schedules, teaching assignments, assigned faculty duties, academic policies, forms requesting approval of new courses and degree programs, accreditation-related documents, and other duties as assigned by the Director of the SAS. The ADAA will also be responsible for the orientation and supervision of Graduate Assistants and Adjunct Faculty who teach in the undergraduate programs. The ADAA may also represent the School at academic-related activities, such as CBCS Chairs meeting, and Association for Gerontology in Higher Education meetings, when the Director is unavailable. The ADAA will be appointed by the Director of the SAS. The ADAA will not have decision making authority concerning academic affairs.

H. DIRECTOR OF STUDENT INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS

The Director of Student Internship Programs will be responsible for the coordination of supervised internships which provide experience in working with older adults in a variety of settings in the community, for students in the SAS' undergraduate, graduate, and certificate programs. The Duties of the Director shall include:

1. Arranging and monitoring gerontology field placements in community settings
2. Initiating and strengthening collaboration between the SAS and community aging services
3. Coordinating field experience in aging with other University departments
4. Coordinating an annual on-campus reception for preceptors/students and
5. Reporting annually to the faculty on the state of the internship program.

I. ACTING DIRECTOR

When the Director is traveling or otherwise unavailable, he/she will appoint an Acting Director who is authorized to assure the completion or routine business of the School. This Acting Director will generally be chosen from faculty with one of the other administrative positions noted above. The Acting Director is not authorized to make policy decisions without input from the Director.

J. MULTIPLE APPOINTMENTS:

At the discretion of the SAS Director, faculty members may be appointed to more than one of these positions. For any faculty member appointed to one or more of these positions, course reductions, administrative stipends or alterations of assigned duties may be given at the discretion of the SAS Director.

IV. STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE

1. This committee will consist of all of the voting faculty members as defined in Section 1, Paragraphs A-D. The committee will elect its own Chair from among the tenured faculty. The Director of the SAS will appoint an Interim Chair to schedule the meeting of the Committee. The Director of the SAS shall not serve on this committee.
2. Duties:
 - a. Conduct the annual review of the faculty for the SAS; complete annual reviews on all faculty members.
 - b. Complete the annual review of the SAS Director, and, if it is the penultimate year in his/her term, provide recommendations concerning reappointment of the SAS Director, detailed in Section III (A)(2).

B. TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE

1. Procedures

For promotion to Instructor Level 2, or from Level 2 to Level 3 Instructor, the SAS may establish an Instructor Promotion Committee to review applications for promotion. In the event such a committee is established, the composition of the committee shall consist of SAS faculty members and, to the extent possible, should include Instructors from Levels 2 and 3.

For promotion to Associate Professor and/or the granting of tenure, the committee shall consist of all tenured faculty members in the SAS at the level of Associate Professor and above, except for the SAS Director, who shall not serve on this committee.

For promotion to full Professor, the committee shall consist of all full-time tenured faculty members in the SAS at the level of Professor, except for the SAS Director, who will not serve on this committee. The committees will elect their own Chairs.

In all cases, the School's Tenure and Promotions committees shall consist of a minimum of 3 faculty members. In the event that there are an insufficient number of faculty members at the appropriate levels, the committee will be supplemented by a faculty member, or members, from other schools or departments. The committee will recommend to the Dean or his/her designee a list of 3 names of potential supplemental faculty members, including a summary of their qualifications. The Dean will designate which of these supplemental faculty members will be asked to participate.

The SAS Tenure and Promotion Committees will meet only during years in which faculty members are applying for tenure and/or promotion, or for mid-tenure review.

For faculty members who are not yet applying for tenure, but who are on a tenure track and scheduled for mid-tenure review by the CBCS, the Tenure and Promotion Committee will provide such review, upon receipt of the required materials packet from the faculty member. The Committee will make its written recommendation to the SAS Director, who will make it available to the individual faculty member for review prior to its submission to the Dean's Office.

2. Duties:
 - a. Collect materials, review supporting documents, and make recommendations to the Director on candidates for promotion and tenure.
 - b. Collect materials, review supporting documents, and make recommendations to the Director on candidates for pre-tenure review of non-tenured faculty members.

C. HONORS AND AWARDS COMMITTEE

1. The Assistant Director for Academic Affairs will chair this committee. The Honors and Awards Committee will consist of other faculty or staff members, as designated by the Director.
2. This Committee will be responsible for the administration of any honors, awards, or scholarships conferred by the SAS, including but not limited to the Dick Rotsell Memorial Endowed Scholarship in Gerontology, the Harold L. Sheppard Memorial Scholarship, and the Wiley P. Mangum Scholarship.
3. In the cases of the Sue Saxon Outstanding Teaching Award, and the Wiley Mangum Outstanding Service Award, the Director of the SAS will recommend at least two individuals for these honorary awards. The Committee will have final decision-making authority on selecting the recipient of these awards, and need not limit their choices to the nominees of the Director.

D. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1. The SAS Executive Committee will be led by the SAS Director, and will also include the Associate Director. The Executive Committee will also include a third member, elected by the faculty, with eligibility including tenured faculty members at the Associate Professor level or higher.
2. The Executive Committee will meet at least quarterly and when so requested by the Director, and shall advise the Director on the major activities of the School, including policy, personnel, and budget issues. The Executive Committee will also advise the Director on matters that require input from the full faculty membership.

V. AD HOC COMMITTEES

A. FACULTY SEARCH COMMITTEE

1. The committee shall consist of at least three full time faculty members appointed by the SAS Director at his/her discretion. An effort will be made to appoint members who have expertise in the area of specialization of the position being filled. The committee will elect its own Chair.

2. Duties:
 - a. The Faculty Search Committee Director will immediately consult with the Office of Personnel and Equal Opportunity in the Dean's Office to ensure compliance with all Human Resources rules and regulations.

 - b. The Faculty Search Committee Director will be responsible for all communication with prospective candidates, and will communicate decisions of the committee/faculty in the most expeditious manner possible. In all cases, job applicants will receive a response from the SAS.

 - c. Subject to input from the Dean's Office, committee members shall establish procedures for obtaining and reviewing all submitted materials, including the timing of the request for letters of reference.

 - d. The committee members will review all submitted materials and share its feedback with faculty at faculty meetings. The list of finalists will be presented in alphabetical order, and will not be rank ordered. The faculty will determine an initial group of candidates it wishes to interview, and may also designate a second group if it deems appropriate.

 - e. The committee will be responsible for coordinating the scheduling and conducting of the interviews, assisted by SAS Staff.

 - f. After a campus visit(s), the Committee shall make a list of strengths of and concerns about each candidate for the faculty's consideration. The faculty will meet to consider the order of their preference; in any case, no candidates will be forwarded to the CBCS Dean's Office who are not acceptable to at least 50% of the faculty. The Director will advise and work with the CBCS Dean to make and negotiate any offers.

B. FACULTY SEARCH COMMITTEE: DIRECTOR OF PHD IN AGING STUDIES PROGRAM

Because the PhD in Aging Studies Program is a campus-wide program, but the PhD Program Director is a faculty member in the SAS, selection of its Director requires input from both faculty in the School and campus-wide faculty involved in the PhD program.

1. The committee shall consist of at least three full time SAS faculty members and two members of the Aging Studies Program Governance Committee who are not SAS faculty. Appointment to the search committee shall be a joint effort of the Director of the SAS and the Aging Studies Governance Committee. The SAS Director will appoint the three faculty from the SAS and the Governance Committee will appoint the two members from that committee. It is expected that the search committee members from the SAS will represent both the interests of the SAS and of the Aging Studies Program, and that the members from the Governance Committee will provide additional representation for the interests of the Program.

The SAS Director will appoint one member of the search committee to serve as the Chair, in consultation with the faculty and the governance committee.

2. Duties:
 - a. The Chair of the search committee will immediately consult with the Office of Personnel and Equal Opportunity in the Dean's Office to ensure compliance with all Human Resources rules and regulations.
 - b. The Chair of the search committee will be responsible for all communication with prospective candidates, and will communicate decisions of the committee to the applicants as quickly as possible. In all cases, applicants will receive a response regardless of the decision.
 - c. Subject to input from the Dean's Office, search committee members shall establish procedures for obtaining and reviewing all submitted materials, including the timing of the request for letters of reference.

- d. The search committee members will review all submitted materials and share its feedback with faculty at faculty meetings. The two search committee members who are not SAS faculty will attend this faculty meeting to provide their input, but will not take part in the faculty show of hands. The list of finalists will be presented in alphabetical order, and will not be rank ordered. The faculty will determine its preferences by show of hands. Candidates will be invited to interview based on the faculty's preferences, within the limits of available financial resources as determined by the SAS Director.
- e. The search committee will be responsible for coordinating the scheduling and conducting of the interviews, assisted by SAS Staff. The interview will include at least one meeting with available members of the SAS Governance Committee.
- f. After the interviews have been conducted, the Committee shall make a list of strengths of and concerns about each candidate for the faculty's consideration. It is expected that the search committee will meet with available members of the SAS Governance Committee prior to this faculty meeting, to obtain their input. Recommendations to the Dean of the College shall be made in keeping with the faculty's preferences with the provision that the candidate must be deemed acceptable by at least 50% of the faculty.

VI. SCHOOL OF AGING STUDIES POLICIES

A. FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY

Annual faculty evaluations are important for a number of reasons, including their potential impact on merit raises and eligibility for special awards, and in providing documentation relevant to tenure and promotion decisions. Discussions of post-tenure review for tenured faculty have also made it clear that faculty evaluations should be taken seriously. In addition, faculty evaluations provide an opportunity for the SAS to promulgate norms concerning what constitutes the highest levels of teaching effectiveness, scholarship, and service to which we aspire, and provides a mechanism for feedback that can improve the quality of our efforts. Evaluations will be conducted by the SAS Director, by the Faculty Evaluation Committee, and the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

In order to promote fairness and rigor in the evaluation process, the SAS adopts the following principles and procedures for faculty evaluation. These are put forth as a supplement to materials for the College of Behavioral and Community Sciences describing standards for annual evaluation and tenure and promotion.

1. Principles

a. Separate annual evaluations should be provided by the SAS Director and the Faculty Evaluation Committee. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will consist of voting faculty members as described in Section I (A-D) of the SAS Governance document; however, the SAS Director will not be included as a committee member. Faculty members holding Visiting, Courtesy Joint, or Adjunct positions will also not sit on the Faculty Evaluation Committee. This Committee will elect its own Chair, who will be responsible for leading meetings, and arranging for completion of appropriate documentation. Evaluations by the Director and Faculty Evaluation Committee should be based on common standards, as presented in this document and related materials from the College of Behavioral and Community Sciences and the University.

b. Annual evaluations by the Director are mandatory for all faculty members. Annual evaluation of the Director by the Faculty Evaluation Committee is also mandatory. Faculty members other than the Director have the right to exclude themselves from evaluation by the Faculty Evaluation Committee. In such instances, the annual evaluation will be completed only by the Director. It should be noted that faculty who exclude themselves from evaluation by the Faculty Evaluation Committee

will not participate as members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, but all faculty members will participate in evaluation of the Director.

c. Faculty members who are on sabbatical or for other reasons cannot participate in meetings concerning annual evaluation must complete annual report materials, but will be evaluated only by the Director.

d. Discussions related to faculty evaluation must be open and honest, in an atmosphere in which all positive and negative comments can be considered. Faculty should not suffer recriminations for providing honest opinions at committee meetings. All discussions and deliberations of the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Tenure and Promotion Committee are to be kept confidential. Feedback to faculty members about Committee discussions should be summarized in written comments, which will include both positive and negative feedback offered by the members of the Committee, and will be communicated to the faculty member exclusively by the Committee Chair.

e. Ratings used to summarize evaluations must be supported in writing and their bases documented. When written evaluations are produced by a Committee, the Chair of the Committee must circulate a draft of written evaluations for approval by other committee members before these are finalized. Further, in cases where significant disagreement exists with regard to a faculty member's rating, defined as 25% of the committee endorsing a different rating, a minority report may be generated that summarizes the evaluation and provides a basis for the evaluation. In this case, the minority report would be circulated among those faculty members with the dissenting views.

f. The SAS Director has an obligation to consider both the evaluations of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, and the SAS Director's own evaluation, in recommending annual raises. Similarly, in forwarding recommendations concerning tenure and promotion, the Director is obligated to consider the opinion of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, as well as the SAS Director's own evaluation of the candidate.

Faculty members have an obligation to submit an annual activity report with sufficient detail and supportive documentation to allow for a thorough evaluation by the SAS Director and the Faculty Evaluation Committee. In particular, the faculty member must provide clear evidence of productivity in their materials for the SAS Director and Faculty Evaluation Committee to justify evaluations above the Satisfactory level.

g. Evaluations must be completed in the context of faculty members' assigned duties. In particular, if a faculty member has a very small percentage of effort assigned to a particular duty (e.g. research), and has a correspondingly higher percentage effort in other areas (e.g. teaching), evaluation should consider these assignments.

h. Faculty members with Administrative Faculty appointments will complete all annual reports required of other faculty members. Administrative faculty will be evaluated in the context of their assigned duties and receive ratings of their performance using the same criteria used for other faculty members (teaching, research, service) as well as their administrative assignments.

2. Procedures

Faculty members report on their calendar year activities on the FAIR system form. This form requires reporting in the categories of Teaching, Research, and Service, and allows for a Statement by the faculty member. The College requires ratings of either "Outstanding", "Strong", "Satisfactory", "Poor", or "Unsatisfactory" in the areas of teaching, research, and service. In addition to the requirements of the College, the following guidelines should be used by faculty in completing these annual reports, and by the SAS Director and Committees in evaluating faculty performance:

a. Teaching

This section of the evaluation includes not only in-class instruction, but also directed readings, directed research, internship supervision, mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students, and development of new courses, course revisions, and program proposals. Noncredit instructional activities can also be included. In the evaluation of teaching, consideration should be given to a number of factors, including student evaluations of instruction; evidence that courses are carefully planned, and taught at an appropriate level of sophistication and rigor; and indication that grading is both fair and appropriately demanding. Review of teaching should include attention to student evaluations, the course syllabus and reading list, graded tests and assignments, and the grade distributions of courses. Faculty members should submit a syllabus, reading lists, sample examinations, grade distributions, and course evaluations to document their efforts. It is important that these materials provide sufficient information about assignments and grading

to allow for evaluation of the rigor of courses. Faculty should also detail any instruction-related efforts outside of the classroom. The “Statement” section should be used to provide information that may be relevant to the SAS Director and Committee in their reviews, for example, extenuating circumstances that may be relevant to a particular course evaluation, or describing noncredit instructional activities.

b. Research

In the evaluation of research, consideration should be given to both the quality and quantity of scholarship. Review of the quality of research should include attention to at least three factors: a) the degree of scrutiny that the work has received by peer reviewers; b) the prominence of the outlet of publication; and c) the amount of contribution of a given author to a scholarly work. Work that is published in peer-reviewed journals with high rejection rates suggests higher quality than work published in outlets that receive less scrutiny, such as publication in journals that reject few articles, publication of invited book chapters, or publication of books with little or no peer review. Publication of technical reports, or articles in newsletters, requires little or no peer review in comparison to articles in top journals. Prominence of publications can be documented through use of the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI). Immediate impact of the faculty member’s research is difficult to document during the early years of a research career, but over time high-impact publications can be documented by reference to the SSCI index of author citations. In the case of co-authorship of publications, some judgment must be made about the faculty member’s contribution to the work. In general, first-author publications (or publications in which the faculty member is second author to a student) suggest the greatest degree of professional contribution. A consistent pattern of publication as a second, third, or lower author makes it difficult to judge whether the faculty member has made a major professional contribution to the work. For some faculty members, being last author on publications from projects that are funded by the faculty member’s research grants may also be an indication of a high degree of professional publication, but these faculty members should continue to publish as first authors as well. When faculty members frequently publish with more senior authors, e.g. when publications are consistently published with a former major professor for some time after the completion of the dissertation, questions are legitimately raised about the professional independence of the junior author.

Research grants that are funded after peer review provide important resources for the faculty member and SAS. Efforts to obtain funding should also be rewarded, particularly if the faculty member can provide evidence that the proposal received favorable reviews. However, obtaining funding should not be considered necessary to obtain a high evaluation of research, and grant funding in the absence of significant publication does not suggest outstanding scholarship.

Conference presentations, while encouraged, do not commonly require the same degree of scrutiny before acceptance as do journal articles. Presentations should be considered of value primarily as a way of presenting preliminary results, and not as an endpoint of the research.

Annual evaluation materials should include not only a full listing of publications, grants, and presentations, but also some evidence relevant to the issues noted above. Where available, the SSCI Impact factor of journals should be noted; otherwise, information on rejection rates of the journals should be provided. Evidence of citation of one's work in the SSCI should also be provided as evidence that the faculty member's research is having an impact on other scholars. Copies of publications should also be submitted to allow for the SAS Director and Committee members to review the quality of the work. The faculty member should also document work in press, submitted, and in progress, and provide a likely timeline for completion of research that is underway. Material such as reviewers' comments on manuscripts may also be included. Particularly in cases where the faculty member has large projects underway, such information may be important for the annual review. The "Statement" section should be used to provide information that may be relevant to the SAS Director and Committee in their reviews, for example, evidence that a particular new and unknown journal has high rejection rates.

c. Service

This section of the evaluation includes service within the university, professional service, and service to the community. It includes work on committees, administrative assignments, advising, and many other activities that are very important to the SAS. Faculty members who make major contributions in the area of service fill vital functions in allowing the SAS and university to run smoothly, the scholarly community to function well, and the community to benefit from faculty members' expertise. The SAS Director and Faculty Evaluation Committee should do

their best to take into account relatively “hidden” activities that are of great value to the SAS, such as informal advising of students. In addition, service that increases the visibility of the SAS within USF, nationally, or internationally is of special value.

Faculty members should do their best to document service activities, and can use the “Statement” portion of the evaluation to describe these efforts.

d. Other procedural issues

The SAS Director will assure the timely distribution of the required activity reporting forms and will set forth a timeline for submission of materials and their review during each Spring semester. The SAS Director will appoint an Interim Committee Chair who will arrange for the scheduling of meetings of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, and the Tenure and Promotion Committee. Prior to Faculty Evaluation Committee meetings, and Tenure and Promotion Committee meetings, committee members must review all submitted materials. The committee meetings should involve discussion of materials reviewed in detail prior to the meeting. It is the obligation of each committee member to be familiar with material submitted for review prior to the meeting.

Faculty members who are being reviewed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee must absent themselves from discussion of and voting on their own case.

Faculty ratings, and recommendations for tenure and promotion, must be approved by majority vote of committee members present. Secret ballots will be used for votes on faculty ratings, and recommendations for tenure and promotion. For votes on Tenure and Promotion, the final voting tally should be recorded and included in the report from the Committee.

When the SAS Director has completed his/her annual evaluation of faculty members, these will be delivered to the SAS staff. Similarly, when the Faculty Evaluation Committee has completed its reviews, these will be submitted to the SAS Staff for record-keeping purposes. Only after all evaluations have been completed will evaluations be distributed to each respective individual faculty member.

Faculty members have a right to add comments to the evaluations they have received by the SAS Director and/or the Faculty Evaluation Committee before these are forwarded to the CBCS Dean's Office. Faculty members may also request in writing that the SAS Director or Committee revise the evaluation if the evaluation appears to be mistaken, e.g. has ignored information in the activity report. However, it is at the discretion of the SAS Director and the Committee to decide whether to change the evaluation before it is forwarded.

B. FACULTY TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICY

1. Basic Philosophy

In developing appropriate procedures for promotion and tenure decisions, we have considered the goals we desire to attain in building our SAS as well as college and university policies.

We desire a SAS with high visibility in the national and international Gerontology community that makes substantial scholarly contributions to basic and applied gerontology. Research directly enhances the training activities of the SAS and its contributions to the university.

We desire a SAS with a reputation for excellent and stimulating teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. In this manner, we can attract the best students and serve them well.

Our SAS should help to serve those professional, university, and community needs which gerontologists are uniquely trained to meet.

Because our SAS is interdisciplinary, we must maintain high standards while being alert to the diverse paths to excellence that may occur among faculty whose research may include such diverse methods as laboratory research, field research, secondary data analysis, or qualitative inquiry. In addition, research in basic gerontology, applied gerontology, and public policy areas may necessitate use of diverse publication outlets. Each faculty member has an obligation to demonstrate the significance of their work, and to be receptive to quality scholarship outside their own area of expertise.

2. Procedures

In addition to reading this document, faculty members should familiarize themselves with the University and College guidelines for promotion and tenure, as well as any other contractual details.

The requisite degree for tenure earning faculty in this SAS, and by national standards, is a doctoral degree in Gerontology or closely related discipline from an appropriately accredited program or school. In a special case of clearly demonstrated meritorious performance, this requirement may be waived by vote of the SAS after consultation the Dean of the CBCS. This is, however, quite unlikely.

Evaluative judgments regarding tenure, promotion, and retention, are made at two levels within the SAS: the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the Director of the SAS. The Tenure and Promotion Committee reviews relevant data and makes a recommendation, including a minority recommendation, if necessary, to the SAS Director. The Chair of the Committee will prepare a summary of the recommendation and its rationale, which (s)he will circulate to the other Committee members for approval, prior to forwarding on to the SAS Director.

The SAS Director independently makes a parallel recommendation. In forwarding his/her recommendations to the CBCS Dean concerning tenure and promotion, the Director is obligated to consider the opinion of the School's Tenure and Promotion Committee, as well as the SAS Director's own evaluation of the candidate.

The candidate's promotion/tenure packet, the results of the faculty ballot (when appropriate), the committee's recommendation and the SAS Director's recommendation are forwarded through the Director of the SAS to the College Tenure/Promotion Advisory Committee and the Dean. Before forwarding these materials, the SAS Director will inform the candidate of the outcomes of this process.

It is recognized throughout gerontology that simple numeric indices of faculty performance do not exist and should not be created. Faculty activity is multivariate and demands careful and detailed scrutiny of all relevant aspects weighted as appropriate to the case.

Untenured faculty and those at junior ranks will receive annual feedback regarding their progress toward tenure and/or promotion. It is reasonable to expect that tenure/promotion decisions would be consistent with the annual

feedback documents and faculty should pay special attention to them. The Director and the Tenure and Promotion Committee are not bound by the annual feedback documents, but their final decision should be substantially consistent with them. All faculty are provided with yearly performance appraisals of their teaching, research, service, advising and when appropriate, administration. Although it is reasonable to expect continuity between the annual performance appraisals and tenure/promotion decisions, the two processes are functionally independent. The Director and the Tenure and Promotion Committee will carefully consider these annual evaluations but they are not bound by them.

The SAS' Faculty Evaluation policy includes detailed statements on standards for evaluation of teaching, research, and service. These standards will also apply to deliberations concerning tenure and promotion.

3. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion – Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

The University requires that faculty be rated by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and by the SAS Director on a five point scale in the four categories presented below. Currently the ratings are: Outstanding, Strong, Satisfactory, Poor, and Unsatisfactory.

a. Teaching

There should be evidence of a sustained commitment to excellence in teaching by the candidate as reflected in student teaching evaluations, faculty/school evaluations, and instructional materials. A rating of at least strong is expected for tenure/promotion to be granted. The same criterion would apply for promotion to full professor.

b. Research

For the promotion to associate professor with tenure, there should be evidence of a body of work of sufficient quality and quantity that has produced at least the beginning of a national reputation for significant and creative contributions to the candidate's field of research, and there should be evidence of the promise of continued growth. A rating of at least a strong in research is expected for tenure/promotion to be granted.

Consistent with university policy, to achieve promotion to associate professor with tenure, the candidate must be rated as outstanding in either teaching or research and at least strong in the other category.

For promotion to professor, an established national and international reputation is expected, as well as the indication of sustained high quality work. A rating of outstanding in research is required for promotion to professor. As noted above, promotion to professor also requires a rating of at least strong in teaching.

c. Service

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, there should be evidence of a positive contribution to the life of the SAS, college and/or university. For promotion to full professor, a candidate is expected to make a positive contribution to the university and to the profession. For promotion to either rank or tenure, a candidate must be rated at least as satisfactory in service.

d. Outside Reviews

Outside review of the credentials of all candidates for tenure or promotion is required. Consistent with CBCS policies, the candidate and the Director will both generate suggestions for external reviewers; a minimum of three letters (but not to exceed six) will be included in the packet. The Director and the candidate will jointly select the reviewers; in the event of a disagreement, each party will select one-half the number of the qualified reviewers to be utilized (e.g., 2 of 4, 3 of 6). This review will be available to the Tenure and Promotion Committee, the tenured faculty, and the Director of the SAS. The Dean, or his/her designate, will make the final determination on the outside reviewers to be invited to submit their reviews.

4. Criteria for Promotion – Instructor Career Path

The Instructor Career Path includes the positions of Instructor Level 1, Instructor Level 2, and Instructor Level 3. Faculty hired in the Instructor Career Path are expected to contribute primarily to the teaching mission of the School, Department, and University. These positions are non-tenured.

Standards for each level are as follows:

a. Instructor Level 1

1. Promise of contributing to the departmental/school and College missions in assigned area(s) of duty.
2. The master's degree in the appropriate area of specialization or other educational credentials as required for University or program accreditation.

b. Instructor Level 2

Meet the criteria for Instructor Level 1. Additionally:

1. Following an initial phase-in of the career path, 5 or more years of experience at Level 1 will be typically required. Early eligibility will be considered for exceptional candidates, but a minimum of 3 years at Level 1 is required by the University.
2. Evidence of overall Outstanding performance in the primary area of assigned duties over the last 5 years or period of review.
3. Evidence of at least overall Strong performance in any other areas of assigned duty with an average FTE of .10 or more over the last 5 years or period of review.
4. Evidence of at least overall Satisfactory performance in any areas of assigned duty with an average FTE of less than .10 over the last 5 years or period of review.

c. Instructor Level 3

1. 5-years of experience at Instructor Level 2. Early eligibility will be considered for exceptional candidates, but a minimum of 3 years at Level 2 is required by the University.
2. Evidence of overall Outstanding performance in the primary area of assigned duties over the last 5 years or period of review.
3. Evidence of at least overall Strong performance in any other areas of assigned duty with an average FTE of .10 or more over the last 5 years or period of review.
4. Evidence of at least overall Satisfactory performance in any areas of assigned duty with an average FTE of less than .10 over the last 5 years or period of review.

C. GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY ASSIGNMENT

The following policy is put forth as a step toward assuring equitable assignment of faculty activities. Hard and fast rules will of course be impossible to develop, but this document will set forth general principles in assigning teaching loads to ranked faculty, and some specific recommendations. The general goals of faculty assignment will be to assure the overall effectiveness of the SAS in completing its core missions; to assure that faculty abilities are used in the wisest way possible; and to assure that faculty members are equitably assigned and share appropriately in the many duties of the School.

Assigned duties will assume a 40 hour work week and percentages will be based on this assumption. Many faculty will choose to spend additional time beyond this 40 hour assignment in areas such as service and research. While this additional time will not alter the percent effort shown on assignment, all activities of the faculty member will be included in evaluation of their performance.

1. General principles

Consideration of faculty assignments will utilize an academic year beginning with the Fall semester, and ending at the conclusion of the following Summer semester. Assignment of teaching loads for ranked faculty is a duty of the SAS Director, but should be done in accordance with this policy, and review of faculty evaluations.

Full-time ranked faculty members on a 9-month appointment should generally teach a minimum of four courses per academic year. Average teaching loads for full-time ranked faculty members on a 9-month appointment who do not have ongoing productive research programs or exceptionally heavy levels of uncompensated service or administration should be six courses per academic year. Maximum teaching load for faculty on 9-month appointments should be eight courses per academic year. These teaching responsibilities can be reduced based on participation in funded research or service projects, unusually high levels of mentorship of doctoral students, or assignment by the Director to special duties (e.g. administration).

Full-time ranked faculty members on a 12-month appointment should generally teach a minimum of four courses per academic year. A maximum load should be 10 courses per academic year. These teaching responsibilities can be reduced based on participation in funded research or service projects, unusually high levels of mentorship of doctoral students, or assignment by the Director to special duties (e.g. administration).

The SAS Director should teach a minimum of two courses per 12-month academic year. Average teaching loads for a SAS Director who does not have an ongoing productive research program or high levels of funded research should be three courses per 12 months. Maximum teaching load for a SAS Director should be three courses per 12-month academic year. Assignment of teaching loads for the SAS Director should be done by the Director in accordance with this policy, after review of evaluation by the SAS faculty. The Director may further reduce his/her teaching load during periods of special administrative obligation. The Dean has the authority to instruct the Director to increase contributions toward teaching.

All faculty are expected to participate in both graduate and undergraduate instruction, within the opportunities or constraints of the SAS.

In cases where tenured faculty wish to make their major academic contribution by outstanding teaching, the SAS Director can make assignments averaging seven courses per 9-month academic year without prejudice regarding merit salary increases. Such faculty members will typically be given a 5% assignment for SAS research. Research evaluations for such faculty will contribute minimally to the overall evaluation and to recommendation for merit raises.

Non-tenured faculty on a tenure track will be given a teaching load of four courses per academic year during their first three years to provide the opportunity for development of a productive research program. After the mid-tenure evaluation, this teaching load may be increased if the faculty member has not demonstrated sufficient research productivity.

Special arrangements for adjustments to teaching load can be made for faculty named Distinguished University Professors. In addition, adjustments can be made for special SAS service which is not compensated for through other means, e.g. by summer salary support for administrative work.

Faculty may request one-time adjustments to their teaching loads for special circumstances, e.g. to increase their scholarly productivity beyond previous levels. In such cases, the faculty member will be expected to put forth a clear written proposal for how the reduced teaching load will result in enhanced research productivity, and must specify grants or publications that they expect to produce as a result of such a one-time adjustment.

Faculty members may also reduce their teaching obligations through funded grants and contracts. As a guideline, 9-month faculty may reduce their teaching obligation by one course by covering 10% of their 9-month salary (in addition to summer salary) from grants and contracts. To further reduce their teaching

obligations, 9-month faculty may reduce their teaching obligation by two courses by covering 25% of their 9-month salary (in addition to summer salary) from grants and contracts. For faculty members on 12-month appointments, reduction of teaching assignment will be possible through coverage of a similar percentage of their 9-month equivalent salary.

The Director will consider faculty member requests to distribute their teaching obligations in individualized patterns throughout the academic year. For example, a faculty member may request reduced teaching during the Fall or Spring semester and teach an equivalent course during the summer.

2. Assigned duties

a. Instructional assignment

Can range from 0-100%; typical assignment for ranked faculty member will be 50% unless the faculty member has unusual administrative or research obligations.

b. Other instructional assignment

Can range from 0-25%; typical assignment would vary considerably. May be higher for the Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director, or other faculty heavily involved in curriculum review and revision.

c. Academic advisement

Can range from 5-30%; typical assignment 5-10%. Higher for faculty coordinating a heavily enrolled program or track with related advising responsibilities.

d. School of Aging Studies research

Can vary from 5-25%. The upper range will generally be reserved for non-tenured, tenure track faculty members during their first three years. In unusual cases, high assignments can be used when the Director regards it as advantageous to assign more research time to a faculty member to assist in the generation of grant proposals, or to support a faculty member's research program during transitions between grants.

e. Organized research

Can range from 0-100%. High levels of research funding and time in organized research will be offset by decreased duties in other areas.

f. Service

Can range from 5-25%. The upper ranges in this category should be reserved for circumstances when the faculty member is engaged in service that brings national recognition to the faculty member and SAS, e.g. service on leading editorial boards or prominent national committees.

g. School of Aging Studies administration

Ranges from 0-50%. The Director will generally have 25-40% in this category, while positions such as the Assistant Director may have 15-40% appointment. In some cases faculty members may have multiple administrative responsibilities and thus have high total administrative assignment.

h. University Governance

May range from 0-15%. Upper ends of the distribution will be reserved for individuals directing major university committees.

VII. REVIEW OF AND AMENDMENTS TO THIS DOCUMENT

This Statement of this SAS Governance shall be reviewed at least every 5 years from the date of the last review.

This Statement of SAS Governance may be amended, in part or in whole, at any regular meeting of the SAS faculty provided the specific amendment in writing or e-mail shall have been distributed with the agenda of the meeting at least one week prior to the meeting.

A 2/3 majority vote of the total voting faculty is required to amend this document, in part or in whole. SAS Staff will keep a copy of this Governance Document, both in hard copy and computer file formats.

VIII. APPENDIX, SPECIFIC POLICIES AND PROCEDURES RELEVANT TO THE SCHOOL OF AGING STUDIES

A. ACADEMIC GRIEVANCE POLICY AND PROCEDURES

The SAS' policies and procedures are consistent with those approved by the Faculty Council of the CBCS and with the University policy (USF Policy 10-002), to wit:

1. "An academic grievance is a claim that a specific academic decision or action that affects that student's academic record or status has violated published policies and procedures, or has been applied to the grievant in a manner different from that used for other students. Grievances may related to such decisions as the assignment of a grade seen by the student as incorrect or the dismissal or failure of a student for his or her action(s). Academic grievances will not deal with general student complaints." (USF Policy 10-002, II).
2. Resolution of Academic Grievances at the School level:
 - a. The student must first make a reasonable effort to resolve his or her grievance with the Instructor involved, with the date of the incident triggering the start of the grievance process. Examples of such incidents would be the issuance of a grade, or the receipt of an assignment; the Instructor should make a reasonable attempt to discuss and attempt to resolve the issue.
 - b. If the situation cannot be resolved, or the Instructor is not available, the student must file a notification letter within three weeks of the triggering incident to the Director of the SAS (henceforth, the Director). The letter should include a concise statement of particulars and must include information on how, in the student's opinion, University system policies or procedures were violated (email communications are acceptable). The Director will provide a copy of this statement to the Instructor, who may then file a written response to the grievance.
 - c. The Director will then consult, individually or jointly, with the student and the Instructor to see if the grievance can be resolved. If the grievance can be resolved, the Director will provide a statement to that effect to the student and the Instructor, with a copy to the College Dean.
 - d. If the grievance cannot be resolved at the School level, the Director will inform both the student and the Instructor of the student's right to file a written request back to the Director within three weeks to advance the grievance to the College level. Upon the timely receipt of the Director will immediately inform the College Dean of the grievance, providing copies of the student's initiating grievance statement, any responses from the Instructor, and the written

request from the student to advance the grievance to the College level. Should the student not file a written request within the three week period, the grievance will end.

- e. If the grievance concerns the Director or other officials of the SAS, the student has the right to bypass the School level process and proceed directly to the College level.
- f. Should an academic grievance reach the College level, academic grievance procedures will then be guided by the CBCS Governance Document.

B. PROFESSIONAL CONFLICT RESOLUTION

1. In the event of a conflict between two or more faculty members on any matters not covered by the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Director of the SAS will make a reasonable attempt to resolve the matter. If the situation is not resolved, written materials summarizing the matter will be referred to the CBCS Faculty Council, which may constitute an ad hoc committee to resolve the issue, in accordance with Article IV, Section D(3) of the CBCS Governance Document. If the situation is not resolved at the Faculty Council level, the matter will then be referred to the Dean's Office.
2. In the event of a conflict between the faculty and the SAS Director, written materials summarizing the situation will be submitted to the CBCS Faculty Council, which may constitute an ad hoc committee to resolve the issue, in accordance with Article IV, Section D(3) of the CBCS Governance Document. If the situation is not resolved at the Faculty Council level, the matter will then be referred to the Dean's Office.

C. POLICY FOR DETERMINATION OF MERIT SALARY INCREASES

In the event that the current Contract does not specify the means by which merit salary increases are calculated, the following procedures will apply.

1. When available and not otherwise prescribed, merit salary money will be distributed solely on the basis of average evaluations, weighted by percent effort, of the Director and Faculty Committee on the Annual Faculty Review Summary Form.
2. If for any faculty members the merit increase determined by the calculation above is less than the contractual minimum raise, these faculty members will receive the minimum required raise, and raises for other faculty members will be recomputed.

D. POLICY ON ALLOCATION OF SUMMER TEACHING FUNDS

The SAS receives an annual allotment from CBCS to fund summer teaching. We must use these funds to optimize SCH production, and to serve the needs of undergraduate and graduate students. In addition, summer teaching funds can serve as an important supplement to regular 9-month faculty members' salaries, up to the amount allowed by University rules.

In the absence of directions from the Provost or CBCS Dean, the SAS Director will fund as many regular 9-month faculty members as possible to teach during the summer term. Additional courses may be taught for pay by adjunct faculty members or graduate assistants. In addition, faculty members on 12-month appointment may teach during the summer without additional compensation. In some instances, faculty members on 9-month appointments may elect to teach part of their regular 9-month load during the summer (under normal circumstances) as a way of freeing up time during Fall and Spring semesters for other activities, if this is approved by the Director.

In the event that there are more 9-month faculty who wish to teach for extra salary over the summer than there are available positions, the SAS Director will use the following criteria, in order, to select faculty to teach:

1. The faculty member must be capable of teaching a course that is likely to generate significant Student Credit Hours during the summer term.
2. Faculty who did not teach a course for pay during the previous summer, who meet criterion #1, will receive the highest priority to teach.
3. Among faculty who did teach the previous summer, the SAS Director will select the faculty member (or members) with the highest course evaluations for the previous year, using the quantitative ratings from student evaluations as the primary source of data.

Pending availability of funds, the SAS Director will make every effort to provide full summer salary support for 9 month faculty members. For 9 month faculty members without grant support to cover their summer salaries, they may be expected to teach summer courses, and/or complete research, administrative, or service activities if they want to earn such summer compensation.