

Research Professor Career Path Promotion Guidelines
College of Behavioral & Community Sciences
University of South Florida

The purpose of this document is to describe the College of Behavioral & Community Sciences (CBCS) guidelines for the promotion of faculty in the Research Professor career path. The Research Professor path includes the ranks of Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor. Faculty hired in the Research Professor career path are expected to contribute primarily to the research mission of the College and, over time, are expected to develop an independent, coherent research program consistent with the College mission. These guidelines are designed to support high standards in awarding promotion to ensure a comprehensive, rigorous, and fair review of the candidate's contributions in each area(s) of assigned duties.

Department Guidelines

Criteria for promotion that specify documented and measurable performance outcomes shall be developed and maintained by individual departments/schools within the College. CBCS departments and schools shall define criteria for 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. CBCS departments and schools 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 department website to all members of the department/school. If a department does not have an approved set of guidelines, the faculty member's application will be evaluated using the College guidelines for the Research Professor career path.

Establishing Department Review Committees

Procedures for constituting the department review committee will be specified in the department/school Promotion Guidelines or Governance Document. When establishing Promotion Committees at the department/school level, whenever possible and practical, the following criteria should be followed:

1. When practicable, membership on the department review committee should be limited to faculty members who have been appointed within the unit for at least two years and who serve in the same capacity (i.e., research professor career path);
2. Committees considering candidates for promotion to Professor will be comprised of individuals holding the rank of Research Professor. When practicable and possible, only faculty in the Research Professor career path will review and make recommendations on promotion applications in the same career path. If the unit lacks a sufficient number of Research Professors, the Chair/Director may appoint one or more qualified Research Professors from other units or from the tenured faculty.

3. Review of applications from faculty with joint appointments should reflect appropriate participation by the units to which faculty have been appointed. Thus, chairs/directors and 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 promotion home for the faculty member.
4. Chairs/school directors and deans should neither vote nor participate on any promotion committee discussions. This exclusion applies to Assistant/Associate Deans, Deans or other out-of-unit administrators when they participate in the Research promotion process in support of or as delegated by Chairs, Directors or Deans.
5. 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 review levels.

Assignment of Duties

The faculty member's record must be evaluated commensurate with their assigned duties. Research faculty should be given assignments that allow them to demonstrate accomplishments necessary for promotion. Promotion in the research professor ranks will be granted only to persons who demonstrate excellence in research/scholarly activity and/or other duties, as specified in their assigned faculty duties.

Faculty hired in the Research Professor career path are typically supported by contracts and grants with set deliverables which may dictate a faculty member's primary job responsibilities. These responsibilities must be considered when evaluating a candidate for promotion. Research faculty may be given teaching and/or service assignments depending upon their funding source. University teaching is permissible with approval from the chair/director, depending on the source of funding supporting the position. Thus, evaluation for Research Faculty may involve three components as applicable:

- Research/scholarly work;
- Teaching or comparable activity (including professional training, technical assistance, advising and student research mentoring);
- Service to the University, the profession, and the community.

Community Engagement. Any of the three categories of faculty activity (research, teaching, service) 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 commensurate

with the faculty member's assigned duties. 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."

I. Overview

The minimum criterion for Research Faculty in CBCS is a display of **excellence** in research as well as other areas in which the faculty member has substantive assigned duties. In addition, collegiality and participation as a citizen of the University are integral parts of faculty performance that factor into promotion recommendations. Careful consideration must be given to the candidate's ability and willingness to work cooperatively within the department or school and the college.

Promotion must be awarded only as a result of rigorous assessment over a period of time sufficient to judge the faculty member's documented accomplishments. A judgment must be made that the faculty member's record represents a pattern of continued accomplishment and productivity with potential for high impact on the field or society.

Each recommendation for promotion 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 toward achieving the mission and goals of the unit, college, and university.

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.

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.

II. Documentation of Readiness for Promotion

a. Documentation of 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 CBCS range from research (creation and attainment of new knowledge, whether basic or applied) to the development and implementation of community-engaged 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.

As part of their application packet, candidates must provide documentation of their research/scholarly activities such as: peer-reviewed articles; contract and grants; peer-reviewed technical reports; citations of the candidate's work in high quality journals; peer-reviewed presentations at conferences; evidence of impact on policy and practice; books/book chapters; reviews of books and articles; records of competitive honors, awards, and fellowships; reviews of grant applications; invited publications; research awards and acknowledgements. It is not necessary for the applicant to have accomplishments in each of these areas.

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 as P.I., Co-I, or Co-PI, and to the demonstrable impact of the research through changes in policy, practice, systems, inventions, development and commercialization of intellectual property, and technology transfer. Evaluation of applied research should consider potential or actual impact on policies and practices.

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. The impact of community-engaged research as well as international/global scholarship may be demonstrated by peer reviewed publications as well as by high-profile products such as publications, technical 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. It is the responsibility of the applicant to describe for reviewers the contributions he/she made to collaborative projects, articles, and other reports included in the application for promotion (see Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, or comparable, for examples and clarifications).

The body of work of a candidate 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 commensurate with the faculty member's assigned duties.

Recommendations for promotion in the Research Professor path 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 ongoing and meaningful contributions.

b. Documentation of Teaching/Professional Training/Technical Assistance

Throughout this document, the word teaching shall refer to instruction in university classes, professional training, and technical assistance.

If teaching is part of a faculty member's assigned duties, the record of activities leading to promotion must provide evidence of excellence in teaching. Substantial and diverse evidence of teaching effectiveness must be presented as part of the promotion application when applicable. Each candidate with assigned duties for teaching must present a record of effective, high quality instruction, as specified by the relevant academic unit, that clearly documents the impact the teaching has had on the field.

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 learners; and the ability to work with, motivate, and serve as an inspiring role model for learners. Faculty members with assigned duties for teaching 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. It is essential that an appropriate and independent evaluative review also be obtained. External review by an independent party is highly recommended.

In addition to participant evaluations of instruction, which must be included, a candidate must present documentation of teaching effectiveness in areas to be considered as part of the promotion packet. Examples include: instructional materials (such as case studies, 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 curriculum

development or course redesign; involvement in curriculum development or other collaborative instructional 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 assistants; dissertation and/or thesis director or committee membership; and awards. Approaches to teaching and concomitant sources of evidence of teaching/training effectiveness may vary across fields, units, and candidates, and consequently, variance in candidate portfolios may also be expected.

Evaluation of teaching/training 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 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; in professional training workshops; through service learning activities, community engagement and internships; in laboratories; within on- and off-campus communities, in organizations, in education abroad settings, and through mentoring of students, including undergraduate and graduate student research.

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness in formats and settings outside the university classes should include documentation of the impact of student learning on practice, application, systems, and policy.

Technical Assistance is the timely provision of specialized advice and customized support to resolve specific problems and increase individual and organizational capacity (Barton, 2004). Capacity development is the "process by which individuals, organizations, institutions, and societies develop abilities (individually and collectively) to perform functions, solve problems, and set and achieve objectives (Godfrey et al., 2002). Technical Assistance is provided to (1) help individuals and organizations access resources on specific topics and challenges; (2) assist with policy planning and program implementation; and (3) develop capacity and produce demonstrated impacts at multiple levels. Technical Assistance involves multi-level capacity building along four interrelated dimensions:

- The development of individual skills and the conditions to ensure that skills are used productively;
- The development of effective organizations within which individuals can work;
- The strengthening of interrelationships among entities;

- The development of enabling environments for addressing issues across societal sectors.

Technical assistance may be conducted through a variety of activities including professional training, consultation, expert advice, reviews, policy analysis, provision of resources, and other relevant activities. Effectiveness in technical assistance activities, as well as its impact, must be documented in the application packet. For example, the impact of technical assistance is documented by providing evidence of impact such as the adoption and implementation of models or practices by agencies/states; the increase in knowledge and/or the change in attitudes of key stakeholders; changes in organizations and systems; or changes in policy, procedures, or funding models. For additional information see Blasé, K.A. (2009), *Technical Assistance to Promote Service and System Change*, Technical Assistance Center on Social Emotional Intervention or similar documents related to implementation and impact.

c. Documentation of Service

The evaluation of service refers to the candidate's contributions to (1) the University (which could be at the level of department/school, college, or university), (2) the professional field or discipline, and (3) to the community. If service is part of a faculty member's assigned duties, candidates for promotion must have made substantive contributions in one or more of these areas.

Documentation of service to the University, such as service on the USF Faculty Senate, College Councils, and committees, should go beyond a simple enumeration of membership and should include the contributions the faculty member made to the process and include an evaluation of the extent and quality of the services rendered.

Service to the profession may include service to organizations, editorial review boards, and other forms of contributions. Service to the community may include contributions to 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 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.

III. Criteria for Promotion

The judgment of readiness for promotion to higher academic rank is based upon a careful

evaluation of a candidate's contributions in research, teaching (or comparable activity appropriate to the unit), and service as commensurate with the faculty member's assigned duties. The evaluation refers to written department/school (or college) criteria for promotion that have been made available to candidates. Promotion 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 within the department guidelines.

General standards for consideration of promotion to the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor follow. In each category, a candidate's achievements are evaluated in relation to criteria specified in the department/school guidelines (if available) for the rank sought as well as the candidate's assignment of duties within the unit. Categories, criteria, and types of evidence for research/scholarly work may vary across departments/schools.

a. Research Associate Professor

In order to obtain promotion to Research Associate Professor, a faculty member must have a clearly documented, continuous, and progressive record of research and scholarship indicative of potential for sustained contribution and distinction throughout her or his career.

1. Research: Promotion to Associate Professor requires a record of excellence with an increasing trajectory of independent and/or collaborative research/scholarly work, supported by substantial and sustained peer-reviewed journal publications or their equivalent as described in this document.

The role of Research Assistant Professor often requires the faculty member to conduct work on behalf of other faculty members who serve as PI and who take the lead role in grant writing and publication. Therefore, it is not necessary for a Research Assistant Faculty member who is seeking promotion to Research Associate Professor to have yet developed their own independent line of research, to be a PI on a grant, or to have a large number of first-authored peer reviewed journal publications. However, the faculty member must demonstrate a trajectory of increased leadership and a record of initial independence in order to be promoted to Research Associate Professor.

2. Teaching: If applicable, a record of excellence in teaching/training/technical assistance or other comparable activity appropriate for the unit (see section on teaching in this document for additional detail on methods to document teaching excellence).

3. Service: If applicable, a record of substantive contribution of service to the University, profession, and/or public.

b. Research Professor

In order to attain promotion to Research Professor, a faculty member is expected to have established an original, coherent, and meaningful program of research or scholarship even when working in a collaborative team. Compelling evidence of significant achievement among peers in one's discipline or professional field must be shown at the national level. Any recommendation for promotion to the rank of Professor must contain evidence that such distinction has been established. National reputation is evidenced by activities such as the following:

- invited and/or peer-reviewed research presentations at national conferences;
- reviewer of manuscripts for peer-reviewed journals and/or service on editorial boards;
- service on grant review panels;
- service on national advisory boards;
- contributions to national professional organizations by serving on committees, reviewing conference proposals, assuming a leadership position, organizing events;
- awards from national organizations or groups;
- invitations to work on grants as a collaborator with researchers who have established national reputations;
- other activities that indicate the faculty member's expertise is recognized and that his/her research has gained national attention.

It is not necessary for a faculty member to have documented activities in each of these areas. However, the faculty member should demonstrate substantive and sustained contributions in two or more of these areas or have broad-based, yet focused, experience across multiple areas.

1. Research: Promotion to Research Professor requires that the faculty member to have a record of excellence in research/scholarly work of at least national visibility and to have developed an original, coherent, and meaningful program of research. This record must be supported by a record of substantial peer-reviewed, first authored journal publications or their equivalent, as well as a record as PI on contracts or grants. In assessing the equivalency of products to first authored journal publications, reviewers should consider high-profile products such as technical reports, formal presentations to local, national, or international agencies, or other products. The impact of these products must be documented in the application packet to assist with the review process.

Categories, criteria, types of evidence for research/scholarly work may vary across departments/schools.

2. Teaching: If applicable, a record of sustained excellence in teaching or other comparable activity appropriate for the unit and commensurate with the faculty member's assigned duties.
3. Service: If applicable, 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 and commensurate with the faculty member's assigned duties.

IV. Timing of Application for Promotion

Following an initial period in rank, normally at least two years, a candidate may apply for promotion when there is clear evidence that he or she has fully met the applicable criteria. Additional merit beyond the normal criteria for promotion, specified clearly in department/school Research Faculty promotion documents, should not be required.

V. Preparation for Seeking Promotion

a. Mid-Point Progress Review

The decision to apply for promotion is optional. Those who elect to seek promotion will ordinarily undergo a mid-point progress review. At approximately the mid-point of the typical interval between promotion to a higher rank, faculty members will ordinarily be given a more comprehensive review of progress toward promotion, to include participation by the relevant department and college promotion committees. Letters from external reviewers are not required for the mid-promotion review. 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. The mid-point review is optional but is strongly encouraged.

b. Process for Initiating Promotion

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to inform the department chair/school director (or division director where applicable) that he/she wants to apply for promotion. Faculty who are considering applying for promotion should initiate the process by first consulting with the department chair/school director (or division director where applicable) 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.

c. External Letters for Promotion Applications

The department chair/school director ordinarily will include in the 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 research 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 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 Research Promotion Committee.

d. Identification of Candidates

At the beginning of each calendar year (January - February), chairs/directors will begin the process for 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 chair/ director that he or she would like the promotion or mid-promotion process to be initiated.

Applications for promotion or mid-promotion review shall be initiated by the candidates during the spring term preceding the submission of the packet in the following fall term. Chairs/directors should ensure that candidates have received current department/school and college 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.

Application forms are available on the CBCS Intranet in the Tenure and Promotion section. Dates for the timeline are established by the Dean's office on an annual basis and are posted in this same location on the CBCS Intranet.

e. 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 department chair/school director is responsible for assisting faculty in preparing their promotion application. The following guidelines should be used by faculty in preparing promotion applications:

1. In general, items/accomplishments should be entered in only one category, either teaching or research or service. In rare instances, items may be included in two or more sections. In these circumstances, justification must be provided.
2. 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 the application packet to describe the difference in assigned faculty duties for purposes of 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.
3. Faculty members are responsible for completing and including the CBCS summary of peer-reviewed publications that may be found on the [Tenure and Promotion website](#).
4. 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.
5. Activities included in the section on innovative teaching/training 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.

f. Submission of Completed Promotion Packet

At the beginning of the Fall semester, candidates should submit a completed 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 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 portfolio. 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 promotion committee. The candidate may add or update

information in the packet at any time prior to the onset of the final review by the Dean's Office. This information should be placed in the Amendment Section of the application.

VI. Review Process

The department/school Research Faculty Promotion Committee will first review the candidate's application packet. Following the committee review, the chair/director of the department/school will review the packet. The packet will then be sent to the Dean's Office for review by the College Committee. After the College Committee has completed its work, the Dean will review the recommendations of all reviewers and make a final, independent decision regarding promotion.

a. Evaluation by Faculty of the Candidate's Department/School

Duties of Department Committee

The department/school will create a Promotion Committee for the Research Professor career path as specified in the department governance document or other document. The purpose of this committee is to review applications for promotion and to provide faculty recommendations to the chair/school director on each application. The department/school promotion committee shall review and evaluate each application packet for promotion in accordance with the department/school criteria.

All committee discussions regarding the 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.

The Chair of the Department Promotion Committee shall be responsible for: (1) writing the evaluation of the majority opinion of the Departmental Promotion Committee; (2) entering the vote of the committee and other required information into the promotion application; and, (3) signing the application on behalf of the committee.

The review and evaluation by department's promotion committee must occur by the timeline published annually by the Dean's Office.

Candidate Meeting With Committee

Candidates for 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.

Review of Application Materials

All members of promotion committees are expected to review the application files as well as the promotion guidelines/criteria from the applicant's department prior to discussion or voting. Committee members at the department/school level will confine themselves to making decisions based solely on the information provided in the candidate's official 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.

Voting

The committee members will vote on promotion for each candidate application by secret ballot. Following a vote by secret ballot, the ballots will be counted immediately in the presence of committee members and the tally will be recorded. 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 as part of the applicant's packet. Where a split evaluation exists, a minority report may accompany the majority recommendation.

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 because he/she may be useful in educating the committee about the structure of the candidate's field. However, he/she must abstain from voting unless there are mitigating circumstances that would indicate otherwise. In such cases, the Promotion Committee Chair should consult with the chair/director who should consult with the Dean's Office to make a final determination about participation.

b. Evaluation by the Department Chair/School Director

The chair/director shall review the application for promotion of each candidate and the recommendations of the department/school committee. The chair/director will then add an evaluative letter and indicate his/her recommendation for 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.

c. Review by College Research and Promotion Committee

Duties of College Committee

The Dean's Office, in consultation with the Faculty Council, will constitute a College Promotion Committee for the Research Professor career path as specified in the CBCS governance document. The purpose of this committee is to review applications for promotion and to provide advice to the Dean on each application.

Evaluations of candidates for promotion to Research Professor must be reviewed by a committee containing at least three faculty members with the rank of Professor. Prior to the initial meeting of the promotion 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 Promotion Committee is responsible for ensuring that the committee is appropriately constituted.

A representative of the Dean's office will convene the first meeting to discuss the relevant rules, guidelines, and procedures and will provide the committee members with copies of all documents pertinent to their reviews.

All committee discussions regarding the 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.

The Chair of the College Promotion Committee shall be responsible for the following:

- (1) ensuring that the application materials are maintained in a secure location during the review process;
- (2) ensuring that all committee members receive and review both the college and department promotion guidelines (when available) for Research Faculty;
- (3) ensuring that the guidelines and criteria are adhered to during the review, discussion, and voting process;
- (4) reminding all committee members that the requirement that all discussion and written narrative materials be held in confidence within the group;
- (5) 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;
- (6) ensuring the accuracy of the written narrative;
- (7) entering the vote of the committee and other required information into the promotion application;
- (8) signing the application on behalf of the committee; and
- (9) delivering the ballots to the Associate Dean immediately following the deliberations.

The review and evaluation by college promotion committee must occur by the timeline published annually by the Dean's Office.

Candidate Meeting With Committee

Candidates for promotion may request a meeting with the college 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.

Review of Application Materials

College committee members should review and be thoroughly familiar with the documents offered to support the applications. Candidates and responsible departmental representatives should supply the college committee members and the Dean with complete, clear, and accurate information.

After each member of the College's Promotion Committee has reviewed the candidate's application, 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/college criteria for promotion commensurate with the faculty member's assigned duties. The Committee must not apply standards that are lower than or different than those specified in the department/school/college criteria or college guidelines.

College Promotion Committee members shall confine themselves to making decisions solely upon the information provided in each candidate's official 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 Promotion Committee Chair to solicit additional information, if necessary. All requests for additional information must be made in writing by the Promotion 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

Voting on a candidate by the College Promotion Committee will be by secret ballot. Following a vote by secret ballot, the ballots will be counted immediately in the presence of committee members and the tally will be recorded. The 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 Promotion Committee must sign the recommendation forms for each candidate.

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 College promotion committee member is from the same department as a candidate for promotion, or if a member has a 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 promotion committee Chair should consult with the Dean's Office to make a final determination on participation.

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

d. Review by the Dean of the College

After the recommendations of the College Promotion Committee are final, the packet will be forwarded to the Dean. The Dean shall review the application, the recommendations of the department/school and college committees, the

recommendations of the chair/school director, and the results of the external review. The Dean shall then complete the appropriate sections of the Promotion Application Form. The Dean's recommendation shall focus exclusively on how well the candidate meets the department/school and college criteria for promotion.

The decision regarding applications for promotion in the Research Professor career path remain within the College. The Dean makes the final determination for promotion.

The Associate Dean will inform the chair/director when the Dean's evaluation is complete. The chair/director will then pick up the packet and discuss the evaluative materials with the applicant. Within ten days following the completion of the Dean's review, the faculty member may request a meeting with the Dean to discuss the recommendation and supporting materials.

In any case where the recommendation of the Dean differs from that of a candidate's chair/director and/or the department/school committee, the Dean will inform the candidate and the chair/director of the candidate's department/school, in writing. The chair/director, the candidate or, at the candidate's discretion, a faculty colleague chosen by the candidate, will then be given an opportunity to respond to the Dean in writing. This brief, written response shall be attached to the file.

Approval History

Approved by CBCS Research Faculty, July 18, 2016

Reviewed by Dean with recommended changes, August 4, 2016

Friendly amendment concurrence by faculty, August 18, 2016