Department Guidelines for Developing T&P Criteria

Charge and Deadline
The charge for each CAS department, according to the 2015 USF Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, is as follows:

The academic units of the University will define criteria for tenure and promotion according to the standards of their respective fields and disciplines, with specific expectations for types and levels of achievement and how they will be measured and documented. Tenure and promotion guidelines at all levels are expected to recognize and value contributions that support USF’s prevailing strategic priorities.

May 15, 2015 is the deadline for submitting a draft of departmental T&P criteria to the CAS Dean’s Office. Reviews and approvals will take place in summer 2015.

Guidelines
These guidelines are divided into three sections: Preliminary Items, Developing Criteria for Teaching, Developing Criteria for Research, and Developing Criteria for Service. Please think about the ideas included here as starting places for discussion among faculty. At the end of the process, department criteria should provide clear and helpful answers to these questions:

a) What does a junior faculty member need to know about expectations in this department?

b) How is this document a resource—throughout tenure-earning years—for a faculty member to make appropriate choices?

c) How is this document a guide for tenured faculty in making recommendations to grant or deny tenure?

Preliminary Items to Include
1. A mission statement with the department’s goals regarding teaching, research, and service.
How do these T&P criteria promote the achievement of these goals? For example, the Department of Chemistry at USF includes this statement as part of the evaluation of all research faculty:

The Department of Chemistry has achieved a National and International reputation in research excellence. As such our tenured/tenure track faculty are expected to make substantial contributions to this reputation through a wide variety of scholarly activities including the securing of extramural research support (i.e., both Federal and Private research funding), peer reviewed publications, books and book chapters, published narratives, etc., invited seminars and colloquia, Patents and Licenses, etc.
2. **A statement that refers candidates to School Research Expectations (if applicable), College Procedures, and University T&P guidelines.** For example, 

   *In addition to these criteria, candidates should familiarize themselves with the University T&P Guidelines, the College of Arts and Sciences T&P Procedures, the Research Expectations in the School of Humanities, and the Collective Bargaining Agreement.*

3. **A description of the tenure and promotion procedures in the department.**

   This section should outline the typical procedure in your department, including the involvement of eligible faculty, faculty committees, writing of narratives, and the timing of each step. Make sure to explain the following items in your outline.

   a) At what levels are tenure and promotion recommendations made in the department? (for example, three levels--faculty evaluation committee, all tenured faculty, and chair)

   b) At what levels are there formal votes? Are these votes recorded in the candidate's application?

   c) Who is eligible to vote in tenure cases? In other words, how is “faculty” defined? (emeritus, affiliate, % of joint appointment, on sabbatical, etc.)

   d) How is the vote conducted? (secret ballot, at a meeting, during a window of time at faculty’s convenience, etc.)

   e) How and when is the faculty narrative created? to whom is it available and when?

4. **This section should outline the required and recommended materials to be submitted by the candidate for faculty and chair review.**

   a) Required materials include: Tenure application with Annual evaluations in FAIR, Course evaluations in FAIR, Mid-tenure evaluations at all levels

   b) Recommended materials: This section should coach candidates on the content and length of required narratives on teaching, research, and service, as well as suggest supplementary materials to be included to facilitate faculty review.
Developing Criteria for Evaluating Teaching

1. **Restate the goal/mission of the department regarding teaching.** How do the teaching criteria promote achievement of this goal?

2. **List of activities** considered important in the department for evaluating teaching and statements about the relative weights of the activities.
   a) What is minimally required?
   b) What marks a standard for excellence?
   c) What evidence of teaching effectiveness is expected by the time of the review?

The list of teaching activities in the current T&P application may be helpful in generating these lists and statements:
- Teaching Awards and Other Recognition
- Textbooks Published
- New Courses Developed
- Collaborative Efforts with Colleagues to Improve Teaching
- Scholarly Papers Published on Teaching in Your Field
- Innovative Methods
- Training Grants
- Other

Also helpful may be the list of teaching activities in the 2015 USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines:
- In addition to course syllabi and student evaluations, a candidate may present the following kinds of documentation of teaching effectiveness: instructional materials (such as case studies, labs, discussion prompts, group projects), assessment activities and products (such as papers, tests, performances, problem sets), and other material used in connection with courses; new course development, course redesign, and adaptation to new formats and media through incorporation of emerging technologies; professional development activities and efforts at improvement; peer observations and evaluations; student performance on pre- and post-instruction measures; exemplary student work and outcomes; records of advising and mentoring; supervision of teaching and research assistants; thesis direction; and teaching awards. Approaches to teaching and concomitant sources of evidence of teaching effectiveness may vary across fields, units, and candidates; consequently, variance in candidate portfolios may also be expected.

3. What is expected in the department regarding **graduate student supervision, mentoring, advising**? What is expected for service on dissertation and/or thesis committees? How does graduate student progress and graduation factor into these expectations?

4. What is expected in the department regarding supervision of **post-doctoral scholars**?

5. What is expected in the department regarding **Honors’ thesis direction and committee membership**? Undergraduate research experience?

6. What are department procedures concerning **peer observation of teaching**? Who can observe a class and write a review? Is there a specific form or template for observing and evaluating?
7. How are **student evaluations of teaching** considered? Is there an expectation that ratings will meet departmental and/or college averages? For any discussion of the role of student evaluations, it may be helpful to review this section. “2. Evaluation for Tenure a.Teaching,” in the 2015 USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines:

Evaluation of teaching must take into consideration an academic unit’s instructional mission; an instructor’s assignment of duties within unit; class size, scope, and sequence within the curriculum; as well as format of delivery and the types of instructional media utilized. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness should consider the wide range of factors that impact student learning and success. Moreover, effective teaching and its impact on learning can take place in a variety of contexts: in campus classrooms; team teaching; online; in the field; in clinical settings; workshops; panels; through service learning activities, community engagement and internships; in laboratories; within on- and off-campus communities, in organizations, in education abroad settings, such as field schools, and through mentoring of students, including undergraduate and graduate student research. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness in formats and settings outside the classroom should include consideration of the impact of student learning on practice, application, and policy.

7. Any other factors relevant to reviews of teaching in this field.
Developing Criteria for Evaluating Research/Creative/Scholarly Work

1. **Restate the goal/mission of the department regarding research/scholarship/creative** activity and link the criteria to that goal.

2. **List of activities** considered important in the department for evaluating research/creative activity and statements about the relative weights of the activities.
   a) What is minimally required?
   b) What marks a standard for excellence?
   c) What evidence of research productivity is expected by the time of the review?

The list of research/creative activities in the current T&P application may be helpful in generating these lists and statements:

- **Publications**
  - books
  - textbooks
  - chapters or segments of books
  - refereed articles
  - non-refereed articles
  - technical reports
  - book reviews

- **Other Research and Creative Activities**
  - Creative Non-Published Works
  - Works
  - Exhibitions
  - Performances/Competitions
  - Other Creative Activities

- **Grants and Contracts**

This list of activities in the 2015 USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines may be helpful:

A candidate may present the following kinds of documentation of a significant research program: reviews of books and articles; records of competitive honors and awards, grants, and fellowships; criticism and reviews of creative work; reviews of grant applications; citations of the candidate's work; evidence of impact on policy and practice; the quality and significance of journals, series, and presses by which the candidate's work is published or of other venues in which it appears; invited, refereed, or non-refereed status of publications; research awards and acknowledgements; and invitations and commissions. Like teaching portfolios, the kinds of documentation will vary among fields, units, and individuals, and candidates should not be expected to provide forms of documentation that are not typical in their disciplines. Where appropriate, consideration will be given to external peer recognition, as demonstrated by a record of funded research, and to the demonstrable impact of research through inventions, development and commercialization of intellectual property, and technology transfer.

3. **What are the expectations for the quality of research/scholarship?** How will this quality be measured?
4. What are the expectations for the **quantity** of research/scholarship? What record of achievement is expected by the time of review?

   **Important:** Any specific number, or range of numbers, offered in department criteria must align with the past three years of successful tenure cases. These research records, by School, are available on the Faculty Affairs website at:  
   [http://www.cas.usf.edu/facultyaffairs/research/](http://www.cas.usf.edu/facultyaffairs/research/)

5. What is the expectation for applying for and/or receiving external funding? internal funding?

6. What weight is given to external reviewers? How are external reviewers’ comments generally incorporated into narratives?

7. For disciplines with community-engaged scholarship and/or interdisciplinary research, this excerpt from the 2015 USF T&P Guidelines may be useful in spelling out expectations:

   It is noted that in some areas of scholarship, publications or other products may appear only after lengthy or extensive effort and may appear in a wider range of venues, both of which can be particularly true of community-engaged and/or interdisciplinary work at the local, national and/or international levels. Community-engaged scholarship may be demonstrated by high-profile products such as reports to local, national, or international agencies and formal presentations, or by other products as designated by the unit, as well as by peer review. For collaborative and coauthored scholarship, the evaluation should include consideration of the candidate’s role and contribution to the work, consistent with disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary scholarly practice.

8. Any other factors relevant to reviews of scholarship in the field.

---

**Developing Criteria for Evaluating Service**

1. Restate the goal/mission of the department regarding **service and link this criteria** to that goal.

2. A list of **typical service activities** at the department, college, university, discipline/profession, and community.

3. What record of service is expected at the time of review? How does this record constitute “**substantive**” service in your department?