

## UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

### POLICIES RELATING TO STANDARDS TO BE APPLIED IN AWARDING TENURE AND PROMOTION

#### I. General Criteria

While the university-wide document pertaining to tenure and promotion applies to all of the colleges in the university, the purpose of this tenure and promotion policy document is to provide general criteria for faculty in the USF College of Business.

Candidates should also consult the University of South Florida document “Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion” (<http://files.acad.usf.edu/facprogdev/5464.pdf>)

The college, or department with the concurrence of the college, may apply in individual cases to the provost for an exemption from any of these Policies for exceptional legitimate and valid reasons. The college or department has the burden of convincing the Provost that the exemption adds value and fairness to the evaluation.

Any faculty member or administrator who would otherwise participate in the recommendation to grant or deny a promotion should be disqualified if that person has a relationship or financial interest that would give the appearance of biasing that person either in favor or against the candidate. Conflicts of interest exist not because actual bias is assumed, but because of the appearance of a lack of sufficient impartiality. Whether a disqualifying conflict of interest does exist often presents the difficult question of degree and it depends upon a determination by a participant in the process to identify the conflict and to disqualify her or himself when appropriate. In lieu of disqualification, it can be sufficient that the circumstances giving rise to an apparent conflict of interest be fully disclosed. When disqualification is required, that can be effected by a decision of a member of the college not to vote or otherwise participate in the evaluation process. At a stage of the process involving a single decision-maker, such as the department chair or the collegiate dean, more burdensome arrangements for a substitute decision-maker would have to be made.

#### II. Tenure

##### A. Tenure Decision

The decision to grant tenure is one of the most critical in university life and is unparalleled in other organizations. Tenure anticipates the quality of

contact between a faculty member and literally thousands of students. The granting of tenure must be the result of a careful analysis of a faculty member's consistent record of achievement and contribution in scholarship, teaching, and service to the university, profession, and community.

The university's decision to recommend the granting of tenure must be made on the basis of a faculty member's activities and accomplishments over a period of time sufficient in length to judge the substance and regularity of teaching, scholarly research and publications, and service contributions. The review must lead to the conclusion that the colleague possesses teaching and scholarship skills necessary to contribute to and accommodate changes in the content of his or her profession or academic discipline, and the readiness to contribute to the university and the community.

Faculty members must have a consistent pattern of positive evaluation in teaching and substantive scholarly contributions judged to be significant and current. Outstanding performance in research and at least strong performance in teaching are required for awarding tenure. Service contributions to the university, profession, and community are also necessary. Participation in the governance of the institution is both a right and obligation of every faculty member.

This university's decision to recommend tenure and the Board of Trustees decision to grant it must be based on documented, substantial, and continuous contributions in scholarship/research/creative activity and teaching sufficient to forecast a career pattern. The number of publications alone, for instance, is not a sufficient indicator of scholarly contribution. One key monograph that changes the course of an area of study in one's discipline along with additional, yet unpublished, work related to that area might represent such sustained and substantial effort. A monograph of less importance and impact might not. Similarly, numerous journal articles or other contributions, important though not benchmark accomplishments in one's field, may serve to accumulate a record of substantive contributions. The judgment that must be made in the tenure decision is whether there is a record of scholarly accomplishment that reliably will predict a career of continued scholarly growth and contribution worthy of a significant and diverse university.

Just as university standards will not support the granting of tenure to an individual whose record lacks substantive contribution of a scholarly nature, so too, persons who are judged to be even superior scholars will not be granted tenure without sustained and positive evaluations of effectiveness in teaching and contributing knowledge to students. It is

recognized that contributions in the area of service are also necessary for the granting of tenure at the University of South Florida.

B. Criteria for Performance Evaluation

1. Evidence of the quality and quantity of research and other scholarly work as measured by the following where the order indicates priority:
  - a. Research culminating in publications in high quality, refereed journals. Each department will maintain a list of refereed journals that are considered to be of high quality.
  - b. Scholarly books and monographs published.
  - c. Research culminating in publications in other academic and professional journals that are not included in section B.1.a.
  - d. Citation analyses from sources such as the Social Science Citation Index and Google Scholar.
  - e. Grant-funded research and reports.
  - f. Research culminating in papers presented at professional meetings.
  - g. Research culminating in "Faculty Working Papers."
  - h. Other

Comment: Faculty committees and administrators responsible for tenure evaluations should have the opportunity to review not only the resume (vita) listings, but also the original evidence. Thus, a faculty member who wishes to be considered for tenure should assemble the results of her or his research and writing efforts for such review.

2. The quality of teaching in different areas at varying levels of sophistication as measured by:
  - a. Content of material offered in courses taught as evidenced by course syllabi, course handouts, examinations and other course material.
  - b. Reception by students in courses taught as evidenced by

student evaluations of teaching.

- c. Evaluations of teaching by faculty peers based on reviews of materials indicated in (a) and class visitations.
- d. Dedication to effective teaching as demonstrated through continuous improvement and efforts to correct identified deficiencies.
- e. Development of teaching materials, including textbooks and published cases, and innovative pedagogical techniques.
- f. Course development in degree and non-degree programs.

Comment: Faculty Committees and Administrators responsible for tenure evaluations should have the opportunity to review both summarized and original evidence. It will be the responsibility of the faculty member, in conjunction with her or his department chair, to make sure all the teaching support evidence is available and assembled properly for such review.

- 3. The quality, quantity, and importance of the service contribution may include such activities as:
  - a. Service to the department, college, and university in the form of committee work or other program assignments.
  - b. Sponsoring or advising university organizations.
  - c. Developing and presenting continuing education or professional programs.
  - d. Effective consulting with public agencies.
  - e. Work with professional and academic organizations.
  - f. Editorial Board review and other journal article refereeing activities.
  - g. Research performed for public and private organizations.
  - h. Professional work with community organizations.

Comment: Service should be evaluated on the basis of

involvement in the university, public, or private sector which has resulted in a valuable professional contribution.

### III. Qualifications for Academic Rank

The judgment of readiness for academic rank is based upon scholarship, teaching, and service contributions. It is not the intent of the university to reject or approve recommendations for promotion solely on the basis of "time in rank." While significant time is typically necessary to accumulate the necessary record of professional accomplishment, exceptional persons whose contributions have been rapidly recognized may submit applications for promotion without regard for time in rank. Moreover, the categorical items found within the "Criteria for Performance Evaluation" used in making tenure decisions (listed in Section I-B) should serve as the general guidelines for the necessary information to be used in the process of assessing the faculty member's professional accomplishments.

#### A. Associate Professor

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor requires:

1. Outstanding performance in research,
2. At least strong performance in teaching, and
3. Acceptable service contributions.

Outstanding performance in research can be demonstrated by publishing in academic journals in the candidate's field that are widely recognized as being top ranked. Outstanding performance in research can also be demonstrated by publications in other respected academic outlets that constitute a focused program of research achievement. It is the responsibility of the candidate to present compelling evidence that one of the above criteria for outstanding performance in research has been met and that the candidate is achieving a national reputation for research contributions.

The record must demonstrate professional accomplishment beyond the doctoral or terminal degree level.

At the University of South Florida College of Business, the rank of Associate Professor signifies accomplishment in scholarship, teaching, and service worthy of the status of a member of the senior faculty. This rank is reserved for those whose accomplishments have achieved significance both in the individual's field and the university.

## B. Full Professor

The rank of Full Professor reflects a composite of an individual's continuing academic and service contributions and accomplishments within the institution (USF) as well as to her or his respective discipline or profession. Moreover, the rank of Full Professor denotes a status and level of significant achievement among her or his disciplinary peers. With few exceptions, to achieve the rank of Full Professor, the candidate must demonstrate national or international recognition for his/her scholarship. Standards call for true distinction in at least one of the three areas of teaching, scholarly research, and service, coupled with a record of substantial achievements in each of the other two areas. That is to say, University-wide and College of Business standards do not permit appointment to the rank of Full Professor without significant distinction, documented on a career basis, in either the teaching, scholarly research, or service area of responsibility. Regardless of the area of distinction, substantial contributions of a continuing nature in each of the remaining areas are also necessary for the achievement of the rank of Full Professor. While assessments of the individual's contributions and accomplishments are on an entire career basis, more emphasis will be placed on those achievements recognized following the individual's promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and/or during his or her tenure at USF.

## REVIEW OF PROGRESS TOWARDS TENURE

An annual review of each faculty member is required and used to evaluate a faculty member's performance. The evaluation is based on the faculty member's self-generated activity report, evaluations of teaching efforts, and other pertinent data concerning the faculty member's efforts. This annual review is an appropriate time for the department chairperson/director and an appropriate unit committee to evaluate faculty who are untenured and in tenure-earning positions as to the progress they have made toward being awarded tenure by the university. This evaluation should be in writing with a copy given to the faculty member who may then respond to the tenure evaluation if he or she chooses. The evaluation should be made in view of the university and college's mission and goals, the faculty member's annual assignment, the faculty member's activity report, and the evaluation of that report.

Within the written evaluation of the faculty member's progress toward earning tenure, there should be a very complete and explicit explanation of how the candidate's evaluation was derived, whether or not the faculty member is making satisfactory progress towards achieving tenure, and if not, why not. If the candidate is not making satisfactory progress toward being granted tenure, the evaluation should indicate those areas that need improvement and provide suggestions as to how the deficiencies may be corrected.

Upon completion of three years in a tenure-earning position at the university, each faculty member is given a particularly thorough and comprehensive review for the purposes of deciding whether the faculty member has made satisfactory progress towards tenure; if the performance level is likely to continue in the future; and whether or not the faculty member should be offered a continuing contract or a terminal contract. This evaluation, referred to as the "third-year review," should be made before the university's deadline for extending terminal contracts expires and also allow enough time for the faculty member to appeal the evaluation if so desired.

Third-year reviews will be performed initially at the academic-unit level and subsequently by the college TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE. Documentation for these reviews shall parallel that of the tenure and promotion process except that outside reviews shall not be requested. The TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE shall provide a report to the dean, department chairs, and school of accountancy director. The report shall include an analysis of strengths and weaknesses of the case as well as a statement as to whether or not the COMMITTEE believes the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion. After the TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE submits its report, a joint meeting of the candidate, department chair or school of accountancy director, and the dean will be held to discuss the candidate's progress toward tenure and/or promotion. Annual reviews, other than the third-year review, shall be carried out solely by the academic unit.

Prior to beginning the formal initiation of the tenure/promotion process, a faculty member should request a consultation with his or her chairperson/director and the college (and campus) dean(s) regarding the faculty member's progress toward being awarded tenure. At this meeting, the faculty member should be given advice on whether or not to begin the formal tenure/promotion process.

## COLLEGE TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW PROCESS

A college TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE shall be established, consisting of one tenured Full Professor from each academic unit (i.e., department or school) elected by a vote of the members of that academic unit who are eligible to vote on tenure and promotion matters or who hold a tenure-earning position. In years where there is an exceptional number of cases to be reviewed, a second TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE may be established. This second TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE must also be comprised of one elected tenured Full Professor from each academic unit. In this special case, the committees must meet jointly before issuing their final recommendation in order to ensure the consistency of their recommendations. The TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE shall review all cases relative to tenure and/or promotion, as specified below.

Tenure and/or promotion reviews will be performed initially by the academic unit, then by the college TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE (or, in the case, of regional campus faculty, the JOINT TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE), and finally by a COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE. The COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE shall consist of all college faculty eligible to vote on tenure and/or promotion cases. All tenured voting members of the COLLEGE FACULTY, as defined in the Faculty Charter, shall be eligible to vote on tenure decisions. Only tenured voting members of the COLLEGE FACULTY holding the rank to which promotion is sought, or a higher rank, shall be eligible to vote on promotion decisions. The TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE shall provide a report to the COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE. The report shall include an analysis of strengths and weaknesses of the case as well as the TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE's vote, both of which shall be made a part of the candidate's tenure and/or promotion packet. To encourage attendance at the meeting of the COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE, we recommend that the meeting date and time be announced early in the fall term.

## CONTENTS AND FORM OF THE TENURE/PROMOTION PACKET

To assure uniformity of all faculty members' tenure and promotion packets, the following contents are recommended:

1. A complete and current up-to-date academic curriculum vitae.
2. A minimum of four outside letters evaluating the faculty member's scholarly



- activities.
3. The required university documents completed with all of the required evaluations and votes recorded.
  4. An appendix including a summary of all teaching evaluations prepared by an appropriate department/unit committee. Peer evaluations of the faculty member's teaching should also be included.
  5. A complete set of scholarly works that have been used in the chairperson/director and unit committee's evaluations.
  6. A list of all professional papers delivered at meetings indicating the review process and whether a complete paper or an abstract is required in the review process.
  7. A list of all published works, with complete scholarly citation. The department chairperson/director should provide an indication of the quality of the journals in which the candidate has published and also the degree of contribution of the candidate to co-authored publications.
  8. Results of citation analyses showing the number of times the faculty member's scholarly work has been cited.
  9. A complete set of all annual evaluations by the chairperson/director and any appropriate faculty committees.
  10. A complete set of all reviews of "Progress Made Toward Tenure" made by the chairperson/director and any appropriate faculty committees.

#### TENURE/PROMOTION PROCESS DATES

The college Tenure and Promotion Review Committee should be appointed by the dean of the college no later than the second week in September.

All early consultations with the dean and chairperson/director regarding the initiation of tenure/promotion should be completed by May 1st of the previous academic year.

Completed tenure/promotion packets should be made available to the college Tenure/Promotion Review Committee no later than the third week in October.

Tenure College faculty holding appropriate rank to vote on a tenure/promotion matter should meet and vote on the tenure/promotion applications no later than the second week in December.

## PROCEDURES FOR SELECTING OUTSIDE REVIEWERS

All currently employed faculty applying for tenure or for promotion to Associate or Full Professor are required by COBA policy to have their research/scholarship/creative work evaluated by "external" reviewers who are generally recognized for their contributions and stature in the field. These assessments are to be based upon a detailed review of the candidates' written work, not simply a scrutiny of a curriculum vita. Faculty members, in consultation with the chair and dean, will choose what material to forward for review and may include, for example, manuscripts in press and submitted, non-published and in-progress work, as well as conventional publications. These reviews become part of the Tenure/Promotion Application and contribute to the basis upon which reviews and recommendations are made at all levels. The tenure/promotion candidate has the right to examine the outside reviews. The letter of solicitation to the outside reviewer should clearly indicate the candidate's option of seeing the outside evaluation.

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion are expected to follow the external review process described in the promotion and tenure application. Specifically, candidates should recommend at least five reviewers to their department chair. Recommendations should be accompanied by brief statements supporting the choices. If reviewers are recommended who have had significant previous contact with the candidate, reasons for that choice should be represented in sufficient detail to allay proper concerns about conflict of interest. While previous contact on a professional level does not constitute a conflict of interest, reviewers should not be selected from those with whom the candidate has had familiar or close social relationships, who are former professors of the candidate, or co-authors of the candidate (except to ascertain levels of participation and contribution to jointly author works). Reviewers should be highly regarded and recognized scholars in the candidate's field and able to evaluate the quality, productivity, and significance of his/her scholarly research activity. Reviewers should ideally be from peer or better institutions and should also be tenured faculty members at higher academic ranks (for decisions regarding promotion) and tenured faculty at the same or higher academic ranks (for decisions regarding tenure only).

The department chairperson, in consultation with the department review committee, should also provide a list of five reviewers from peer or better institutions. These should also be tenured faculty members at higher academic ranks (for decisions regarding promotion) and tenured faculty at the same or higher academic ranks (for decisions regarding tenure only). For candidates seeking tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, at least two of the external reviewers should be full professors, while external reviewers who are associate professors should ideally hold endowed positions and/or be nationally known for expertise in a field. The chairperson will share the department's list of potential external reviewers with the candidate. The candidate shall identify any potential external reviewers with whom the candidate has worked in any capacity and describe the nature of the relationship. If the candidate believes that

any potential external reviewer(s) on the list might be unfairly biased, the candidate may submit a written letter of objection to the department chairperson. If the candidate submits such a letter, the chairperson will enter it into the candidate's promotion file.

In consultation with the dean (and, if one exists, the campus dean, or the department's promotion and tenure committee), the chairperson/director will select a minimum of four individuals (with equal numbers from the candidate's and department's lists) from whom reviews will be solicited. In the event the chairperson/director believes additional recommendations are desirable or necessary, then (1) the candidate should be requested to make supplementary recommendations, and (2) the chairperson/director may suggest additional reviewers to the candidate. Ordinarily this process should result in a list of reviewers acceptable to the candidate, the chairperson/director, and the college (and campus) dean(s). Should agreement not be reached in this fashion, the college's tenure and promotion committee will, in consultation with the college (and campus) dean(s), select review candidates from lists provided by the candidate and the chairperson/director.

The candidate will provide copies of a current vita and other materials appropriate for an external review of scholarly research. The chairperson/director will forward these materials with an invitation to the reviewers. It is recommended that the chairperson/director tentatively solicit reviewers by phone in advance of the formal invitation by letter. The process should be scheduled to insure adequate time for reviewers and sufficient opportunities for reviews to be considered by the college-level committee. An illustrative letter of invitation is attached.

At the discretion of the candidate, and in consultation with the chairperson/director, outside evaluations that are no more than two years old may be resubmitted in a subsequent tenure or promotion application.

ILLUSTRATIVE LETTER

Invitation to External Reviewers

\_\_\_\_\_(DEPARTMENTAL LETTERHEAD)

\_\_\_\_\_(DATE)

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

\_\_\_\_\_(NAME) is being considered for (tenure)(the rank of Full Professor)(the rank of Associate Professor) in the (Department)(School) of \_\_\_\_\_ at the University of South Florida. You have been recommended as a person highly qualified to review and evaluate \_\_\_\_\_'s research/scholarly/creative contributions. We believe external evaluations contribute substantially to the academic review process and we would appreciate greatly your willingness to serve in this capacity.

Under existing agreements and regulations, your written comments would become part of \_\_\_\_\_'s file and be available for (his/her) review. If you are willing to accept our invitation, we solicit your comments regarding the depth, originality, importance, significance, visibility, productivity, and independent scholarship of (his)(her) contributions. We do not, of course, want you to make a (tenure)(promotion) recommendation as such. Your evaluative comments, however, based upon your knowledge and appreciation of the field and its standards, will make a significant contribution to our review and discussion. Please keep in mind that your comments should reflect appropriate norms, as you see them, for a candidate for (tenure/Associate Professor/Full Professor).

In order to complete our review, I hope we might have your response by \_\_\_\_\_(DATE). Should you decide not to accept our invitation to serve as an external reviewer for \_\_\_\_\_(NAME), we would appreciate learning of that decision at your earliest convenience. In either case, please be assured that we are very grateful for your consideration of our request.

Sincerely,

\_\_\_\_\_(DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON/DIRECTOR)

## CANDIDATE, CHAIRPERSON/DIRECTOR, AND DEPARTMENTAL STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES IN COMPLETING TENURE AND PROMOTION FORMS

### Department Staff Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of the school/department secretary where the faculty member resides to assist in the preparation of all necessary forms and to ensure that the appropriate and current forms are used. As soon as the candidate indicates to the department chairperson that he or she is applying for tenure and/or promotion, the department secretary should meet with the candidate. It is the department secretary's responsibility to provide the candidate with all of the necessary information requirements. The department secretary should package all the forms and then review each of them with the candidate. The department secretary should work with the candidate in the preparation of the forms. He/she should be prepared to type the forms at the candidate's request and to maintain an accurate file of all information provided by the candidate. Also, if the candidate requests the opportunity to review files of prior candidates for promotion and/or tenure, the department secretary should provide the candidate with examples. It is important that the department secretary recognizes his or her responsibility to assist in the preparation of tenure and/or promotion data.

### The Role of Chairperson/Director

The role of the department chairperson/school director is to guide the candidate for tenure and/or promotion through the process. The Chairperson's/Director's responsibility is first to review the entire application process for tenure and/or promotion with the candidate. The chairperson/director should outline the steps necessary for the application and provide specific dates as to when each of the steps must be completed. A major responsibility for the chairperson/director is to address how external reviews will be obtained. **(See the guidelines presented on page 10 for more details.)**

The chairperson/director is to gather student and peer evaluations and any other meaningful information that may be helpful in determining the effectiveness of the candidate as a teacher. The chairperson/director is responsible for gathering data on the candidate's teaching effectiveness for the previous five years.

The chairperson/director is responsible to see that all appropriate committees that have responsibility for tenure and/or promotion act on a timely basis and that committee documents are accurate, accountable and properly signed. It is the chairperson's/director's responsibility to review all of the candidate's forms and present the tenure/promotion package to the dean in a timely manner.

It is the responsibility of the chairperson/director to work closely with all candidates for tenure from the time the faculty member accepts a position at the University of South Florida. The chairperson/director should, at a minimum, meet with the faculty member

within the first semester and assist him or her in development of a file. The chairperson/director should clearly outline the expectations of the College of Business. The chairperson/director, at a minimum, should meet with the candidate each year to review the faculty member's file and his or her progress for tenure and/or promotion.

### Candidate Responsibilities

It is the candidate's responsibility to prepare accurate information attesting to his or her competency in the area of research, teaching, and service. The candidate is responsible for providing the department chairperson or school director with information each year that they are a faculty member that attests to their competencies in these three areas. The candidate must provide student evaluations and any other information that demonstrates their teaching effectiveness. The candidate should also provide the chairperson/director with any significant course development work and any thesis and dissertation committees they are presently on. Furthermore, the candidate should provide journal articles accepted for publication, journal articles that are published, books and monographs published, professional papers presented, reprinted articles, and other published work. Also, the candidate should provide information on research in progress and on research funds generated. Finally, the candidate must provide a citation analysis of his/her work using sources such as the Social Science Citation Index and Google Scholar. Self-citations should be excluded.

The candidate is also responsible for providing information on university, professional, and community service he or she may have provided. The candidate should include university and college committee and other appropriate assignments. The candidate may also include special institutional assignments and participation in special programs and seminars. The candidate should also include active participation in professional and honorary organizations and service at national, state, or local community levels.

It is the responsibility of the candidate also to provide information regarding honors and awards and anything else that the candidate believes should be considered in evaluating his or her performance.

When the candidate applies for tenure and/or promotion, he or she can provide the names of suggested external reviewers; however, it is the responsibility of the chairperson/director, in consultation with the dean, to select external reviewers.

The candidate has the right to review his or her file at any time. The candidate is responsible for the accuracy of his or her file and the candidate may add to his or her file with approval of the college Tenure and Promotion Committee at any time prior to the dean forwarding his or her file to the provost's Office. Any additions to the file after the dean has forwarded the file to the provost's Office must be approved by the dean of the College of Business.

REVISED AND APPROVED 1-30-09