

contributions to the University, profession, and/or community. This record of teaching, research, and service should predict continuing high productivity throughout the individual's career.

V. Evaluation for Promotion

Evaluation for promotion to associate professor is the same as for tenure. In cases where a candidate for tenure holds the rank of Assistant Professor, the recommendation for tenure must include a recommendation for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Conversely, a

choose to continue with the tenure and promotion process through the Provost's Office and be denied, the candidate will not have the option of submitting an application again.

- C. Following the CAS Governance Document, a candidate may request to be considered by a School Tenure and Promotion Committee other than the one in which her/his department is located. This request must be approved by the College Dean prior to the beginning of the tenure process.

VIII. Reviews

A. Annual Review of Progress toward Tenure

It is the responsibility of the department faculty review committee and department Chair to include a progress toward tenure review as part of the annual evaluation for all faculty in the probationary period for tenure. This yearly review should be a candid assessment of performance in teaching, research, and service assignments and should include specific recommendations for maintaining excellent progress and for improving in needed areas.

B. Mid-Tenure Review

An extensive mid-tenure review will be conducted, typically during the third tenure-earning year. If an individual is credited with tenure-earning service at the time of initial appointment, the review will

C. Review of Progress toward Promotion

For faculty holding rank below that of full Professor, annual evaluations may include an evaluation of progress toward promotion. A mid-point, comprehensive review--in the typical interval between appointment to Associate Professor and promotion to full Professor--may be conducted by the department faculty committee eligible to review promotion to full Professor applications. This mid-point review is intended to be informative: encouraging to faculty making solid progress toward promotion and instructional to faculty who may need to improve in selected areas of performance.

D. External Reviews for Tenure and Promotion

1. Qualifications of external reviewers

A candidate's scholarship and creative works are to be evaluated by external reviewers with significant scholarly reputations in the substantive/methodological area of the candidate's work. Reviewers should be highly regarded and recognized scholars in the candidate's field and able to evaluate the quality, productivity, and significance of the candidate's research and/or creative activities. If possible, reviewers should hold senior appointments at aspirational peer institutions.

The reviewers are expected to familiarize themselves with the work of the candidate, to comment on the value of the candidate's work, and to place it in relation to the work of others in the field.

External reviewers should be selected so as to minimize the possibility of conflicts of interest - actual, potential, or apparent. If any reviewer is recommended who has had significant previous contact with the candidate, reasons for the choice should be presented in sufficient detail to allay concerns about conflicts of interest.

2. Compiled list of reviewers

A candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor should submit a list of six to ten suggested reviewers to his/her d(b)3(e)-3(seynBT/F2 11.04 Tf(ty)-Cha(f)1r.ie)1Cs

3. Soliciting reviews

The candidate's Chair will solicit reviews from the approved list with the goal of obtaining *at least* three letters of evaluation from reviewers for a candidate applying for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor and *at least* five letters for applying for promotion to professor. USF T&P Guidelines state that no more than six letters are ordinarily included in the application. Although the Chair may contact the selected reviewers informally, an official request for an evaluation shall be in the form of a letter from the candidate's Chair composed in accordance with the model letter drafted by the Provost's Office. *It is inappropriate for a candidate to contact reviewers regarding promotion and/or tenure consideration.*

After ascertaining a reviewer's willingness to serve as an evaluator, the Chair will forward to the reviewer materials provided by the candidate, including a current vita and other materials the candidate chooses as appropriate. The process should be scheduled to ensure adequate time for the reviews to be returned and considered by the department, Chair, School, and College committees.

4. Protecting Reviewers' Identities⁴

Following the USF Tenure and Promotion Guidelines on the option of protecting the identity of reviewers, a candidate may choose to waive access to reviewers' identities. There shall be no penalty or presumption for or against a candidate on the basis of his/her decision to waive or not to waive the right of access to reviewers' identities.

The Chair will be responsible for redacting identifying information from the letters and providing a code list to be used in narrative evaluations. For example, the code list might identify each reviewer by a letter (Reviewer A, Reviewer B), and the evaluative narratives will refer to reviewers by this code. The identities of the reviewers and their assigned code will be available to all individuals responsible for evaluation; the candidate, however, will not have access to the code list when reviewing his/her application.

5. Other Considerations

All external reviews received

The College Tenure and Promotion Committee will be made up of nine members, three from each of the respective Schools. If each level of review (Department, Chair, School) prior to the College Committee has recommended a candidate for tenure and/or promotion, the College committee will include the candidate on a consent agenda.

The College Tenure and Promotion Committee members should familiarize themselves with all cases on the consent agenda prior to voting on the School's decision.

Conversely, there will be a full review at the College Tenure and Promotion Committee level if any of the following occur:

- 1) The candidate requests full review by the College Tenure & Promotion Committee.
- 2) The candidate has not been recommended for Tenure and/or Promotion at one or more of the previous levels of review.
- 3) There is a split vote of one-third or more at any of the previous levels of review.
- 4) The College Tenure and Promotion Committee votes by simple majority to give full review to a particular case.

If a College Tenure and Promotion Committee member is from the same department as a candidate for tenure and/or promotion, or if a member has a personal and/or professional association with a candidate that constitutes a conflict of interest, that committee member will recuse him/herself from the case.

The entire committee may vote by a simple majority to au n/F2 11.04 Tf1 0 0 1 236.09 440I Tm|