

The Department of Educational and Psychological Studies Tenure and Promotion Guidelines 2020

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Educational and Psychological Studies

mission and vision, the Department of Educational and Psychological Studies is committed to the selection and development of all faculty members with an emphasis on our shared values of excellence, equity, and inclusion. One aspect of faculty development is the evaluation of faculty performance and promotion. This evaluation process should address both individual and institutional goals and the diversity of faculty work.

Approved by EPS faculty vote, May 27, 2020
Approved June 11, 2020 by Dean's Office
Approved June 8, 2020 by Provost Office

Approved by EPS faculty vote, May 27, 2020
Approved June 11, 2020 by Dean's Office
Approved June 8, 2020 by Provost Office
2

Procedures for Department Chair Evaluation of Tenure and Promotion Applications

1. The chair should independently review and evaluate each applicant's materials prior to reading the tenure and promotion committee's report.
2. After the independent review, the chair will take into account the committee's narrative developing his/her evaluation report.

Regional Chancellors will provide a formal review in promotion and tenure cases for faculty members on branch campuses prior to a College Dean completing and forwarding a recommendation to the Provost" (USF Consolidation Handbook, Volume 0.8 (w) JTJ 0 Tci217 0 JTJ Tj -0.07(o)1.2 (o)-9.6 2 0 T013 Tw 0.228 0 Td [(Vo)-1-6.6 (

Approved by EPS faculty vote, May 27, 2020
Approved June 11, 2020 by Dean's Office
Approved June 8, 2020 by Provost Office

The peer review process is the best means of judging quality and impact of the candidate's research and creative scholarship. Evaluation at the department/unit level should include an assessment of the quality of the candidate's work and consider discipline appropriate evidence of the significance of research, as well as the candidate's assignment of duties within the department. In addition, creative scholarly endeavors reflecting the unique roles and responsibilities of the College of Education should be recognized. Developing innovative pedagogical materials (e.g., electronic literature, learning application, assessment tools etc.) or working to transform an instructional paradigm (e.g., transforming a laboratory school, etc.) are a few examples of creative scholarship pioneered by educational researchers. A candidate may present the following kinds of documentation of research program: all refereed publications, book chapters, books; reviews of books and articles and other publications such as research reporting on grants; records of competitive honors and awards, grants, and fellowships; reviews of grant applications; citations of the candidate's work; presentations; 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. Of note, faculty with under-represented identities can face bias and discrimination with regard to receipt of many of the aforementioned forms of evidence of research, including grants, awards, and other recognitions that depend on visibility, nomination, and voting (e.g., Ginther et al., 2011; Whittaker et al., 2015). Therefore, it is imperative to have a holistic evaluation of each faculty member's research.

Approved by EPS faculty vote, May 27, 2020
Approved June 11, 2020 by Dean's Office
Approved June 8, 2020 by Provost Office

underrepresented groups), used non-experimental methods (e.g., qualitative, ethnography), or are potentially controversial in that the status quo is challenged (Louie & Wilson Ahlstrom, 2018). 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 department, as well as by peer review. For collaborative and coauthored scholarship, evaluation should include consideration of the candidate's role and contribution to the work, consistent with disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary scholarly practice. The body of work of a candidate for tenure must be judged against the appropriate standards within the area of research and creative scholarship, balancing the significance and quality of the contribution with the quantity of publications and other scholarly products. Recommendations for tenure 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 prospects for continuing and meaningful contributions.

- c. Service. The third component to be evaluated includes the categories of service to the University, the professional field or discipline, and engagement with the community. Candidates for tenure must have made substantive contributions in one or more of these areas. The record must provide evidence of excellence in service. Evaluation of administrative and other professional services to the University should go beyond a simple enumeration of committees to include an evaluation of the extent and quality of the services rendered. Public service may include work for professional organizations and 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. Normal service activities associated with good citizenship are not usually evaluated as part of the tenure and promotion process. General standards of public and professional service will vary across units, but service at the progress0 ocai(it)-3 (d5.5 (ic)-1.97 (n)-0.8 (i)-3a 0.006 e)-3 (26.6 (t)-5w Un(.).1 (Ge)-3 (n)13.-5.5 er

Approved by EPS faculty vote, May 27, 2020
Approved June 11, 2020 by Dean's Office
Approved June 8, 2020 by Provost Office

3. Extensions to the Standard Probationary Period

General extensions. Ordinarily, a faculty member in a tenure-earning position will either be awarded tenure at the end of the probationary period or be given one-year notice that further employment will not be offered. However, exceptions to the tenure clock may be considered, such as medical exigencies or parental situations covered by FMLA or ADA legislative or extenuating circumstances approved by the University or as specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. A tenure-earning faculty member under such circumstances may request an extension of his or her probationary period. The request must be made in writing and must be approved by the chair of the department, College Dean and the institution's designated senior academic officer overseeing the candidate's unit. Ordinarily, extensions of more than two years beyond the college's

Approved by EPS faculty vote, May 27, 2020
Approved June 11, 2020 by Dean's Office
Approved June 8, 2020 by Provost Office

D. Department Tenure and Promotion Committee

Please see the 2020 Consolidated EPS Governance Documents for Tenure and Promotion procedures in the department. [Clickable link will be added once finalized]

Approved by EPS faculty vote, May 27, 2020
Approved June 11, 2020 by Dean's Office
Approved June 8, 2020 by Provost Office
12

References

- Aruguete, M. S., Slater, J., & Mwaikinda, S. R. (2017).⁴⁰ The Effects of Professors' Race and Clothing Style on Student Evaluations. *The Journal of Negro Education* 46(4), 494-502.
- CobbRoberts, D., Esnard, T., Unterreiner, A., Agosto, V., Karanxha, Z., Beck, M., & Wu, K. (2017). Race, gender and mentoring in higher education. *Sage Handbook of Mentoring*, 388.

Approved by EPS faculty vote, May 27, 2020
Approved June 11, 2020 by Dean's Office
Approved June 8, 2020 by Provost Office