University of South Florida
College of Education

Department of
Language, Literacy, Ed.D., Exceptional Student Education, and Physical Education (LLEEP)

Faculty Governance Guidelines and Procedures

Approved July 27, 2022 by USF Office of the Provost

Contents

Preface

The purpose of this Governance document is to detail the procedures by which the Department of Language, Literacy, Ed.D., Exceptional Student Education, and Physical Education (LLEEP) operates. The document provides guidance for committee work and procedures and alerts the elected and appointed officers as to how they should carry out their responsibilities so that committees operate consistently as membership changes over time. It also makes public the decision-making processes involving faculty, processes that guide faculty and student success. So conceived, this document is not an attempt to impose a rigid structure on everyday operations. Rather, it contains explicit statements of guidelines on important functions within the Department that are consistent with, but that are not explicitly addressed in, other College and University guidelines. In turn, these statements are important because they contextualize the more general College/University procedures with details specific to the LLEEP department in that they inform department members of the needed operating procedures. Such statements should be able to be changed, or exceptions granted, by agreed-upon procedures of the Department. The entire Governance document is to be reviewed on an annual basis by the Governance Committee. The policies and procedures of each committee will be guided by, and shall remain consistent with, the policies and procedures set forth by the Guidelines and Procedures for Governance. This document is divided into six major domains: (1) Preface; (2) Mission; (3) Membership; (4) Faculty and Student Success Standing Committees; (5) Conduct of Department Business; and (6) Official Amendment of the *Governance Guidelines and Procedures* of the Department of Language, Literacy, Ed.D., Exceptional Student Education, and Physical Education.

1. Mission

The mission of the Department of Language, Literacy, Ed.D., Exceptional Student Education, and Physical Education (LLEEP) is to develop ethical and highly competent educational professionals and researchers who work in partnership with stakeholders to enhance through research, advocacy, engagement, and teaching the quality of life for students, schools, and communities in a global context. The Department is a multi-campus academic unit, with faculty on all three campuses of the University of South Florida. The Department provides undergraduate, graduate, and in-service programs and learning experiences that reflect collaboration with stakeholders, incorporation of professional practice standards, and alignment with state, national, and international standards.

To fulfill the Department's mission, the faculty and staff are committed to offering challenging learning opportunities in the areas of language, literacy, exceptional education, program innovation, and physical education within the context of a supportive and diverse environment; creating and supporting research, scholarship, and inquiry in education via these avenues; and preparing the next generation of educators, scholars, and leaders for pK-12 and the professoriate. The faculty and staff of the LLEEP Department are committed to preparing lifelong learners who are ready to consider multiple perspectives; embrace diversity, equity, and advocacy; think critically; and make informed, evidence-based decisions.

2. Membership and Voting Privileges

The faculty membership of the LLEEP Department shall consist of all full-time faculty members on continuing, full-time appointments with the rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor, and inclusive of visiting faculty. Only faculty on permanent, recurring lines will vote to determine the guidelines and procedures of the academic programs of the department. Faculty who hold administrative positions do not cast votes in their home department if they vote beyond the LLEEP Department. Similarly, non-administrative LLEEP Department faculty may have only one vote in any given election, such as tenure and promotion, per university guidelines.

In the sections below, leadership within programs is described specific to program coordinators and area coordinators. The context for these individuals to facilitate dialogue among program faculty with respect to curricular issues is also offered hereafter.

3. Standing Committees

The LLEEP Department recognizes that faculty members are the core of its academic programs, scholarly agenda, and community engagement commitments. In keeping with university and college undergraduate and graduate program specifications, members of the Department's standing committees consult regularly to discuss curricular issues and monitor program accreditation, compliance, and student progress. Representatives from these standing committees shall consult with program faculty and the Department Chair regarding policies and procedures and convene with other groups within the college, university, and community to address professional practice issues relevant to faculty development.

Given that department faculty members advise the Department Chair or the Chair's designee on the appointment of program-specific instructional needs, including the employment of tenure-earning and adjunct faculty, the Chair of the LLEEP Department shall convene Faculty and Student Success Standing Committees to review charges, policies, and procedures and to note the committee's meeting schedule, dates, or both, as well as the due dates for completing relevant committee tasks.

Standing Committees in the LLEEP Department are broadly focused on faculty and student success as aligned with the USF Strategic Goals: Governance Committee, Annual Review Committee, and Institutional Review Board Committee.

The Department Chair may temporarily convene an Advisory Group or Ad-Hoc Committee(s) of three or four faculty members to offer advice on current issues. Ad-Hoc Committees shall be given a charge by the Department Chair, shall report to the Department Chair and Department concerning the results of their charges, and shall be disbanded by the Department Chair upon the completion of their charges. Should an Ad-Hoc committee be determined as useful to the Department such that it functions in a permanent role, the committee members shall put forward a proposal to the Department that includes the name of the committee and its purpose, policies, practices, and responsibilities of the Ad-Hoc Committee Chair and that of the Committee members. Ad-Hoc committees can become Standing Committees by a majority vote of the LLEEP Department. The Tenure and Promotion Committee is an Ad Hoc Committee.

3.1   Conduct of Standing Committees

Purpose of Standing Committees. The purpose of a standing committees is to support the smooth functioning of the Department. When logistically possible, standing committees should mirror College and University committees and representatives from the LLEEP Department's standing committees should serve on the corresponding College/University Committees.

Creation of Standing Committees. The call for creating a new Standing Committee must be brought forward by 2-3 members of the LLEEP Department. The name of the Committee, its purpose, and its guidelines, practices, and procedures must be clearly delineated in a proposal at the time of its presentation at a Department meeting. A super-majority of the LLEEP Department must vote in favor of establishing a new Standing Committee. Once established, its name, guidelines, practices, and procedures must be included in the *Governance Guidelines and Procedures of Language, Literacy, Ed.D., Exceptional Student Education, and Physical Education (LLEEP).*

Oversight of Standing Committees by the Department. Unless otherwise stated, each Standing Committee shall be created based on a process of elections after the names of those nominated have been voted upon by the Department. Special consideration should be given to including faculty from the Sarasota-Manatee, St. Petersburg, and Tampa campuses when establishing any standing committee. If there is not representation from Sarasota-Manatee, on a standing committee, a special at large member will be elected from faculty assigned to Sarasota-Manatee. Similarly, if there is no representation from faculty assigned to St. Petersburg or Tampa on a standing committee, a special at large member will be elected from faculty assigned to St.

Petersburg or Tampa. Accordingly, there is a possibility that one or two special at large members may be added to the membership of a standing committee. However, in order to guard against overburdening colleagues from campuses with proportionally few department faculty, those elected from those campuses may opt out of service on some committees other than the Annual Review committee.

Unless otherwise stated, each standing committee shall be led by a Chair determined by members of this Committee. In exceptional cases, the Department Chair reserves the right to appoint a Committee Chair. Each Committee Chair, in consultation with the Department Chair, shall inform members of the Department of the names of elected Committee Members and Department Chair upon completing the process of election and selection. Except in special circumstances warranting exception by the Department Chair, Standing Committee Chairs or Committee Members must serve on the respective Standing Committees to which they are elected. In special cases, Committee Chairs, Members, or Members At Large who wish to no longer serve may resign from their position, although, in the interest of effective and efficient functioning of the Department, LLEEP faculty are encouraged to fulfill the entire term of their committee service. In the rare event that a Committee Chair, Committee Member, or Member At Large resigns, a new Standing Committee Chair/Committee Member shall be elected by the Department to serve out the remainder of the term of the individual being replaced. Additional specifications may govern specific Standing Committees as agreed upon by Committee Members, Members At Large and the Department.

Duties of Standing Committee Chairs The duties of Standing Committee Chairs are as follows: work with the LLEEP Chair of the Department and Committee members to develop an appropriate charge, shared agenda, and plan of work for the Committee for the year; meet with Committee members at least once a month unless otherwise determined by the Department Chair; develop a written workplan to account for charges assigned to the committee; obtain signed commitment from each Committee member regarding their specific work outcomes and contribution to the goals of the Committee during the year; monitor the progress of the Committee work and coordinating committee activities to reach the goals of the committee; work with members of the Department to induct members into the spirit and purposes of the committee; communicate regularly to the Department updates concerning the needs and contributions of the Committee via an oral or written report (as decided upon by the Department Chair, prior to or at Department meetings as designated by the Department Chair); and recognize the work of the Committee members and Members At Large in a formal and specific letter by May 1 at the end of each academic year. All Standing Committee Chairs shall be guided by the calendar of the Department (see Table 1).

Table 1.

Master Calendar for Completion of Department Tasks

Events	Timeline
LLEEP Monthly Department Meetings	On Department Calendar: Beginning of Fall
LLEEP Monthly Program Meetings	On Department Calendar: Beginning of Fall
LLEEP Department votes for faculty seeking tenure and promotion	Beginning of Fall
The elected ad hoc LLEEP Tenure and Promotion Committee votes for faculty seeking tenure and promotion	Beginning of Fall as needed
COEDU Tenure & Promotion Committee vote	Mid-Fall
LLEEP Revisions to the Governance Document	End of Fall or End of Spring
Annual Review Submissions	February 1
Annual Departmental Elections	February 15 if practicable
Letter of Acknowledgment from Committee Chairs to Committee Members	May 1

Term of Office for Chairs and Members of Standing Committees. The term of office for new Committee Chairs, Committee members and Members At Large shall begin officially at the time of their appointment. Each Committee Chair, Committee Member, and Member At-Large shall serve two-year staggered terms. Each Committee Chair shall monitor the terms of the Committee Chair and of each member of the committee and maintain accurate rosters.

Meetings of Standing Committees. Each Standing Committee will meet at least once a month, as designated by the Committee Chair and its members. Provision will be made for electronic participation in meetings so that faculty from all three USF campuses may participate-in meetings. The Chair of each Standing Committee will be responsible for setting each Committee meeting agenda and coordinating the meeting. It is the Committee Chair's responsibility to maintain committee records, meeting minutes, and archives and, furthermore, place all such records in the LLEEP Department archive (e.g., Box) and forward access to this information to his/her successor upon the completion of a given term of office.

Requests for Budget Monies of Standing Committees. In the event that a committee sees the need for budget monies, the Committee Chair will indicate to the Department Chair, the budget monies needed, and will specify a timeline over which Committee expenses will occur.

Conflict of Interest Policy for Standing Committees. Each Standing Committee must make an effort to ensure that decisions reached are fair and objective. A conflict of interest can and does arise when conditions or circumstances preclude or interfere with the individual's capacity to make objective, detached decisions during the deliberations of Committee work. In such events, Standing Committee Chairs shall be convened for further consultation and resolution of arising concerns.

Voting Eligibility. Unless otherwise stated, all faculty on permanent, recurring lines shall vote to select representatives on Standing Committees.

Term of Service. Membership on each Standing Committee shall be for a period of two years, with a subset of the committee replaced annually (e.g., four replaced in one year, three replaced in the next). Except in special circumstances warranting exception by the LLEEP Department Chair, elected faculty must serve on the respective Standing Committees to which they are elected.

Elections. According to Florida Statues, the USF/UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement, and USF Regulations, all faculty members (9-month and 12-month) are generally required to have written annual assignments within 6 weeks of the start of the new academic year. To provide time for consultation with the Chair and to enable accurate assignments for the following academic year, all Standing Committees shall complete their membership votes by February 15 if practicable each year.

To assemble the ballot in preparation for annual elections to Standing Committees, the Administrative Specialist shall work in consultation with the Chair of the Governance Committee and the Chair of the Department to:
1. Review currently existing documents to discern Faculty members eligible to serve and vote for each representative for the ballot. These documents include the LLEEP Governance Document, the LLEEP in-house historical document (i.e., Governance Excel Voting Spreadsheet) and the COEDU Constitution;
2. Consult with the active Chair of the Faculty Policy Council to ascertain currently serving members and their terms;
3. Consult with Chairs of other College and University standing committees, as needed to ascertain currently serving members and their terms;
4. Confirm accuracy of eligibility lists with Governance Committee Chair, Department Chair, Governance Committee and Department Faculty;
5. Draft election ballots using Qualtrics or other mechanism as designated by the Department Chair;
6. Submit prepared ballots to Governance Committee Chair and Department Chair for final review;
7. Review of ballots via interactive face-to-face or synchronous session by Governance Committee Chair and Department Chair to enhance chances of accuracy;
8. Finalize ballots and prepare for anonymized dissemination to faculty within the designated election window/timeframe;
9. Schedule automated reminder for the half-way mark of the voting window;
10. Aggregate anonymous election results and refine for delivery to Governance Committee and Department Chair after election period has expired;
11. Draft runoff ballots as needed after certification of election results;
12. Repeat deployment measures used for initial election ballots in the run-off ballots;
13. Present aggregated anonymous run-off election results to the Chair of the Governance Committee and to the Department Chair for certification with the Governance Committee.
14. Share the official results of the election with Department Faculty.

Results of elections to Standing Committees shall be held in confidence by the Department Chair, Administrative Specialist, and all members of the Governance Committee prior to dissemination to faculty. The Governance Committee shall make recommendations for runoffs and subsequent elections when there is a tie. Unless otherwise indicated, faculty who are already serving in one Standing Committee may not be listed as eligible for election to another Standing Committee.

In the event that the election results from a ballot include an individual faculty member who is simultaneously elected to two positions, the Governance Committee shall first review the LLEEP Governance Document to determine whether the elected committee member can simultaneously serve across the designated committees without conflict. In the event that the faculty member is prohibited from serving across both committees as per the Governance Document, a subsequent election will be conducted to determine the position preferred for this faculty member by Department faculty. In the event that the faculty member is not prohibited from serving across both committees as per the Governance Document, no further action shall be taken. Should the runoff election results from an election reflect a tie such that an individual faculty member has the same number of votes for two independent positions, the Chair of the Department shall vote to break the tie in the event that a vote has not already been cast by the Chair. The Department Chair may take into consideration multiple factors when casting their vote in such a circumstance. In the event that the Department Chair has already cast a vote, a subsequent election will be conducted to determine the faculty member preferred for this position by Department faculty. Pre-empting the need for runoff elections, three (3) alternates for each committee shall be elected. Alternates are designated as individuals with the subsequent next highest number of votes. The terms of alternates may be staggered. Term lengths may vary in order to match the term length required for each committee. When election results have been certified with the Chair of the Department, the Chair of the Governance Committee, and the Governance Committee, the Governance Committee Chair shall announce election results to Department faculty. See Appendices for Ballot and Elections information.

Unless otherwise noted, special elections shall be held to finish the terms of those Standing Committee members who are unable to complete the term of their service due to retirement, sabbatical, leave, or other administrative assignment. Faculty elected in a special election shall serve out the remainder of the term of the faculty member they are replacing.

Term Limits. Unless otherwise stated, after serving for an elected term on a given Standing Committee, faculty shall be eligible for re-election to this committee for an additional term.

Selection of Standing Committee Chairs. Each committee will select its Committee Chair at its first meeting unless otherwise specified. The Committee Chair should have served on the committee for a period of at least one year prior to being selected Chair.

3.2   Procedures for Faculty and Student Success Standing Committees

The procedures governing the Faculty and Student Success Committees are outlined next.

Faculty and Student Success Standing Committees. Four Faculty and Student Success Standing Committees will oversee various faculty-related reviews, governance, and research review: (1) Governance Committee; (2) Annual Review Committee; (3) Tenure and Promotion Committee; and (4) Institutional Review Board Committee. These Standing Committees shall provide support for the smooth operation of the LLEEP Department by contributing to the Department's obligations in College and University governance and research processes. They shall also recognize and affirm faculty growth and progress in working with students, develop high-quality courses, initiate and sustain research related to education and specialized expertise, collaborate with colleagues, contribute to the department's obligations in College and University personnel processes, and gain national recognition as a scholar in one's field(s). Equally important, they shall also guide student success. Faculty serving on the College's Tenure and Promotion Committee shall not serve on the Department's Tenure and Promotion Committee during the same academic year. Similarly, faculty serving on the Department's Tenure and Promotion Committee shall not serve on the Annual Review Committee during the same academic year. The specifications that guide these Standing Committees are explicated next.

3.2.1 Governance Committee

Purpose. The purpose of the Governance Committee is as follows: develop, refine, organize, store, and archive governance document(s) for the department; annually revisit the approved document, identify potential areas for revision or addition, and review existing college and university governance procedures and policies; report suggested changes to faculty at department meetings or other forums; facilitate opportunities for elections; maintain records of Governance Committee membership within the LLEEP Department; consult with Department Chair regarding dates for proposed elections and other voting concerning the Governance Committee; and maintain records of election and voting outcomes, including alternates.

Operating Procedures. The Governance Committee is to be comprised of an elected Chair and the Chairs of the other Standing Committees. The Chair of the Governance Committee shall be determined by the members of the LLEEP Department. The Governance Committee Chair, in consultation with the LLEEP Department Chair, shall inform members of the Department of the names of Committee Members and Committee Chair upon completing the process of selection. Special consideration should be given to including faculty from the Sarasota-Manatee and St. Petersburg campuses in the discussions of the Governance Committee. As such, if there is no representation from Sarasota-Manatee, St. Petersburg, or Tampa on the Governance Committee, a special at large member is to be elected from the faculty assigned to these three campuses. Accordingly, there is a possibility that one or two special at large members may be added to the Governance Committee. However, in order to guard against overburdening colleagues from campuses with proportionally few department faculty, those elected from either the St. Petersburg or the Sarasota-Manatee campuses may opt out of service on the Governance Committee.

The Governance Committee Chair, Committee Members, and Members At Large who officially accept office must serve on the respective Standing Committees to which they are elected. In special cases, Committee Chairs, Members or Members At Large who wish to no longer serve may resign from their position, although, in the interest of effective and efficient functioning of the department, faculty are encouraged to fulfill the entire term of their committee service. Should

such a situation arise, a new Governance Committee Chair/Committee Member/Member At Large shall be elected by the LLEEP Department to serve out the remainder of the term of the individual being replaced.

Responsibilities of the Chair of the Governance Committee. The responsibilities of the Governance Committee Chair are as follows: work with the Department Chair, Committee Members, and Members At Large to develop an appropriate charge, shared agenda, and plan of work for the Committee for the year; conduct and maintain records of elections for the Annual Review Committee; Governance Committee; and Institutional Review Board Committee by February 15 if practicable of each year; meet with members of the Committee at least once a month unless otherwise determined by the LLEEP Department Chair; obtain a commitment from each Committee member regarding the specific work they are willing to do in order to contribute to the goals of the Committee during the year; monitor the progress of the Committee work while concomitantly coordinating the needed committee activities to reach the committee's goals; work with members of the LLEEP Department to induct members into the spirit and purposes of the committee; communicate regularly to the Department updates concerning the needs and contributions of the Committee via an oral or written report (as decided upon by the Department Chair, prior to or at Department meetings as designated by the Department Chair); and recognize the work of the Committee Members and Members At Large in a formal and specific letter by May 1 at the end of each academic year. Additional Guidelines for the Governance Committee Procedures are provided in Appendix A.

3.2.2 Annual Review Committee

Charge. The charge of the Annual Review Committee is as follows: (a) review annual review applications submitted by assistant professors, tenured professors, and instructors; and (b) review annual review submissions upon being convened by the LLEEP Department Chair. The Department Chair will distribute the charge to the committee approximately two weeks before the commencement of said review.

Considerations for Annual Review. The annual evaluation of faculty and the evaluations for promotion and tenure are based on assigned duties. The Department Chair will work with the College Dean and with university leaders to assure equity of access to faculty support on all USF campuses in order to meet the required Department/School, College, and University standards for both annual evaluations and tenure and/or promotion. Regional campus faculty should be included as much as possible when forming a committee. In accordance with SACSCOC Consolidation Handbook (p. 36), supervisors responsible for making the assignments will ensure that the assignment meets the following:
- Aligns with USF's mission as research intensive, preeminent, R1 university;
- Provides fair and equitable opportunities to applicable faculty members to progress toward meeting the criteria and standards for promotion and tenure;
- Supports the faculty member's qualifications, experience, including professional growth and development, and preferences to the extent practicable;
- Observes fair and equitable opportunities to fulfill any applicable criteria for merit salary increases;
- Considers the needs of the program or department/units; and

- Meets the minimum full academic assignment in terms of 12 contact hours of instruction or equivalent assignments in research and service (and, if applicable, clinical and/or administrative assignments).

Annual Faculty Assignments. Annual faculty assignments, expressed in percentage of effort, are made in one of five "general" categories, as shown in Table 2 below. Also shown are the sub-categories which are required for mandated effort reporting. The following table is adapted from the categories of Assignment and General expectations for FTE (see SACSCOC Consolidation Handbook, p. 36).

Table 2.

Assignment Categories

GENERAL CATEGORY	SUB-CATEGORY
TEACHING/INSTRUCTION	Undergraduate Organized Sections
	Undergraduate Individual Instruction
	Graduate Organized Sections
	Graduate Individual Instruction
	Other Instructional Effort
	Academic Advising
RESEARCH	Department Research
	Sponsored Research
	Creative Activity
SERVICE	Professional & Public Service
	University Governance
ADMINISTRATION	Academic Administration
OTHER	Leave of Absence with Pay/Professional development
	Release Time for UFF Activities

3.2.3 Annual Reviews of Faculty Performance by Department Chair

The Department Chair shall be guided by the following considerations for conducting yearly reviews of faculty performance:

Assign faculty time in Spring. Faculty assignments for the new academic year will be made at least six weeks prior to the beginning of the academic year, although they are generally made sooner, usually in the spring semester prior to the new academic year. Due process shall allow for consultation and discussion between the Chair and the faculty member. To this end, faculty governance structures and voting processes are to occur in the early spring to allow for accurate assignments for the following academic year.

Provide timely access to FIS. The Faculty Information System (FIS) has built in provisions to ensure that proper notification and consultation occurs. The USF UFF collective bargaining agreement allows a formal process to dispute an assignment. Academic Affairs at USF has transitioned from FAIR to the Faculty Information System (FIS) for both faculty assignments and faculty annual evaluations. All annual evaluations in Academic Affairs units shall utilize

FIS. Branch campus units have the option of using FAIR for 2019 calendar year evaluations, but future annual evaluations shall utilize FIS only. All assignments within Academic Affairs made in Spring 2020 for Academic Year 2020-2021 shall be made using FIS (see SACSCOC Consolidation Handbook, p. 38).

Align faculty assignment to actual percentage of time allotted. The faculty and the Department Chair shall calculate the hours in the week for various research activities and equate these hours to percentage of time allocated for research.

Review faculty assignments within the context of stated goals and actual outcomes. Assigned duties provide the starting point for reporting the completion of mandated effort (i.e., the proportion or percentage of time spent on any activity) as required in the State University Accountability Process. According to SACSCOC Consolidation Handbook (p. 39), USF shall continue to utilize the Assigned Faculty Duties-Faculty Activity Report (AFD-FAR) module of FAIR to track effort reporting through consolidation until such time as conversion to FIS is completed. Effort percentages for externally funded federal research reported to the State and to the Federal government as a part of USF's PERT process must be equivalent. Alignment shall be maintained between goals identified at the beginning of the year, time assigned for various research activities, and evaluation metrics. Evaluation shall be based on quality and quantity in the context of assigned time.

Faculty Performance Appraisal. Annual assignment and performance appraisal of all faculty on branch campuses (including academic leaders÷ such as campus-based chairs, campus directors, campus assistant/associate deans, and campus deans) shall be conducted in compliance with USF policies and procedures; shall be consistent with a single set of department/school, college, unit assignment, and appraisal guidelines; and shall include formal written input by the Regional Chancellor (RC) or designee prior to a College Dean or Vice President completing their appraisal. All other tenure-earning faculty members shall be evaluated for tenure and promotion following USF's Guidelines. The new guidelines were adopted by the United Faculty of Florida (UFF) on June 27, 2019 and are effective as of July 1, 2020.

Annual Performance Evaluation Process. Annual performance evaluation processes as of April 6, 2020 are described in detail in Article 10 of the USF UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement (https://www.usf.edu/hr/documents/employment-resources/employee-labor-relations/uff-collectivebargaining-agreement.pdf). They include the following:
- Faculty will be evaluated at least once annually except if they have received a notice of non-reappointment.
- Information used in preparing evaluations comes from faculty's immediate supervisor, peers, students, themselves, and other university supervisors and individuals responsible in service assignments.
- Any classroom visits/observations related to annual evaluations will be noted at least 2 weeks prior to the visit and the date agreed upon by the observed faculty member.
- The written evaluation will include the faculty member's annual assignment.

Developing and Maintaining the LLEEP Annual Performance Process. Each academic department/school is to develop and maintain its own evaluation processes. A majority of a

quorum of unit faculty shall approve said processes. These processes shall be made available to all faculty in the unit (see section on Governance Documents). The Criteria for annual evaluations are outlined in Article 10.4 of the USF UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement (https://www.usf.edu/hr/documents/employment-resources/employee-labor-relations/uffcollective-bargaining-agreement.pdf) and are summarized below:

- Teaching effectiveness;
- Contribution to the discovery of new knowledge;
- Public service;
- Participation in governance processes;
- Other assigned duties; and
- Faculty teaching in a classroom are required to be proficient in the English language.

Defining Distinction in Research. The College requires excellence in research, scholarship, and other creative activity. In evaluating each faculty member, the Department shall consider the quality of the work, including its value to the faculty member's field. Sufficient quantity is necessary to permit a reliable judgment and to ensure continued commitment.

Research Assignments. Research assignments are subdivided into funded research, departmental research, and creative activities. To be classified as funded research, the faculty member's salary for that percentage of assignment is to be derived from a C&G funding source. For example, if a faculty member has a 50% research assignment, and if 10% of his/her salary is C&G derived, the assignment would be subdivided into funded research (10%) and departmental research (40%). If a faculty member is C&G funded, but none of the C&G funds are used to pay their salary, that research will be classified as departmental research.

Impact. High-impact outlets are most important; however, the college recognizes that the impact of books or creative scholarship are determined by different measures than journal articles alone. In addition to excellence in publications, a faculty member is expected to engage in a cycle of research, scholarship, and other creative activity which includes work in circulation and work in progress. Recognizing the interdisciplinarity of educational scholarship and of faculty research programs, individual faculty may choose different paths or combinations thereof (e.g., scholarly articles, books).

Figure 1. *Guidelines for Determining Research Impact (Library Connect, 2020)*

Storage of Evaluation Documents. The department/unit must maintain a single evaluation file containing all documents used in the evaluation process. Faculty may examine their evaluation

files if they so wish. These files may not contain anonymous material other than student evaluations. All student evaluation comments must be included in the evaluation file. In the past, these files have been maintained in the FAIR system. USF is currently switching to the Archivum Faculty Information System (FIS).

3.2.4 Annual Review Eligibility and Elections

Purpose. The Annual Review Committee shall review the faculty narratives and all related documentation submitted by the tenured and tenure-earning faculty.

Members. The Annual Review Committee shall be comprised of five continuously appointed tenured faculty and two instructors. During the electoral process for this committee, special consideration is to be given to nominations of faculty from the Sarasota-Manatee and St. Petersburg campuses. If there is no representation from Sarasota-Manatee, St. Petersburg, or Tampa within the elected members, and a faculty from the Sarasota-Manatee site is undergoing annual review, a special at large member will be elected from the faculty assigned to the Sarasota-Manatee campus. Likewise, if there is not representation from faculty assigned to St. Petersburg within the elected members, and a faculty from the St. Petersburg campus is undergoing annual review, a special at large member will be elected from faculty assigned to St. Petersburg. Similarly, if there is not representation from faculty assigned to Tampa within the elected members, and a faculty from the Tampa site is being reviewed for annual review, a special at large member will be elected from faculty assigned to Tampa. Accordingly, there is a possibility that one or two special at large members may be added to the membership of the Annual Review Committee.

Length of Term. The length of the Annual Review Committee term shall be a 2-year term (staggered).

Election of Annual Review Committee Members. All LLEEP faculty may elect the committee's seven representatives.

Election. Elections to the Annual Review Committee shall be held in the end of the spring semester.

Alternates. The faculty member with the next highest number of votes shall serve as alternate. The LLEEP faculty governance member(s) and Department Chair shall verify election results and maintain, in confidence, the ballot results for identification of alternates should one of the five representatives not be able to complete his or her term.

Commitment. In keeping with the COEDU Annual Review Guidelines, eligible faculty may not opt out of service on the Annual Review Committee. To foster faculty awareness and maintain faculty-wide discussion of annual review (AR) issues, faculty members who have served a two-year term are not to be eligible for AR service again for at least two years. In the case of faculty who are elected to a two-year term but who are unable to fulfill the second year, the LLEEP Department shall hold a special election for a representative to serve the remainder of the term. Additional Guidelines for the Annual Review Committee Procedures and Responsibilities are provided in Appendix B.

3.2.5 Annual Review Procedures

The spirit of the review process is to honor each faculty member's accomplishments, development, reflection on the teaching cycle, and contribution not only to the field of interest, but also to the university and college mission. Consistent with the university and college policies regarding annual reviews, the purpose of the annual review is for faculty members to establish how they reflect excellence by meeting quality standards within their respective discipline(s). Faculty have the opportunity, through annual review, to illustrate how such quality was achieved, goals addressed, and, as appropriate, the context of their assignments. The process relies on the faculty to educate the ARC and Department Chair through the case made within the narrative.

Roles of the Annual Review Committee. The Annual Review Committee reviews the annual evaluation narratives and all related documentation provided by each tenure-earning, tenured, and continuously appointed instructors. Tenured and tenure-earning faculty are reviewed by associate and full professors who are elected in staggering two-year terms. Associate Professors seeking promotion may request review by a full professor, even if promotion application is not imminent. Instructor submissions are reviewed by instructors and tenured faculty. In the case where instructors are unavailable to review the materials of instructor peers, the review is to be performed by associate and full professors.

3.2.6 Submission of AR Narratives and Documentation

In addition to the faculty narrative submitted to Archivum, faculty (including tenured, tenure-earning, instructors, and visiting faculty) shall submit a 2-3 paragraph Executive Summary of highlights from the Annual Review, not to exceed 1 page (single-spaced). This summary is intended to inform primary and secondary reviewers as well as the entire AR committee in developing evaluative statements regarding excellence in the faculty member's work for the given year in teaching, research, and service. While not a restatement of the faculty narrative word-for-word, the summary statement shall include highlights relevant to the assignment. The summary statement should precede the narrative and be noted as such. Portions of this summary of highlights may be included in the AR Committee's evaluative statement of faculty performance.

Progress toward Tenure. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair or other appropriate administrator and department peer committee, where constituted, to include a progress toward tenure review as part of the annual evaluation for all faculty in the probationary period for tenure. Beyond the narrative and summary page (described above), tenure-earning faculty shall provide a 1-2 page description of his/her research agenda progress. The progress page may be provided in chart, graph, or other narrative print format as a supplementary document in Archivum and labeled accordingly.

Vita. A separate copy of the faculty member's vita (brief or full vita) shall be submitted following the summary page as a supplementary document in Archivum.

Electronic Submission. Consistent with USF policy, faculty are to upload their narratives to the university's designated electronic repository (i.e., Archivum system). Narratives shall be written in accordance with the COEDU Annual Review policy in terms of breadth, depth, and length. The

summary paragraph(s), vita, and progress toward tenure (for tenure-earning faculty only) described above are in addition to the maximum word limits indicated on the COEDU AR Policy document.

Additional Documentation. Faculty shall maintain documentation files based on the guidelines provided in the LLEEP Governance document. Such files (electronic except for books or other works that are not replicable in electronic format) may be requested by the AR committee to inform the AR review process. Faculty are advised to purposefully select artifacts to that best illustrate excellence in their scholarly activities (manuscripts under review, accepted, in press, published; grant activities) for the year and prepare a separate table indicating quality of journal or stature in field to provide reviewers a context for understanding the work. Such descriptors may include journal acceptance rates, impact factor, and so on, and selectivity of conference presentations (i.e., 300 of 1,700 selected for conference; 1.00 impact factor; 15% acceptance rate).

Narratives. Narratives shall provide an overview of excellence as reflected in the previous year's teaching, research, and service, and are to be developed in accordance with the requirements for tenure and promotion outlined by the Department, College, and University. Consistent with the COEDU AR guidelines, faculty may provide as much documentation as desired, although the committee is not obligated to review said documentation. The primary effort in preparation for the AR submissions shall rest on the narratives rather than the supplemental documents. All narratives are to be submitted to Archivum.

Supplemental Documents. Faculty members are also asked to submit the following for review by the AR committee electronically as supplemental documents in Archivum:

- **Summary**
- **Vita**
- **Progress toward Tenure** (Tenure-earning faculty only)
- **Supporting Documents** (Required of Tenure-earning faculty)
- **Timelines.** Faculty shall adhere to the timelines of the COEDU for submission of AR narratives and a summary statement unless otherwise indicated by the Department Chair.

The Department Chair will notify all faculty of the electronic submission of these documents.

3.2.7 Annual Review Process

Confidentiality, Integrity. To ensure integrity in the evaluation process, AR committee members and observers will maintain confidentiality of meeting discussions, reviews, and opinions generated throughout. The committee shall seek to establish a credible review process that honors each faculty member's unique line(s) of inquiry, teaching philosophies, professional context, and service to the university. The AR committee may invite faculty to submit responses to specific questions or discuss AR submissions when further clarification is needed. Such discussions are intended to be limited to the dyads of reviewers assigned as primary and secondary reviewers and the faculty member.

Election of AR Chair. Faculty serving on the AR committee will elect a Committee Chair by majority vote. Preference shall be given to faculty who are full professors and who have most recently served on the AR committee in their previous department. In years subsequent to 2019-2020, the AR Chair shall be selected from the AR committee members in their second year of service on the AR Committee. The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee recognizes the work of the Committee members in a formal and specific letter by May 1 at the end of each academic year.

Random Assignment. Distribution of faculty to be reviewed shall be random for faculty according to rank. In order for an equal distribution of reviews, assignment of AR committee members and faculty (Full Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, and Instructors) shall be made at the first meeting of the AR committee. A recording of the procedures shall be maintained for historical purposes, though the identity of reviewers assigned will remain confidential.

Interrater Reliability. In order to establish consistency in ratings, all AR committee members will randomly select 3-4 narratives for independent review and rating, then discuss ratings. Scoring of these initially-selected narratives shall continue until consensus is achieved for each. Thereafter, remaining documents shall be scored according to the process described below. Reviewers from both tenured/tenure-earning faculty and instructors' committees shall meet for IRR of teaching and any other areas common across faculty assignments.

Reviewer Assignment. Elected AR faculty and instructors shall serve as primary or secondary reviewers for randomly assigned review of narratives, respectively. Each member of the dyad will independently review the assigned AR narratives and relevant supporting documents, then present a brief evaluation summary to the full AR committee for consideration. The evaluation draft may be informed by the summary statement provided to the AR committee and contain ratings of faculty assignments. While pairs of dyads may be assigned to multiple primary and secondary reviews of some narratives, the committee shall ensure that dyads vary in assignment across the department. Thus, reviewer 1 and reviewer 4 may both read A1, A4, A7, but shall also be paired with other AR committee members for other reviews.

Periodic Checks for Rater Consistency. Following the review of 1⁄4 of assigned reviews and within two weeks of the initial interrater reliability check, the entire AR committee shall reconvene and randomly select from among the reviews completed to verify interrater reliability. The committee shall independently review another set of approximately 1⁄4th of the narratives and reconvene for consistency checks of these anchors as described above for the next set of reviews selected randomly. The committee shall decide whether additional consistency checks are needed based on percentage agreement of committee. Moreover, the AR Committee may convene additional meetings to establish reliability of reviews at any time during the AR process.

Full Committee Review. All AR committee members shall independently review each narrative summary. Dyads comprised of the primary and secondary reader shall present their ratings, evidence, and discuss final rating determination with the whole of the committee.

Completion. Upon completion of the annual review rating process, the AR Chair shall upload relevant ratings and feedback to FIS and notify Department Chair of completion. The

committee shall also provide to the chair a report of the ratings for each faculty member for all assigned areas. For branch campus faculty, Regional Chancellors or their designee will provide "formal written input… prior to a College Dean completing the performance appraisal" (see USF Consolidation Handbook V. 1, p. 16).

Annual Review Process Retrospective. Following the completion of the AR committee's evaluations, the committee shall reconvene to discuss procedures and provide recommendations for adjustments to the process for consideration by faculty and, if needed, the Governance Committee. Such feedback shall be collected at a time when faculty have recently completed the review process and suggestions about elections, submissions, reviews, and reporting can be noted. Particular challenges encountered and recommended actions shall be provided.

3.2.8 LLEEP Annual Review Expectations

3.2.8.1 Introduction and Purpose. Per applicable university, college and department governance documents, the Annual Review Committee conducts an annual evaluation of faculty activity for which the faculty member has an annual assignment of effort. The outcomes of this process may impact the awarding of merit pay and faculty professional and career development.

The annual performance review for a faculty member holding a rank below that of (full) Professor or Professor of Instruction (formerly Instructor III) will normally include an evaluation toward promotion. At the time of this writing, the criteria and process for annual review contained herein are consistent with expectations for promotion and/or tenure and promotion and will be updated to remain so. However, we also acknowledge these are separate processes and faculty are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the separate processes and expectations for both annual review and promotion and tenure.

The purpose of the evaluative process, therefore, consists of a number of necessary elements. The evaluative process must:

1. Apply articulated department standards of professional performance (as outlined in this document) to faculty members' assigned workload responsibilities;

2. Hold the evaluated faculty member and the annual review committee members equally accountable to their peers through this process;

3. Provide authentic supportive and constructive feedback meant to provide direction for future growth and professional success;

4. Include feedback that is helpful, specific, and individualized to the faculty member being evaluated to assist in working toward continued professional success, including specific feedback regarding areas in need of improvement;

5. Reflect the university's aspirational goals;

6. Reflect continuity of evaluative principles from year to year;

7. Be interpreted in a manner consistent with the Collective Bargaining Agreement;

8. Reflect and support diversity among the fields and approaches to teaching, research, and service represented in the department and the faculty member's individual assignment and resources available; and

9. Include procedural safeguards to ensure equitable reviews.

It is also important to recognize certain philosophical safeguards in the annual review process and specifically to note the limitations of said review:

1. The review cannot be based on personal bias or favoritism;

2. No member of the committee may participate in the review of their own record at any time;

3. The review cannot abridge or threaten academic freedom in any way;

4. The review cannot substitute the standards or practices of one discipline for another;

5. The review cannot be used as a surrogate for evaluation of "collegiality"; and

6. The review cannot discourage the free exchange of ideas or equity among all ranks of the faculty, especially in the committee's deliberations and decisions.

3.2.8.2 Interpretive Guidance

The committee shall receive from each faculty member under evaluation evidentiary documentation and a narrative that provides guidance to the committee as to how the individual record meets the expectations set forth below. The narrative shall be concise and succinct. Brevity is expected.

The committee shall indicate its own evaluation of the record in reference to the expectations outlined in this document taking into account the evidentiary documentation and the narrative.

3.2.8.3 Expectations

3.2.8.3.1 Teaching

Faculty members should submit a narrative describing their activities and successful productivity related to teaching and learning during the year under review.

To receive a score of **Outstanding,** evidence is submitted by the faculty member that meets the criterion for *satisfactory* below with additional evidence as to quantity *and* quality of

the work and a rationale for why their teaching should be considered outstanding. Possible evidence (not intended to be exhaustive) includes:

- **Innovation in Practice, when applicable**

  - Documentation of unique or new approaches to instruction or assessment with rationale, for example

    - Syllabi;
    - assignment descriptions; and
    - brief examples of a practice/strategy.
    - Evidence of iterative course improvement/revision or development of existing courses;
    - Development of new courses;
    - Reports of observations of teaching;
    - Teaching awards; and
    - Evidence of iterative course improvement/revision or development of existing courses.
    - Activities that demonstrate commitment to student success
    - Documentation of activities that, in the committee's opinion, reflect activity beyond typical classroom teaching and advising;
    - Evidence of student mentoring including, but not limited to,
      - serving and mentoring when possible on doctoral/master's committees and/or as major professor;
      - submitting external funding proposals;
      - presenting at professional conferences;
      - directed research activities;
      - undergraduate honors thesis;
      - independent student research projects;
      - volunteer/paid student research assistant supervision;
      - student conference submissions; and
      - academic products co-authored with students.

To receive a score of **Strong**, evidence is submitted by the faculty member that meets the criterion for *satisfactory* below with additional evidence as to quantity *or* quality of the work and a rationale for why their teaching should be considered strong. Examples of additional evidence include, but are not limited to:

- Evidence of commitment to learning;
- Instructor reflection on, and use of, student feedback;* and
- Fulfillment of teaching obligations with reflection on, and the use of, student feedback*.
- Student evaluations (formal and/or informal) and statement on the use of said feedback
- Documentation of professional development;
- Statement regarding changes in philosophy or practice with rationale;

- Reports of observations of teaching;

To receive a score of **Satisfactory,** evidence is submitted by the faculty member that reasonably suggests the use of instructional and evaluation practices that are consistent with teaching and learning,

- reflecting a thoughtful approach to teaching and learning;
- aligned with instructional and evaluation practices; and
- reflected in student success.

To receive a score of **Weak**, the faculty member fails to meet the criteria for Outstanding, Strong, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory.

To receive a score of **Unsatisfactory**, the faculty member's narrative and submitted documentation suggests, in the opinion of the committee, a significant lack of in terms of both teaching and learning.

*The faculty recognize a growing body of evidence that calls into question the use of student feedback in the evaluation of teaching quality, and in particular the role that such evaluations may play in continuing discriminatory practices. It is therefore inappropriate for the committee to base the evaluation of this criterion solely on the scores of student evaluations. It is also not permissible for the annual review committee to interpret a faculty member's objection, lack of providing, or silence on said evaluations in a way adverse to the faculty member.

3.2.8.3.2 Service

Faculty members should submit a narrative describing their activities and successful productivity related to service during the year under review. Service commitments are highly individualized to the faculty member, and the department faculty encourage decisions based on appropriateness to workload assignment and position. Service expectations, therefore, may vary among the ranks and titles of faculty and based on workload assignment. In general, however, a 10% service commitment is equivalent to 4 hours of service per salaried week (per the CBA section 9.8, a work week is 40 hours). It is recognized that this is a weekly average and that individual weeks may vary.

To receive a score of **Outstanding,** evidence is submitted by the faculty member that meets the criterion for *satisfactory* below with additional evidence as to quantity *and* quality of the work and a rationale for why their service should be considered outstanding. Such evidence could include, but is not limited to:

- Internal (within the university) committees on which the faculty member served with a concise, succinct, written account outlining the role assumed.
- Recognized service to the college, campus, or university, with a concise, succinct, written account outlining the role assumed.
- External service to the profession

- service as an officer of an organization;
- conference chair;
- journal editor;
- other role in support of a professional agency or organization related to the faculty member's discipline or area of professional expertise

Letters of appointment, copies of website pages, press reports and similar documentation can be submitted with a concise, succinct, written account outlining the role assumed.

- Public/community service and outreach

- compensated and uncompensated work that reflects positively on the faculty member's academic standing and/or the institution, broadly defined.

Letters of appointment, copies of website pages, press reports, a list of committees or boards of directors on which the faculty member served with a concise, succinct, written document outlining the role assumed can be submitted.

To receive a score of **Strong**, evidence is submitted by the faculty member that meets the criterion for *satisfactory* below with additional evidence as to quantity *or* quality of the work and a rationale for why their service should be considered strong.

- Number and outcomes of activities;
- Individual contributions to the listed service activities; and
- Indicate how their service work aligns with their service assignment or how it exceeds their service assignment.

To receive a score of **Satisfactory,** evidence is submitted by the faculty member that reasonably suggests work equivalent to at least .4 hours per week of work per 1% service workload assignment and a rationale for why their service should be considered satisfactory, and appropriate to the rank, assigned workload, and level of professional experience. Such evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- Internal service (participation in recognized USF activities other than teaching or research);
- External service
- activities in professional service to administrative agencies;
- Activities in professional organizations related to the faculty member's discipline;
- Public/community service, or outreach;
- Volunteerism that is relevant and appropriate to the discipline, and that reflects positively on faculty status as an academician; and
- Compensated activities approved per university guidelines shall also be considered service.

To receive a score of **Weak**, the faculty member fails to meet the criteria for Outstanding, Strong, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory.

To receive a score of **Unsatisfactory**, the faculty member's narrative and submitted documentation suggests, in the opinion of the committee, a significant lack of productivity in terms of both quantity and quality.

3.2.8.3.3 Research

Faculty members should submit a narrative describing their activities and successful productivity related to research during the year under review. In the context of the department, research is scholarly and/or creative activity that (1) meets the professional standards of rigor and relevance; and (2) is shared in recognized professional venues that are situated to inform and impact the field.

We recognize that research and/or scholarly activity are shaped by and based not only within one or more disciplines, but also stem from paradigmatic assumptions of truth, evidence, and methodology. Academic specializations may value differently specific products of research and/or scholarship, such as grants, books, or articles. Academic specializations also have specific cultures regarding projects such as proceedings, co-authoring, and external funding. Further, we recognize that research methodologies evolve. Accordingly, the department faculty intends to recognize and celebrate a diversity of research and/or scholarship that meets the two criteria noted in the paragraph above.

Despite the fact that research and/or scholarship is a diverse undertaking and cannot be universalized within the department, faculty members who have a research assignment as part of their workload are expected to show activity annually regarding research and/or scholarship that meets the criteria set forth at the outset, and in so doing present evidence demonstrating that their activity meets *both* the following benchmarks:

> 1. The activity meets the standards of rigor and relevance as defined by their specialization. External evidence of said standards should be provided; and
>
> 2. shared in recognized professional venues that are situated to inform and impact the field

To receive a score of **Outstanding,** the faculty member's narrative and supporting materials meet the criteria for satisfactory and demonstrate through external sources significant rigor and relevance in a recognized professional venue that is situated to inform and impact the faculty member's field. The evidence should demonstrate the potential for **high impact (see below)**.

> Possible evidence (not intended to be exhaustive) includes:

- **Peer reviewed journal articles**

- including impact factor

- for journals without an impact factor, the following features could indicate journal quality and impact:

  - international refereed;
  - national refereed;
  - prestige within field;
  - length of journal;
  - who are the editors and/or editorial advisory board;
  - How many libraries hold it?
  - Acceptance rate
  - Google scholar citations;
  - H-index;
  - Scopus cite score;
  - Source Normalized Impact per Paper (SNIP);
  - Downloads/reads;
  - open access;
  - awards;
  - wide circulation;
  - association journal
  - number of citations of the article

- **Books, monographs, and book chapters**

  - including publisher (national or international)
  - who wrote the foreword;
  - endorsements;
  - commissioned (by a national or international organization);
  - editors;
  - handbooks;
  - textbooks (university textbooks; classroom curriculum);
  - outcomes and impacts (who picked it up, etc.),
  - encyclopedias;
  - open access books;
  - awards national/international/regional;
  - peer-authored, published book reviews

- **Conference proceedings**

  - including if it was refereed [peer reviewed; etc], [International refereed; National refereed; State & regional],
  - Level by organization;
  - Level by location,
  - Audience and/or organization;

- Type of presentation [Poster, paper, Symposium, panel speaker, round table); invited?]

- **Conference Presentations**

  - including if it was refereed (peer reviewed; etc), (International refereed; National refereed; State & regional)
  - Level by organization;
  - Level by location, Audience and/or organization;
  - Type of presentation (Poster, paper, Symposium, panel speaker, round table); invited? Invited talk, keynote talk, speech)

- **Grants**

  - Funded or not (did you get scored, did you make it to a panel);
  - Total funds proposed and/or funded;
  - Demonstrated effort towards grant procurement for unfunded grants;
  - How competitive; Federal, state, local; Research, training (including development);
  - Degree of effort;
  - Role within the Grant;
  - Share of Funds (to you as a salary savings, to the college, to USF);
  - Activities involved in the grant such as the report writing;
  - Reviewing of grants;
  - Management of grants

- **Creative Scholarship**

  - AR/VR application for learners (e.g., second language learners)
  - University published or sponsored;
  - Endorsements;
  - Commissioned (by a national or international organization);
  - Grant-funded;
  - Producers;
  - Handbooks;
  - Multimodal Products;
  - Outcomes and impacts (who viewed, performed, downloaded, tweeted, picked it up, etc.);
  - Open Access Products;
  - Patents;
  - Public intellectual output;
  - Awards;
  - National/international/regional);
  - literary products

- **Other**

  - Tests
  - Surveys
  - Assessments
  - Measurements
  - Curricula
  - Professional Development Materials

High impact can be defined as work that supports the goals and aspirations of the university and/or the discipline of the scholar. Potential for high impact typically would be seen in such elements as the frequency, speed, and longevity of citation; response to calls for high area(s) of need and/or replication; clear indication that it will impact policy and practice; and reputation, circulation, and impact factor of the publication venue. **High impact must be demonstrated through external sources.**

Examples could include, but are not limited to:

- Congressional testimony;
- Keynote and/or invited addresses at significant national or international venues;
- Articles or invited editorship for special topics in a top journal in the field;
- Work cited as "seminal";
- External funding awarded from a highly competitive grant;
- Work that demonstrably advances the university's aspirations toward AAU and/or top tier status;
- Creation of new intellectual property resulting in patents and or licensing, and similar distribution channels;
- Work that has a wide use in educational practice;
- Recognized expertise in a national or international public sphere; or
- Prestigious awards.

To receive a score of **Strong**, the faculty member's narrative and supporting materials meet the criteria for satisfactory and demonstrate through external sources significant rigor and relevance in a recognized professional venue that is situated to inform and impact the faculty member's field. Evidence listed in "Outstanding" or its equivalent can be provided (and is therefore not repeated here), but in the opinion of the review committee does not suggest the potential of "high impact."

To receive a score of **Satisfactory,** we recognize that the stream of research and/or scholarly productivity ebbs and flows over the course of the scholar's life, and is subject to a number of influences. A faculty member is expected to engage in a cycle of research, scholarship, and/or other creative activity which includes work in circulation and work in progress. Recognizing the interdisciplinarity of educational scholarship and of faculty research agendas, individual faculty may choose different paths or combinations thereof (e.g., scholarly articles or books). Additionally, differing research projects take differing

amounts of time, yet may result in similar scholarly products or deliverables. External funding may or may not be available for certain research projects (and such funding does not necessarily reflect the relevance or desirability of said projects). Additionally, the point in a researcher's career will impact choices regarding research/scholarship. Accordingly, the quantity of research and/or scholarly products such as articles and books may vary over the course of a career, and the department recognizes and accepts such variability.

The faculty member's narrative and supporting materials demonstrate alignment with the department's established research and/or scholarship criteria noted herein in the context of the faculty member's assignment for research at a level consistent with the faculty member's position. Evidence listed in "Outstanding" or its equivalent can be provided (and is therefore not repeated here), but in the opinion of the review committee includes no external sources that attest to the significance of the work.

To receive a score of **Weak**, the faculty member fails to meet the criteria for Outstanding, Strong, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory.

To receive a score of **Unsatisfactory**, the faculty member's narrative and submitted documentation suggests, in the opinion of the committee, a significant lack of productivity in terms of both quantity and quality.

3.2.8.3.4 Appeals

If a faculty member wishes to challenge the results of the annual review process, they can do so based on one or two criteria: procedural or evaluative.

If the faculty member claims that a procedure was not properly followed, they can notify the Annual Review Committee Chair and the Department Chair. The Department Chair and Committee Chair shall collaboratively adjudicate.

If the faculty member claims that the evaluation, in part or in whole, is incorrect, they may prepare a narrative in response with their justification for a different score and submit it to the Annual Review Committee Chair. Upon receipt of the appeal narrative, the Annual Review Committee Chair shall:

1. Distribute the appeal narrative to all members of the committee;

2. Take an anonymous yes/no vote on the following question in regard to the faculty member's appeal: "Shall the annual review committee revise its evaluation?"

3. If the majority vote is no, the Annual Review Committee Chair shall notify the faculty member of that decision. Otherwise, the Annual Review Committee Chair shall call a meeting of the committee to reconsider the faculty member's original evidence and narrative. The appeal narrative shall also be considered, but no additional evidentiary documentation may be submitted or considered.

4.   The outcome of the reconsideration shall replace the original report of the committee and no further appeals to the committee shall be considered.

5.   No member of the committee may review the report of the committee on their own record, nor appeal in any manner the determination of the committee, prior to the publication of said review in the normal manner.

3.3.   Institutional Review Board (IRB) Committee

Purpose. The purpose of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) Committee shall be as follows: serve as within-departmental reviewers of faculty and student IRB applications; annually revisit and review IRB requirements at the University level to identify potential areas for revision or addition; annually review existing College and University governance procedures to align these with IRB procedures and practices; report suggested changes concerning IRB procedures to faculty at Department meetings or other forums; maintain records of IRB Committee membership within the department, college, and university; consult with the LLEEP Department Chair regarding dates for proposed elections and other voting concerning the IRB Committee; and maintain records of IRB Committee election and voting outcomes, including alternates. See Appendix C for Understanding the Purpose of the LLEEP IRB Committee and the BullsIRB Portal.

Operating Procedures. The IRB Committee shall be developed based on a process of elections after the names of nominated and interested members have been voted upon by the LLEEP Department. The IRB Committee is to be led by a Committee Chair determined by members of this Committee. The Chair of each committee, in consultation with the Department Chair, shall inform members of the Department of the names of elected Committee Members and of the name of the Chair upon completing the process of election and selection. IRB Committee Chairs or Committee Members who accept the position are expected to serve for the duration of their terms. In the rare event that a member no longer wishes to serve, a new IRB Committee Chair/Committee Member shall be elected by the Department to serve out the remainder of the term of the individual being replaced.

Eligibility and Elections. The following address the selection, charge, terms, and procedures of the IRB Committee members.

   Charge: Review all IRB applications forwarded by Department faculty and students.

   Members: Five (5) to seven (7) representatives shall be elected to serve as reviewers with preference for representation across programs. In the event that all programs cannot be represented, the IRB committee shall accept nominations as are available from the LLEEP. During the electoral process for this committee, special consideration shall be given to nominations of faculty from the Sarasota-Manatee and St. Petersburg campuses. If there is not representation from Sarasota-Manatee within the elected members, a special at large member shall be elected from faculty assigned to Sarasota-Manatee. Likewise, if there is not representation from faculty assigned to St. Petersburg within the elected members, a special at large member shall be elected from faculty assigned to St. Petersburg. Similarly, if there is not representation from faculty assigned to Tampa within the elected members, a special at large

member shall be elected from faculty assigned to Tampa. Accordingly, there is a possibility that one or two special at large members may be added to the membership of the IRB Committee. However, in order to guard against overburdening colleagues from campuses with proportionally few department faculty, those elected from the Sarasota-Manatee and St. Petersburg campuses may opt out of service on the IRB Committee.

Length of Term: The length of the IRB Committee term shall be a 2-year term (staggered).

Election of IRB Committee Members: Continuously appointed tenure-track or tenured faculty.

Who may elect members: Continuously appointed tenure-track or tenured faculty are eligible to vote for IRB committee members.

Election: Elections to the IRB Committee shall be held in mid-spring semester.

Alternates: Faculty who received the second (third or fourth) highest votes on the ballot shall serve as additional reviewers when needed. In addition to the elected IRB officials, the names of these alternate faculty shall be reported to LLEEP after voting is completed.

Service on other Standing Committees: Members of this committee are free to serve on other standing committees.

Responsibilities of the Chair of the IRB Committee. The IRB Committee Chair works with the Chair of the Department and Committee members to develop an appropriate charge, shared agenda, and plan of work for the Committee for the year; meets with members of the Committee at least once a month; secures a commitment from each Committee member regarding the specific work they are willing to do to contribute to the goals of the Committee during the year; assigns IRB proposals for review equally and equitably; monitors the progress of the Committee work and coordinates committee activities to reach the goals of the committee; works with members of the LLEEP Department to induct members into the spirit and purposes of the committee; communicates regularly to the Department updates concerning the needs and contributions of the Committee via an oral or written report (as decided upon by the Department Chair, prior to or at Department meetings as designated by the Department Chair); and recognizes the work of the Committee members in a formal and specific letter by May 1 at the end of each academic year.

Conflict of Interest. Faculty serving on the IRB Committee shall not simultaneously review proposals submitted by students for whom they serve as Dissertation Chairs.

4. Ad Hoc Tenure and Promotion Committee

Charge. The Tenure and Promotion Committee (TP) Committee shall be an *Ad Hoc* Committee. The TP Committee shall review (1) mid-tenure applications submitted by assistant professors, (2) tenure and promotion applications submitted by assistant professors, (3) promotion applications submitted by associate professors, and (4) review applications and prepare nominations for emeritus. The Department Chair shall distribute the charge to the committee approximately two

weeks before commencement of review. Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Committee Procedures and Responsibilities are provided in Appendix D.

Members and Length of Term. The TP Committee will consist of a minimum of five and a maximum of seven tenured members. Faculty shall elect these representatives to serve a one-year term. Membership on this committee is ordinarily limited to faculty who have been appointed within the Department for at least two years. Committees considering candidates for promotion to Professor will comprise individuals holding the rank of Professor.

During the electoral process for said committee, special consideration is to be given to nominations of faculty from the Sarasota-Manatee and St. Petersburg campuses. If there is no representation from Sarasota-Manatee, St. Petersburg, or Tampa within the elected members, and a faculty from Sarasota-Manatee is undergoing review, a special at large member will be elected from faculty assigned to Sarasota-Manatee. Likewise, if there is not representation from faculty assigned to St. Petersburg within the elected members, and a faculty from the St. Petersburg campus is undergoing review, a special at large member will be elected from faculty assigned to St. Petersburg. Likewise, if there is not representation from faculty assigned to Tampa within the elected members, and a faculty from Tampa is undergoing review, a special at large member will be elected from faculty assigned to Tampa. Accordingly, there is a possibility that one or two special at large members may be added to the membership of the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Eligibility to Serve. Tenured faculty may review applications for Instructor promotion and Tenure and Promotion to Associate. Only Full Professors may review Promotion to Full applications. In the event the TP committee elected does not have five Full Professors to review the Full Professor applications, an election for the number of additional Full Professor faculty needed shall be held. Only those members who have received tenure at the University of South Florida shall be eligible to review and make recommendations on tenure applications. Chairs, directors, and deans shall neither vote nor participate on any Tenure and Promotion Committee. This exclusion applies to assistant or associate chairs, directors, or deans when they participate in the tenure and promotion process in support of, or as delegated by, chairs, directors or deans. Individuals serving on more than one advisory committee (e.g., department and college) shall vote at the Department level on candidates from their home department/unit rather than at the College level.

Individuals serving on more than one committee may still advise at the College level to allow for those from a department/unit to inform other committee members around program/department norms. Such advisement is limited to communication for educational purposes about discipline-specific information; it is not equivalent to participation for decision-making purposes (i.e., voting). Voting for members of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee shall occur by February 15 if practicable, or prior to the vote of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee. When the ballot for the College Tenure and Promotion Committee is created, faculty who have been elected to this committee will have an asterisk (*) placed by their name to signify their membership on the Department Committee.

Election of the TP Committee. All LLEEP tenured and tenure-earning faculty are eligible to elect the representatives.

Election. Elections to the TP Committee are to be held by February 15 if practicable.

Alternates. The faculty member with the next highest number of votes shall serve as alternate. The LLEEP faculty policy member(s) and Department Chair shall verify the election results and maintain, in confidence, the ballot results for identification of alternates should one of the TP representatives not be able to complete his or her term.

Service on other Standing Committees. Faculty serving on the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee may not also serve on the College Tenure and Promotion Committee during the same academic year unless warranted due to lack of sufficient faculty.

Faculty Voting Process for Tenure and Promotion for Department Colleagues. Table 3 illustrates the faculty voting procedures for tenure and promotion for department colleagues.

Table 3.

Faculty Voting Process for Tenure and Promotion for Department Colleagues

Faculty Role	Eligibility to Vote on		
	Department Poll	Department Tenure and Promotion Committee Poll	College Tenure and Promotion Committee Poll
Tenured faculty member (*not* serving on Department Tenure and Promotion Committee or College Tenure and Promotion Committee)	Yes	No	No
Committee Member on Department Tenure and Promotion	No	Yes	No
Committee Member on College Tenure & Promotion	Yes	No	No*

Note*: "Members of the committee from a candidate's department may participate in discussions but not make motions or vote on that candidate" (COEDU Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, 2020, page 12). These College Tenure and Promotion Committee members do, however, make motions and vote on colleagues from other departments. Therefore, the votes for faculty must occur within the department—not at the College level if a faculty member, due to lack of sufficient faculty, needs to serve at both the college and department levels.

Additional considerations include:

1. Recommendations for the awarding of tenure are made by the employee's supervisor and include a poll by secret ballot of the department's eligible tenured members, who are expected to review the application files prior to voting. Eligible faculty on sabbatical or temporary leave (such as a Fulbright) may vote or be recorded as absent.

2. Chairs, directors and deans shall neither vote nor participate on any tenure and promotion committee. This exclusion applies to assistant or associate chairs, directors, or deans when they participate in the tenure and promotion process in support of, or as delegated by, chairs, directors, or deans.

3. Individuals serving on more than one advisory committee (e.g., department and college) *shall vote at the department level* on candidates from their home department/unit rather than at the college level. Individuals serving on more than one committee may still advise at the college level to allow for those from a department/unit to inform other committee members around program/department norms. Such advisement is limited to communication for educational purposes about discipline-specific information; it is not equivalent to participation for decision-making purposes (i.e., voting). Voting for members of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee should occur prior to the vote of the College Tenure & Promotion Committee. When the ballot for the College Tenure and Promotion Committee is created, faculty who have been elected to the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will have an asterisk (*) placed by their name to signify their membership on the Department Committee.

4. In instances where departments are geographically distributed, department procedures must include methods to ensure equitable and appropriate participation by faculty throughout the department in recommendations for tenure and promotion.

5. All members of tenure and promotion committees are expected to review the application files prior to discussion or voting. Procedures to ensure participation by all committee members (or, as needed, alternates) are established and followed at all levels of review. Following a vote by secret ballot, the ballots are counted immediately in the presence of committee members, and the tally is recorded. Written narratives from majority and dissenting minorities, if any, may be included with the record.

6. Procedures for post-tenure review (i.e., Sustained Performance Evaluations) will be decided at the departmental level and will be conducted in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

7. The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee recognizes the work of the Committee members in a formal and specific letter by May 1, if practicable, at the end of each academic year.

5. Emeritus Evaluations

The following address the selection, charge, terms, and procedures of Emeritus faculty.

Guidelines for Emeritus Status. Departmental guidelines for Emeritus status have been developed within the parameters provided by the university guidelines on emeritus status (http://psychology.usf.edu/policies/forms/emerituspolicy.pdf). According to those guidelines, "By conferring the Emeritus status, the University of South Florida recognizes the retiring faculty

member has been and remains a member of the University community. Therefore, the recommendation that a retirement would lead to the Emeritus status must be grounded in the record of the retiree."

Eligibility for Emeritus Status. Tenured faculty in the department who are retiring with at least 10 years of service to the university are eligible for consideration. Exceptions to the 10-year rule can be made for faculty retiring because of disability.

Role of the Department in Determining Emeritus Status. LLEEP assumes the responsibility for the evaluation of the appropriateness of conferring the Emeritus status on retiring faculty. Emeritus status recognizes a scholar for contribution of work to an appropriate field/discipline housed in the Department.

Nomination and Application Process. The individual faculty member who is retiring initiates the process (or is nominated in writing by any tenure-line faculty member in the Department) during the faculty member's final semester of employment. The process should begin during the faculty member's final semester of full employment and materials submitted to the Chair at least two weeks before the due date. The Department Chair shall review and submit the materials to the College Dean. The Dean, upon review, shall forward the materials to the Provost's Office no later than one month before the end of that semester. To facilitate timely review, the department recommends that materials be submitted by September 1st for those retiring at the end of the fall semester, February 15th for those retiring at the end of the spring semester, and May 15th for those retiring at the end of the summer semester.

Nomination Criteria. Individuals shall be nominated based upon their cumulative performance that has resulted in significant contributions over a sustained period of time. A faculty member must have been recognized for distinctive contributions to the development of his or her discipline in areas such as teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, or professional service.

Materials for Nomination at the Department Level. The nominee shall submit the following materials to the Tenure and Promotion Committee: a written nomination with a summary of the contributions the scholar has made to the field in teaching, research, and/or service; a copy of the complete Curriculum Vitae.

Committee for Determining Emeritus Status. The TP Committee for LLEEP, through the normal department governance procedures, shall have the responsibility for evaluating nominations for Emeritus Status, with one caveat: if there is no member on the TP Committee from the nominee's field/discipline, a faculty member from the department in that field/discipline may be invited by the Department Chair to join the TP Committee for the purposes of evaluating the nominee's materials. The TP Committee shall review the application materials and submit a letter of recommendation to the Department Chair.

Materials for Consideration by the Dean. The LLEEP Department Chair will forward the following to the College Dean:
- The letter of self-nomination or nomination from a faculty member in the department;
- The Vita of the Nominee;

- A letter from the Departmental TP Committee indicating their recommendation based on the department approved criteria; and
- A letter from the Department Chair recommending or withholding his/her support of the Emeritus status. [Note: Letters should briefly evaluate the candidate's record as a faculty member.]

Dean's Review. The College Dean shall review the nomination letter, Vita, and letters from the departmental committee and the Department Chair and shall transmit all information to the Provost's office.

Reporting. Appointments to Emeritus status shall be reported through appropriate channels for personnel change to the Human Resources Office.

Service to the Department. Although Emeritus Faculty are typically not involved with any aspect of program delivery, Emeriti can serve the department when invited by the LLEEP Department Chair and/or program faculty by volunteering service (for example, doctoral mentoring, co-writing/reading grants, fund-raising through the Development Office, new faculty mentoring). To the extent necessary to sustain the active scholarly life of Emeriti, departments shall strive to accommodate the Emeriti by granting them access to departmental resources including office and laboratory space, and such other departmental resources normally made available to faculty at the discretion of the Department Chair.

Rights of Emeritus Faculty. Emeritus faculty shall have all other rights conferred by the university on emeritus faculty.

6. Conduct of Department Business

Chair Appointment. Each department will have a Chairperson appointed by the College Dean, with input from department faculty, selected through procedures approved by the Faculty Policy Council in accordance with Florida Board of Education and University policy and procedures. Department Chairs shall be tenured and hold rank at the Professor or Associate Professor level in the Department where they serve. If there are no candidates from the Department approved by the College Dean, a faculty member from outside the Department may be appointed by the College Dean as the Department Chair. Additionally, an external search may be made for a chairperson of a department at the sole discretion of the College Dean.

Department Chair's Responsibilities. The role of the Department Chair is to supervise the operation of department programs to include curriculum, instruction, schedule of courses and faculty assignments, and student success; ensure department governance bylaws are followed; monitor student evaluations of instruction, courses, and programs; provide leadership in student recruitment, advising, and clinical placements; and work with students and faculty on matters of academic complaints and potential grievances in accordance with USF policy. The Chair may also perform administrative duties including, but not limited to, approval of student requests, such as petitions, defenses, and Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviews; certification of department payroll; and approval of faculty and staff leave and travel authorizations. The Chair also provides reviews, guidance, and support for the tenure and promotion process. The Chair shall provide

support for College mission and goals; respond to requests for data related to metrics on College mission and goals; and liaison with accreditation and respond to requests for data on all accreditation and reporting processes. The Chair shall also foster a culture of scholarly productivity in the department and complete annual evaluations of faculty and staff. In addition, the Chair supervises department staff; manages the department budget; coordinates/participates in faculty hiring and provides guidance and support in tenure and promotion. The Chair develops performance improvement plans, letters of counsel, and termination procedures when warranted. The Chair also coordinates and facilitate faculty meetings, serves on the Chair's Council, and performs other duties as assigned by Associate Deans or the College Dean. The Department may also have an Associate Chair, who is College faculty, appointed by the College Dean to assist the chair in carrying out the responsibilities outlined above.

Absence. The Department Chair will appoint a designee to preside over department meetings in their absence or reschedule the meeting if needed.

Master Calendar. The Department Chair shall be guided by the master calendar of the Department (see Table 1).

7. Faculty Advisory Groups

7.1 Program Leadership Advisory Group

Purpose. The primary purpose of the Program Leadership Advisory Group is to meet regularly with the Department Chair to discuss initiatives prioritized by the College Dean's Office, which can then be communicated back to faculty. The Program Leadership Group will advise the Department Chair in relation to matters such as faculty support, faculty awards, morale, celebrations, or other concerns. Faculty who serve on the Program Leadership Group shall also share with the Department Chair program considerations, ideas, and issues that affect faculty and students and that are critical to the smooth functioning of the Department. A secondary purpose of the Program Leadership Advisory Group shall be to address major student issues that may potentially compromise the integrity of department programs or professional responsibilities. The Program Leadership Advisory Group shall also follow guidelines for Faculty Credentialing in consultation with the Department Chair to facilitate the credentialing of graduate faculty. The Program Leadership Advisory Group may be convened by the Department Chair to serve on a regular basis or for specific purposes or initiatives.

Constitution. The Program Leadership Advisory Group shall consist of members appointed by the Department Chair. During the appointment process for this committee, special consideration shall be given to the appointment of faculty from the Sarasota-Manatee and St. Petersburg campuses. If there is no representation from Sarasota-Manatee on the Program Leadership Advisory Group, a special at large member will be elected from faculty assigned to Sarasota-Manatee. Likewise, if there is not representation from faculty assigned to St. Petersburg, on the Program Leadership Advisory Group, a special at large member will be elected from faculty assigned to St. Petersburg. Similarly, if there is not representation from faculty assigned to Tampa on the Program Leadership Advisory Group, a special at large member will be elected from faculty assigned to Tampa. Accordingly, there is a possibility that one or two special at large members

may be added to the membership of the Program Leadership Advisory Group. However, in order to guard against overburdening colleagues from campuses with proportionally few department faculty, those elected from the Sarasota-Manatee and St. Petersburg campuses may opt out of service on the Program Leadership Advisory Group.

Operating Procedures. The Program Leadership Advisory Group shall be charged with fulfilling the duties assigned by the Department Chair. The members shall establish a document reflective of the department's shared professional standards and shall present the document to the Department for review annually in order to solicit modifications. This shall involve meeting with Committee members of Standing Committees at least once a month. The Chair for each Committee shall submit an oral or written report, as decided upon by the Department Chair prior to or at each Department meeting, of the progress concerning review of the standards. Both the initial and revised professional standards for the Department shall be reviewed by faculty before a vote to ratify is held. Upon completion of the vote, the Professional Standards shall be distributed to members of the Department. Members of the Program Leadership Advisory Group serve at the discretion of the Department Chair.

7.2 Faculty and Student Success Advisory Group

Purpose. The purpose of the Faculty and Student Success (FSS) Advisory Group is to provide guidance to the Department Chair and advocate for faculty and students round the implementation of initiatives deemed necessary for faculty and student success.

Constitution. The FSS Advisory Group shall consist of the Chairs of the Annual Review, Governance, and Institutional Review Board Committees. During establishment of the FSS Advisory Group, special consideration shall be given to including faculty from the Sarasota-Manatee, St. Petersburg, and Tampa campuses. If there is not representation from Sarasota-Manatee, on a standing committee, a special at large member will be elected from faculty assigned to Sarasota-Manatee. Likewise, if there is not representation from faculty assigned to St. Petersburg on a standing committee, a special at large member will be elected from faculty assigned to St. Petersburg. Similarly, if there is not representation from faculty assigned to Tampa on a standing committee, a special at large member will be elected from faculty assigned to Tampa. Thus, there is a possibility that one or two special at large members may be added to the membership of the FSS Advisory Group. However, in order to guard against overburdening colleagues from campuses with proportionally few department faculty, those elected from the Sarasota-Manatee and St. Petersburg campuses may opt out of service on the FSS Advisory Group. Members within the Faculty Success Advisory group shall select their Chair of choice. In exceptional circumstances, the Department Chair reserves the right to appoint a Chair for the Advisory Group. Each Advisory Group Chair shall serve for a period of one year. Individuals may serve as Chairs of this Group only after serving as a member of the Group for one year. The Advisory Group Chair is to meet with members at least once a month.

Operating Procedures. The FSS Advisory Group shall be charged with fulfilling duties as assigned by the Department Chair. The Chair of the FSS Advisory Group is expected to represent the interest of faculty to the Department Chair on an ongoing basis. Members of the FSS Advisory Group serve at the discretion of the Department Chair.

Roles and Responsibilities of the Chair. Guided by the Department Chair, the FSS Advisory Group shall work with the Chair of the Department and Group members to develop an appropriate charge, shared agenda, and plan of work for the year; meet with members at least once a month; develop a written workplan to account for assigned charges to the Group; obtain signed commitment from each member regarding their specific work outcomes and contribution to the goals of the Group during the year; monitor the progress of the Group work and coordinate group activities to reach the goals of the Group; communicate regularly to the Department Chair and to Department updates concerning the needs and contributions of the Committee via an oral or written report (as decided upon by the Department Chair, prior to or at Department meetings as designated by the Department Chair); and recognize the work of the Committee members and Members At Large in a formal and specific letter by May 1 at the end of each academic year.

Roles and Responsibilities of the Committee. Guided by the Department Chair, the FSS Advisory Group shall follow the appropriate charge, shared agenda, and plan of work for the year; work with members of the Department to induct members into the spirit and purposes of the Group; use insights from the internal Committees represented by this Advisory Group to advise the Department Chair concerning proposed changes to be made to Departmental procedures; serve as a liaison between the Department within the College of Education and Faculty Success initiatives underway in the broader university context; and propose changes to the Faculty Governance document as needed to foster faculty success.

8. Electronic Voting

In the event that the LLEEP Department needs a motion relating to procedural matters of the Department that necessitates a vote at a time when the members of the Department are unable to meet, the Chair or designated Department member may call for an electronic vote. In consultation with the Chair of the Department and the Chair of the Governance Committee, the Administrative Specialist of the Department shall coordinate the voting process and oversee electronic voting on behalf of the Department, giving careful consideration to participation of regional campus faculty in the voting process. Upon completion of the voting process, and unless otherwise indicated, the Administrative Specialist shall send a report of the vote via email to the Department faculty and Department Chair immediately after the close of the voting period. Votes shall be considered binding if a quorum (i.e., majority) of Department members have voted. A quorum for the LLEEP Department will designated to represent at least *half of the Department plus one* such that if the Department consists of 40 members, a quorum is binding if at least 21 members are present. The Department Chair in consultation with the Governance Committee shall use the Department LMS and email lists to ensure members have received the motion and the call for the vote (see Appendix E for an overview of voting eligibility).

9. Department Meetings

Department meetings are convened by the Department Chair during the fall and spring semesters and shall allow for attendance and/or electronic participation by regional campus faculty. Faculty meetings may be conducted using electronic platforms supported by USF. All faculty members, as defined herein, with the exception of Visiting Assistant Professors and Visiting Lecturers, have voting privileges with the department. In the event there are votes taken at Department

meetings, faculty unable to attend meetings in person shall have the opportunity to voice their opinions and vote via electronic vote or email, as guided by the Department Chair. All faculty mebers, as defined herein may represent the department on College and University committees unless otherwise noted in committee eligibility criteria in the Department, College, or University policies. Appendix E provides clarification for voting eligibility during elections, and Appendix F provides the Ballots and Committee Constitution for Spring Elections.

Absence. The Department Chair will appoint a designee to preside over department meetings in their absence or reschedule the meeting if needed.

Agenda. All department meetings require an agenda. This agenda is decided upon by the Chair of the Department in consultation with Committees and Department Members. The agenda shall be distributed to faculty at least 48 hours prior to each Department meeting to provide faculty an opportunity to suggest agenda items for discussion.

Minutes and Task List. At each Department meeting, the Department Chair or the Department Chair's designee shall document meeting minutes and send to faculty for review within seven (7) working days after the meeting. Minutes at the Language, Literacy, Exceptional Education, Ed.D., and Physical Education (LLEEP) meetings shall include reports from all standing and ad-hoc committees, all motions and associated vote counts, notes of all guidelines and procedural changes approved by members of the Department, and any written reports presented at Department meetings. The Department Chair or the Department Chair's designee shall also maintain a list of tasks or action items to be performed by various Department members.

Reports. The Faculty Council Representative(s), Standing Committee Chairs, and chairs of other Department, College, and University committees shall have the opportunity to report on committee actions at Department meetings.

Communication. Electronic publication of announcements and minutes constitutes appropriate communication of faculty meetings. Communication of such announcements and documents shall be made via email.

Location. The location of Language, Literacy, Exceptional Education, Ed.D., and Physical Education (LLEEP) meetings shall be decided upon by the Chair of the Department based on availability of space. In the event no space can be secured for a planned meeting, an electronic meeting may be held instead. Faculty shall receive invitations to electronic meetings for all planned department meetings to allow full participation of faculty regardless of their home campus. Such invitations shall be made by the Department Chair or the Department Chair's designee using the University's LMS or other university electronic conference tools.

10. Program Faculty and Meetings

Program faculty are individuals with shared specializations who often teach in certification, degree programs, or both, and who may serve a range of students at different degree levels. Such faculty commonly exhibit a shared commitment to a given academic area for which they were hired.

Program Affiliation. The College Dean determines the affiliation of tenured, tenure-earning faculty, and instructors. Committee members may invite guests to participate in program discussions regarding planning and academic issues, although the voting membership remains with the core faculty. Program faculty members shall determine who may be invited to attend meetings and how to involve guests in decisions related to the functions of the program.

Functions of the Program Faculty. Program faculty members function as a unit within the department and are involved in sharing responsibility for collaborating on programmatic management. Program faculty are responsible for conducting regular program meetings at least monthly to review student progress and student performance on critical assessments and ~~to~~ discuss areas of opportunity for attention within the curriculum based on student performance data. Such reports shall be regularly presented and shared at Department faculty meetings and made available to Department leadership, UPC, GPC, and the Associate Dean for Undergraduate and Graduate Education. These reports/studies shall also guide subsequent research, professional development, conference attendance, and other opportunities for strategic professional growth. Program faculty, at the direction of the Department Chair, are expected to work with the department Academic Program Specialist(s) to review student applications, schedule updates, admissions monitoring, student matriculation issues, and graduation preparation.

Program Meetings. Program meeting dates and times are determined early in the academic year to align with University, College, and the Department of Language, Literacy, Exceptional Education, Ed.D., and Physical Education (LLEEP) calendars, such that a master schedule for the meetings may be posted and attended by faculty who are primarily in another program but who have a role in the program's functions. Program meetings shall allow for electronic participation.

Program Goals. Goals for upcoming meetings and related agenda items (e.g., progress of program doctoral students, application reviews for master's degree students, paperwork reflecting proposed changes in courses, student progress in meeting performance goals, placement issues, faculty assignments, course scheduling, and space requests) shall be set at the end of each meeting in preparation for the next scheduled meeting. The tentative program meeting agenda and date/time shall be circulated to program faculty within two business days before the scheduled meeting.

11. Faculty Assignments

In accordance with USF's Collective Bargaining Agreement, teaching assignments are determined based on student needs to ensure student success. Ultimately, the Department Chair determines faculty assignments in consultation with the Program Faculty, Program Coordinators, and Area Coordinators, and as part of the broader process of mentorship. Three steps govern the process of faculty assignments:

- Following Annual Review, the Department Chair meets with program faculty to set programmatic goals.
- Program faculty develop a plan to achieve goals and identify course offerings, assignments, and the like.

- The Department Chair meets with each faculty member to discuss the previous year and together they set individual goals for the next academic year based on past performance and in the context of metrics guiding faculty performance.

Based on these discussions, Program Coordinators shall convene program faculty to identify program course needs based on the degree program of study and service courses, schedule of classes, relevant timelines for book orders, and faculty preferences for teaching assignments. The Program Coordinator shall communicate the program faculty's requests and/or decisions about course assignments in writing to the Area Coordinator and Department Chair. If faculty are not able to resolve differences of opinion about program assignments via deliberation among program faculty, then the Department Chair shall make the final decisions regarding faculty assignments. Such decisions may be determined, at the Department Chair's discretion, by a variety of considerations, which may include:

- Student and Program need;
- Faculty expertise in a given area and specialization;
- Faculty course evaluations from previous semesters;
- Faculty load and other research, service, and teaching assignments;
- Faculty interest in teaching a specific course;
- Recency of professional development to remain current in the area via scholarship, training, coursework, and/or work in school and community settings; and
- Respect for the expertise and experience of all department faculty.

12. Program Coordinators

Program Coordinators are to be selected by the Department Chair for oversight and monitoring of Doctoral, Masters, and Undergraduate Programs. Department Chairs shall solicit input from program faculty regarding prospective Program Coordinators.

Program Coordinator Duties. Duties of the Program Coordinators include, but are not limited to, convening program faculty meetings for the purpose of (1) planning courses and timelines (in fall for the spring term, in spring for summer and fall); (2) facilitating discussions among program faculty (and adjuncts or guests as warranted) regarding long-term and short-term program goals, instructional assignments, sequence of courses, e-portfolio reporting, monitoring student progress, reviewing course content and materials, oversight and evaluation of graduate assistants' teaching at USF, procedural concerns, other matters of academic oversight; and (3) communicating regularly with faculty, Area Coordinators, and the Department Chair regarding program matters.

13. Area Coordinators

Area Coordinators convene regular meetings with the program coordinators to discuss upcoming program milestones and program management issues. Area Coordinators serve as a link between program coordinators and the Department Chair. Area Coordinators are appointed by the Department Chair.

14. Graduate Credentialing

The College of Education has placed the responsibility for graduate credentialing within each department's full-time, tenured, and tenure-earning faculty, with credentialing criteria approved by the Faculty Council's Graduate Programs Committee. At the request of a tenured or tenure-earning full-time faculty member, the Department Chair may conduct a review for credentialing to determine if this faculty member may chair doctoral dissertations. In case a Department Chair wishes to be credentialed, approval must occur by the Dean of the College. The department follows the Graduate Programs Committee approved criteria as reflected in the following criteria for credentialing faculty to chair dissertation committees:

- All tenured faculty who hold the rank of full or associate professor and who publish on a regular basis shall be credentialed upon application to the department chair and the department.
- At a minimum, professors must publish at least four refereed publications during the previous five years to be considered publishing on a regular basis.
- Faculty who fail to publish the minimum shall be allowed to remain as chair until students under their supervision complete their degree or exit the program but shall not be allowed to accept new students unless there are extenuating circumstances to be evaluated by the credentialed faculty.
- Only full-time faculty members may serve as chairs of dissertations.
- Tenure-track faculty at the assistant rank may be credentialed if (1) their publishing record complies with the minimum requirements; and (2) they have served on dissertation committees within the previous two years.
- Committee members must be credentialed graduate or affiliate graduate faculty as defined by the University and have the background and expertise that contribute to the success of the student. Affiliate graduate faculty may be Emeritus professors, retired, or recently resigned professors who are credentialed by the department and approved by the College and Office of Graduate Studies Deans. Affiliate graduate faculty may teach graduate courses; serve on master's, specialist, and doctoral level committees; direct master's and specialist's committees; and co-direct doctoral committees at the discretion of the College (see USF Graduate Catalog, Section 8).

15. Graduate Assistants

Graduate Assistants shall also be reviewed by program faculty in accordance with program rating processes. Faculty shall identify the observational instrument or measures to be used to rate graduate assistants. Program faculty shall identify which graduate assistants will be reviewed and which faculty members shall review each student so that distribution of graduate student reviews is shared across the program faculty.

16. Faculty Employment

Department faculty shall advise the Department Chair on program-specific instructional needs, including the hiring and dismissal of tenured, tenure-earning, instructor, and adjunct faculty across all campuses, including regional campuses. The following procedures shall guide search committees, hiring, and appointments in LLEEP.

Searches for Continuously employed Faculty. LLEEP is committed to excellence in teaching in all of its programs. The department is staffed by continuously employed tenured, tenure-earning faculty, and instructors with expertise at the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral levels who conduct a broad-based program of research and scholarship. Consistent with USF's hiring process, once the College Dean has received approval for a search for a continuously appointed tenured, tenure-earning, or instructor position, the Department Chair shall identify the search committee members in consultation with the College Dean. Searches for faculty serving programs on multiple campuses shall include faculty representation across the affected campuses. Faculty from the program that is to conduct the search will be consulted as to the availability and scope of the current commitments in determining the members of the search committee. On all search committees for faculty hiring on branch campuses, Regional Chancellors or their designee shall serve as a voting member (see USF Consolidation Handbook). The Department Chair shall appoint a search committee chair to function as the primary point of communication with the chair, committee, support staff, and, as appropriate, the applicants.

Search committee members shall follow the University and College's search protocols guiding review of applications, confidentiality, announcing meetings in keeping with the rules governing open meetings, and adhering to the guidelines for searches provided by the USF Human Resources Office. Search committees function to screen potential applicants in keeping with the position requirements and offer recommendations for hiring to the Department chair, who in turn conveys these recommendations to the College Dean. The College Dean, in consultation with the Chair, determines who, of the recommended applicants, may be invited for interviews, and who, if any, among the recommended interviewees is to be offered a position.

17. Adjunct Employment

Application for Adjunct Faculty Employment. Employment of adjunct faculty comprises three steps: (1) Requirements for Consideration; (2) Receipt of Request; and (3) Appointment. These steps are reviewed next.

Adjunct Faculty Credentialing Policy. LLEEP is committed to excellence in teaching in all of its programs. The department is staffed by faculty and instructors with expertise at the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral levels to conduct a broad-based program of research and scholarship. Adjuncts may be appointed in order to offer a wider range and variety of course offerings, to be responsive to changing needs of students, to improve efficiency in the use of faculty resources, and bring a special expertise to the course that may not otherwise be available from the roster of permanent full-time faculty. Additionally, adjuncts may be appointed to supervise field experiences at the undergraduate and master's levels. Program areas must review the credentials of adjunct candidates to ensure that their expertise in the discipline is relevant to the experience sought. However, the responsibility for administrative hiring procedures rests with the departmental and college staff associated with Human Resources. When appointed, adjuncts are expected to demonstrate the same commitment to excellence in teaching as the other department faculty while also adhering to and supporting all departmental, college, and university policies and procedures.

Application for Adjunct Faculty Employment. Employment of adjunct faculty comprises three steps: (1) Requirements for Consideration; (2) Receipt of Request; and (3) Appointment (see Table 4 below). These steps are reviewed next.

Step One — Requirements for Consideration

Prospective adjunct faculty submit the following information to the Department Chair:

Eligibility. The standard USF Application for Employment and documentation of eligibility for employment (see I-9 Form for information). Adjuncts are responsible for adhering to the USF appointment process and submitting appointment documents to Human Resources as part of the Right Start program.

Letter of Interest. A brief letter of interest and including the specific courses desired to be taught, and a statement of availability (days, times, semesters, etc.).

Official Transcript. An official transcript certifying the highest level of degree completed and other required professional credentials. (Note: An unofficial transcript may be accepted until the official transcript is received; however, an official transcript must be provided before the adjunct candidate's appointment is finalized.)

Comprehensive Vita. A comprehensive vita that includes educational background, employment history, and service, as well as a record of research and publications, as available.

Reference. Names and telephone numbers of three (3) peers or supervisors in the applicant's field of professional competence, who are knowledgeable about the applicant's qualifications and abilities. The applicant shall also document if the current employer has been informed about the proposed adjunct appointment.

Faculty Credentials: In keeping with the accreditation guidelines of the 2006 Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), or the other associations selected by the University and USF's System Policy (Number 10-115; Faculty Credentials for Teaching Undergraduate and Graduate Courses, 2013) regarding credentialing of faculty, applicants are to provide evidence regarding educational background and related experiences as noted below:

> **General Education Courses.** Faculty teaching general education courses at the undergraduate level shall hold an earned doctorate or master's degree in the teaching discipline or master's degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (a minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline).

> **Baccalaureate Courses.** Faculty teaching baccalaureate courses shall hold an earned doctorate or master's degree in the teaching discipline or master's degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline).

Graduate and Post-Baccalaureate Courses. Faculty teaching graduate and post-baccalaureate course work shall hold an earned doctorate/terminal degree in the teaching discipline or a related discipline. Accordingly, applicants for adjunct positions at any of these ranks must provide evidence of coursework completed specific to the discipline, which shall include a list all course titles, credit hours, semester/year courses completed, course grades, and institution(s) where coursework was completed.

Step Two — Receipt of Request

Upon receipt of a request to adjunct, the Department Chair forwards the information to the respective Program Coordinator. The Program Coordinator consults with program area colleagues to determine if the applicant is qualified for hire. The program faculty then discusses the proposed adjunct's materials and either accepts them or ask for further documentation, including a request for an interview where needed. If accepted, each adjunct shall be credentialed for specific courses based on the recommendations made by the program faculty. Thereafter, the Program Coordinator informs the Department Chair of the outcome of the application review.

Qualified Applicants:

- The Program Coordinator or Department Chair informs the qualified candidate of the specific courses for which he or she is considered qualified; doing so does not guarantee appointment.
- The candidate's application is then considered active for the current academic year, including the fall and spring semesters and the summer sessions.
- The Program Coordinator or Chair of the Department informs the candidate that the application was not acceptable. The candidate has the right to reapply in the future.
- The Program Coordinator returns the application materials including the determination made by the Program faculty.
- If an applicant for an adjunct position does not teach a course during the academic year in which the application was filed, the application packet must be resubmitted the following year.
- If an adjunct person teaches a course at USF during an academic year, he or she is automatically placed in the active pool for the next academic year, assuming he or she is still considered qualified and remains interested in a position.

Step Three — Appointment

Upon appointment, the adjunct meets with the regular program faculty who typically teaches or supervises the assigned course. This meeting serves as an orientation and takes the form of a face-to-face, or virtual electronic meeting. Included in this orientation is a review of relevant departmental, college, and university policies and procedures governing instruction, including the departmental course syllabus. The Program Coordinator collaborates with the Department Chair in preparing for this orientation and review. The Department Chairperson is responsible for the appointment of all adjuncts, contingent on the needs of the department and availability

of resources. The Department Chair convenes all newly hired adjuncts for the purpose of general orientation to discuss and facilitate awareness of the following and other issues:

- Academic freedom;
- Course syllabus guidelines for development and formatting, and introduction to ATLE services;
- Help Desk/technical support for Canvas and other university-supported programs/portals;
- Introduce and register faculty for Chalk and Wire (or current electronic portfolio system) requirements and instructor registration process;
- Office space and keys;
- Office of Students with Disabilities Services, faculty policies and procedures; and
- Student course evaluations, policies and procedures.

Individual adjuncts then consult with relevant Program Coordinators who offer specific guidance, including the following:

- Required key assessments/critical tasks;
- Required use of course-specific syllabi; and
- Textbook selection and ordering.

Course Completion: Upon completion of the course, the Department Chair reviews student course evaluations along with other available information, and when appropriate, the Program Coordinator or designated faculty member who supervises the course is also consulted. If concerns are identified which cannot be corrected, a recommendation may be made to remove the person from the list of approved adjuncts. In such cases, adjunct faculty shall have no continuing commitment to the Department following the end date of their appointment. The following is required upon separation:

- Completion of all grading of student work when a grade of Incomplete or Missing has been assigned;
- Completion of all Instructor Postings to the Chalk and Wire System and return of all agreed upon student work to LLEEP.

Hiring Contingency Statement: In the event that the enrollment minimums are not attained, or if continuing faculty is rescheduled to teach the course, appropriate University procedures shall be followed. The attached checklist may be used to aid the adjunct approval process.

Table 4.

Checklist for Adjunct Faculty Appointment

Steps	Tasks
Step 1 Application Process	• USF Application for Employment Documentation of eligibility for Employment (optional) • Letter of Intent • Official transcripts • Additional documentation of qualifying experience • Comprehensive Vita • Three references (with names and telephone numbers)
Step 2 Departmental Review	The Department Chairperson forwards the information to the Program Coordinator and/or designated faculty member. • Candidate packet accepted (qualified for hire) • Credentialed for the following courses • Application active for the current academic year • Additional information needed.
Step 3 Appointment/Orientation	• Department chair sets orientation date and time • Department chair reviews both the relevant department, college, and university policies and procedures and the course syllabus. This orientation includes information on the course evaluation process and the Electronic Portfolio requirements for the course.

18. Appointment of Affiliate Faculty and Courtesy Faculty

Requests for affiliate faculty and/or courtesy faculty appointments may be initiated by an individual seeking appointment or by a faculty member nominating an individual. Nominations (including self-nominations) are to be made to the Department Chair. Subsequently, the Chair determines the program(s) in closest alignment with the individual's expertise. The identified program(s) shall then determine the application materials they would like to have the individual submit. The program(s) most closely aligned with the individual's expertise reviews the application materials and provides a recommendation to the Chair to endorse or not endorse the individual's application. If the individual seeking an affiliate or courtesy appointment is endorsed by the program(s), and is supported by the Chair, the Chair of the Department completes the relevant university appointment forms and obtains the appropriate signatures and approval from the College Leadership.

19. College of Education Faculty Policy Council

The Faculty Policy Council (FPC) is the policy-making authority for the College engaged in faculty governance on matters that concern more than one department. The FPC shall report its decisions to the College Dean and to the faculty at-large. Implementation of adopted policies is the responsibility of the College Dean, in consultation with the council. The FPC may, at its discretion, refer specific policy decisions to the eligible faculty for a vote by anonymous ballot.

Academic programs belong to the College Faculty. Specific degree-granting and non-degree-granting program areas may exist within any department and are the responsibility of the college

faculty as a whole. The forwarding of any academic program or course proposal—whether creation, modification, or permanent removal—requires the approval of the FPC upon the recommendation of the Undergraduate Programs Committee for undergraduate programs or the Graduate Programs Committee for graduate programs, respectively.

Members of the FPC work in partnership with the College Dean, while representing the perspectives of faculty at all academic ranks, both tenured and non-tenured, on all three campuses. All members of the College Faculty are eligible for election to the FPC. However, Instructors and Assistant Professors must have three years of full-time service at USF before they are eligible to serve on the FPC. Faculty who hold the rank of Professor are particularly encouraged to serve. In the spirit of collegiality and mutual respect, council members will deliberately seek the counsel of faculty members at all ranks. The membership of the FPC shall include two faculty representatives elected from each department. If faculty members whose primary assignments are at Sarasota-Manatee, St. Petersburg, and Tampa campuses are not elected to represent a department, an at-large member(s) from the missing campus(es) will be elected. Hence, there can be at most two at-large members elected to ensure FPC has representation from Sarasota-Manatee, St. Petersburg, and Tampa campuses. Thus, the membership of FPC can range from eight to ten (8-10) faculty members (i.e., two representatives from the four departments, and at most two at-large members). The chairs of GPC and UPC may also be members of the FPC. The chairs of GPC and UPC are only eligible to vote in FPC if they are also concurrently elected by their respective departments to serve on FPC. Therefore, if not elected by their respective departments to serve on FPC, they shall then serve as a non-voting ex officio member of the Council representing GPC or UPC. The faculty welcomes non-voting membership of the College Dean and the College Dean's designees, **and the immediate past Council Chair who serves as a non-voting ex officio member of the Council.

Nominations for each department representative shall be made within the relevant constituency. College Faculty shall have an opportunity to participate in electing department representatives. Elections shall be conducted by procedures developed within each department by February 15 if practicable of each year. In addition to two department representatives from each department, two alternates are to be elected. The alternates shall have full voting privileges when the corresponding FPC member is absent. Representatives to the FPC shall serve a staggered two-year term, and no member may serve more than two consecutive terms. The term of office begins with the first contract day for nine-month faculty employees. A member of the Council is expected to resign if this member is not a full-time faculty member for the term of office or otherwise cannot fulfill the responsibilities of Council membership. A majority of the Council may declare a seat vacant from a record of absences of a maximum of two times within an academic year. The first alternate for the vacancy's constituency shall fill the seat for the remainder of the term. Additional information regarding procedures for the College of Education's Faculty Policy Council can be found in the College of Education Constitution.

20. College of Education Undergraduate Programs Committee

The UPC will act for the faculty in matters related to undergraduate education and advise the FPC, College Dean, and College Dean's designees on policy matters, university's student success initiatives, initiate a review and propose recommendations to policies related to undergraduate

education, review and recommend to the College Dean applicants for awards pertaining to undergraduate education, such as Graduating with Distinction, and recognizing undergraduate students honored for outstanding leadership, research, and professional practice. The UPC provides oversight of the quality of undergraduate courses and program offerings. Specific duties include consideration of new courses, substantial course changes, new programs, and program changes. The UPC makes recommendations to the Faculty Policy Council regarding the undergraduate curriculum, including the creation, modification, or elimination of courses and programs consistent with the approved procedures for curriculum proposal review. The UPC supports the university's student success initiatives at the undergraduate level. The UPC also collaborates with the College of Education Office of Continuous Improvement Support (OCIS), and regional/branch campus, for the purposes of reporting, program review, and accreditation.

Each Department offering undergraduate programs selects three representatives, with two-year staggered terms, to serve on the committee. Faculty from departments not involved in delivering undergraduate education may consider less than three representatives in order to dedicate time and energy to curriculum development and oversight at the graduate level. No member is to serve more than two consecutive terms. Membership provides for shared representation among faculty from departments with responsibilities for undergraduate education, including offering degree programs, courses in core curriculum, USF's general education program, and courses required for admission to undergraduate teacher preparation programs. When possible, UPC members shall also serve as representatives of General Education Council and other appropriate university committees. College representatives for University Undergraduate Council and General Education Council who are not members of the UPC shall serve as non-voting ex officio members.

If there is not representation from Sarasota-Manatee, St. Petersburg, and Tampa within the elected members, and a faculty from Sarasota site, a special at large member may be elected from the faculty assigned to Sarasota-Manatee. Likewise, if there is not representation from faculty assigned to St. Petersburg within the elected members, a special at large member may be elected from faculty assigned to St. Petersburg. Similarly, if there is not representation from faculty assigned to Tampa within the elected members, a special at large member may be elected from faculty assigned to Tampa. Thus, there is a possibility that one or two special at large members may be added to the membership. Additional information regarding procedures for the College of Education's Undergraduate Programs Committee can be found in the College of Education Constitution.

21. College of Education Graduate Programs Committee

The GPC will act for the faculty in matters related to graduate education, and advise the FPC, College Dean, and College Dean's designees on policy matters, university's student success initiatives, initiate a review and propose recommendations to policies related to graduate education, review and recommend to the College Dean applicants for awards pertaining to graduate education, such as University Graduate Fellows, and recognize graduate students honored for outstanding leadership, research, and professional practice. The GPC will provide oversight of the quality of graduate course and program offerings. Specific duties include consideration of new courses, substantial course changes, new programs, and program changes. The GPC will provide leadership for graduate policy formation, coordination, and implementation. The Committee is responsible for the review and assessment of graduate

programs and courses in the college. The GPC will make recommendations to the Faculty Policy Council regarding action on courses, certificates, and degrees. The GPC will support the university's student success initiatives at the graduate level. The GPC will also collaborate with the College of Education Office of Continuous Improvement Support (OCIS) for the purposes of reporting, program review, and accreditation.

Each department within the college will select two faculty to be members of the GPC. Members will serve two-year staggered terms, with no member serving more than two consecutive terms. During its first meeting of the fall semester, the Graduate Programs Committee will select a chair and a vice-chair to lead the Committee if the chair is absent. When possible, GPC members will also serve as representatives of the Graduate Council and other appropriate university committees. College representatives for Graduate Council who are not members of the GPC will serve as non-voting *ex officio* members.

If there is not representation from Sarasota-Manatee, St. Petersburg and Tampa within the elected members, and a faculty from Sarasota site, a special at large member may be elected from the faculty assigned to Sarasota-Manatee. Likewise, if there is not representation from faculty assigned to St. Petersburg within the elected members, a special at large member may be elected from faculty assigned to St. Petersburg. Likewise, if there is not representation from faculty assigned to Tampa within the elected members, a special at large member may be elected from faculty assigned to Tampa. Thus, there is a possibility that one, or two special at large members may be added to the membership. The chair of the GPC committee or their designee shall notify the chairs of each department of upcoming vacancies for GPC by February 28 of each year. Additional information regarding procedures for the College of Education's graduate Program Committee can be found in the College of Education Constitution.

22. College of Education Faculty Success and Community Initiatives Committee

The feedback will promote a culture within the college that honors and supports our colleagues, encourages their continuous productivity, and promote successful experiences for our faculty and students. Furthermore, this committee advises the FPC and College Dean on the development of mechanisms for recognizing outstanding accomplishments of faculty and students, such as early career award, lifetime achievement award, student, alumni, and community partner recognitions. The committee shall serve in an advisory role for awards that require nominations from the College Dean, Campus Deans, and Department Chairs. It will also encourage the nominations of faculty for internal USF awards such as:

- Distinguished University Professor
- Outstanding Research Award
- Distinguished Service

Each department within the college will select one representative among the faculty, who can be of any rank, to serve on the committee. Committee members must be active faculty members within their departments. The department's representatives should serve two-year staggered terms. No member shall serve more than two consecutive terms.

If there is not representation from Sarasota-Manatee, St. Petersburg and Tampa within the elected members, and a faculty from Sarasota site, a special at large member will be elected from the faculty assigned to Sarasota-Manatee. Likewise, if there is not representation from faculty assigned to St. Petersburg within the elected members, a special at large member will be elected from faculty assigned to St. Petersburg. Likewise, if there is not representation from faculty assigned to Tampa within the elected members, a special at large member will be elected from faculty assigned to Tampa. Thus, there is a possibility that one, or two special at large members may be added to the membership.

23. College of Education Instructor Promotion Committee

The Instructor Promotion Committee consists of one representative faculty member from each department. Preference for appointment to this committee is given to individuals who have held an appointment within the Instructor Promotion Career Path Levels 2 or 3 for at least two years. If there are not yet instructors in a department who have been at Levels 2 or 3 for at least two years, faculty in all career paths within COEDU, who have held assignments that include teaching, and who hold the rank of Associate or Full Professor, are eligible to serve on this committee.

Faculty in career paths other than Instructor shall relinquish their position on the College Committee to instructors once a sufficient number of qualified instructors are available to serve on the committee. If there is not representation from Sarasota-Manatee, St. Petersburg, and Tampa within the elected members, and a faculty from Sarasota site is being reviewed for promotion, a special at-large member shall be elected from faculty assigned to Sarasota-Manatee. Likewise, if there is not representation from faculty assigned to St. Petersburg within the elected members, and a faculty from the St. Petersburg campus is being reviewed for promotion, a special at large member will be elected from faculty assigned to St. Petersburg. Similarly, if there is not representation from faculty assigned to Tampa within the elected members, and a faculty from the Tampa site is being reviewed for promotion, a special at large member will be elected from faculty assigned to Tampa. Thus, there is a possibility that one or two special at large members may be added to the membership, with the preference for the at-large member to be at the rank of Full Professor. These special at-large members shall only deliberate and vote for faculty members for their respective campus. Members serve a two-year term. The initial formulation is to have from each unit one member who serves for one year, and a second member who serves for two years. Members may not serve consecutive terms. The chair of the committee is selected by the committee members.

All full-time, non-visiting, instructors in the college are eligible to vote for representatives for the Instructor Promotion Committee. The College Dean's office shall certify a list of eligible voters. Additional information regarding procedures for the College of Education's Instructor Promotion Committee can be found in the College of Education Constitution.

24. University of South Florida Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate is the primary faculty advisory body to the University of South Florida President, Provost, and Senior Vice President for USF Health on all matters pertaining to the

academic climate of the university. Each Department elects a representative to the Faculty Senate. LLEEP holds an election for their Faculty Senate Seat at such time as it becomes vacant or an election is called for by the Faculty Senate. The LLEEP Senator is responsible for reporting Faculty Senate activities to the Department and bringing Department concerns to the Senate. The election of a LLEEP Department representative for the Faculty Senate is to be held by February 15 if practicable each year. Each representative serves for 3 years, for a maximum of two consecutive terms. Senators who are fulfilling a term of less than three years may run for a full-term seat at the next election following completion of that term. Terms for the Faculty Senate begin in the Fall Semester.

The nomination and election process of a representative for the Faculty Senate may be done virtually at a faculty meeting or it can be conducted by email. The election shall be coordinated by the Department Chair or appropriate departmental representative. Departments with faculty on multiple campuses will communicate with and include all departmental faculty throughout the nomination and voting processes. Senators must be elected by the faculty -- not appointed. All nominees must be listed with their vote tally in the event the Senator-Elect is not eligible, in which case the next nominee will be selected. Nominees must be full-time members of the general faculty *and* must hold the rank of Instructor, Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate professor, Professor, Instructor Librarian, Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, or Librarian. All eligible faculty, except Associate and Full Professors, Associate Librarians, and Librarians, "must have three-years of full-time service at USF before they are eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate".

All members of the "General Faculty" are eligible to vote. This typically includes tenured/tenure track faculty, librarians and permanent instructors but excludes adjuncts and visiting faculty. See the Faculty Senate Constitution for more information. Chairs in Academic Affairs can vote but higher-level administrators (e.g. Associate Deans, Deans) are not eligible to vote.

Departmental election results should be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Office (fsenate@usf.edu) upon completion of the election.

25. Official Amendment of the LLEEP Governance Guidelines and Procedures

A guidelines and procedures description shall accompany each Standing Committee, Awards Committee, and the like outlined in the LLEEP Faculty Governance document. Amendments to these descriptions and to any part of the Governance Document shall be submitted to the faculty and chair for review at least seven calendar days prior to a department meeting that has been scheduled at least seven calendar days in advance. The proposal shall be included on the agenda of said meeting. If voted upon, a simple majority of all faculty in the department shall be sufficient for approval and, if approved, the document shall be submitted to Faculty Policy Council and College Dean's Office, as appropriate.

All amendments previously voted upon by the faculty by simple majority and reflected in the minutes of LLEEP faculty meetings prior to the adoption of this amendment are hereby incorporated in the applicable departmental governance document.

References

Library Connect. (2020). *Librarian quick reference cards for research impact metrics.* Retrieved from https://libraryconnect.elsevier.com

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (2008). *Faculty credentials*. Retrieved from http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/faculty%20credentials.pdf

University of South Florida (2013). *Procedures for the credentialing of teaching faculty at the University of South Florida*. Retrieved from http://www.usf.edu/provost/documents/planning_sacs_facultycredentialing/sacs-facultycredentialingprocedure.pdf

Appendix A

Guidelines for Governance Committee Procedures

1. Convene the Governance Committee team in consultation with the Department Chair in preparation for the upcoming academic year. The team consists of Chairs of LLEEP Standing Committees.
2. Identify and discuss elements of the charge to the committee based on the LLEEP Governance Guidelines and Procedures.
3. Identify a mechanism for obtaining input from department faculty about faculty interest in service across and beyond the Department and utilize feedback to inform nominations process during elections.
4. Identify a mechanism for obtaining input from department faculty regarding current concerns to be addressed and provide opportunities for discussion of said concerns during department meetings.
5. Report ongoing discussions of the Governance Committee to faculty at department meetings or other forums and main an open line of communication to faculty for providing input.
6. Coordinate the annual election process in consultation with the Department Chair by considering faculty nominations and using the overall guidelines provided for elections. Consider due date for proposed elections and other voting considerations in the process.
7. Maintain records of Governance Committee membership, records of election and voting outcomes, including alternates, as well as all elements of governance within the LLEEP Department.
8. Annually revisit the approved Governance Guidelines and Procedures to identify potential areas for review, revision, including modification and addition, in alignment with the desire of department faculty and existing College and University governance procedures and policies. Include faculty in the annual review, discussion and revision of Governance Guidelines and Procedures.
9. Develop, refine, organize, store, and archive iterations of the Governance Guidelines and Procedures for the Department.
10. Ascertain that all faculty are acknowledged across committees for their service to the Department.

Appendix B

Guidelines for Annual Review Committee Procedures and Responsibilities

1. In consultation with the Department Chair, individuals elected to the Annual Review (AR) committee convene to elect a chairperson. The name of the AR committee chairperson is then communicated to the Department Chair, who, in turn, assigns "administrative role" to the AR chairperson in the Faculty Information System (FIS) for the Annual Evaluations.

2. In consultation with the Department Chair, the AR chairperson troubleshoots and resolves outstanding faculty reports issues with Archivum. The AR chairperson may have to send back a few reviews for a faculty member who asked to have the submission (narrative, executive summary, supporting documents) sent back prior to the official submission deadline.

3. The AR committee chairperson convenes the team to discuss the committee's charge based on the Governance Guidelines and Procedures of the Department of Language, Literacy, Exceptional Education, Ed.D., and Physical Education (LLEEP).

4. The AR committee chairperson discusses with the team the distribution of responsibilities and AR assignments (primary and secondary reviewer roles), the anticipated scheduled meeting times over the 3-week AR period, the particulars of the review process, the language of the review, and the format the review needs to follow to adhere to established practices for various faculty roles (teaching, research, service; progress towards tenure, where applicable).

5. The AR committee chairperson maintains the complete list of all AR reports and the due dates for the proposed final AR submissions by the individual AR committee members. Given unforeseen circumstances, some built-in flexibility in report completions and/or submissions is advisable here.

6. The AR committee chairperson identifies the needed mechanisms for discussing concerns or conflicts of interest AR committee members may have with a particular faculty review. Establishing and maintaining an open line of communication of said concerns or conflicts is critical to the smooth operation of the AR process. Absolute confidentiality is to be maintained at all times.

7. During scheduled review meeting times, the AR committee chairperson establishes the procedures of sharing the AR reports, the order of reporting, and the manner by which these reports are to be discussed, evaluated, and randomly selected for further analysis and verification purposes.

8. The AR committee chairperson reviews all AR reports for language and format and maintains established consistency across all submitted evaluations. If any changes are to be introduced, said changes are to be discussed and agreed upon by all AR committee members in advance of final submission to Archivum by the AR committee chairperson.

9. The AR committee chairperson enters all completed AR evaluations in Archivum by the designated due date and informs the Department Chair accordingly.

10. The AR committee chairperson acknowledges the service of each AR committee member with a letter of appreciation to the Department Chair by May 1.

Understanding the Purpose of the LLEEP IRB Committee and the BullsIRB Portal

1) Committee receives charge from the Department Chair.
2) Committee meets to elect Chair.
3) Chair works with Department Chair to ensure that all committee members are included as reviewers in the portal for LLEEP and have access as reviewers.
4) Chair and committee members individually review the BullsIRB portal to understand its components.
5) Chair invites the previous committee chair to meet with the committee to answer questions about the portal and how it works including the stages of the submission and review process (i.e., Pre-submission, Organization Review, Clarification Requested (Org-Review), etc.). Additionally, the previous committee chair shares their insights/thoughts regarding what worked and what can be improved with respect to organizing and implementing the review process (i.e., logistics).
6) Chair and committee familiarize themselves regarding all required documents/information needed in a submission in order for it to be reviewed (e.g., correct IRB protocol, IRB certification is up to date, name of Advisor/Major Professor if a submission is from a graduate student, appropriate consent forms, etc.).
7) Chair checks with committee members to make sure they are comfortable with navigating the BullsIRB portal for the purpose of completing reviews.
8) Chair communicates with USF IRB to determine who/how to contact USF IRB in the event of issues or if questions arise.

B. Organization of the Review Process

Note: All committee members receive notification when a submission is ready for "organization review."

1) Chair oversees and keeps track of new submissions and the progress of all reviews.
2) Chair keeps track of which committee member is reviewing which submission and ensures that all members share equitably with respect to number of reviews.
3) Chair screens all new submissions to ensure all required documentation and information is included prior to sending off for review by the committee (e.g., correct IRB protocol, IRB certification is up to date, name of Advisor/Major Professor if a submission is from a graduate student, appropriate consent forms, etc.).
4) Chair communicates with individual committee members to ask if they can complete the review of a new submission (if a committee member cannot, then the chair identifies another committee member to ask based on the number of reviews they have done or are in the process of completing).
5) Chair addresses questions/issues that committee members might be experiencing with a particular review.

C. Communication

1) Chair serves as the point person related to communication to and from the committee regarding questions faculty/graduate students might have regarding the department review process including issues/concerns with their submissions.
2) Chair communicates with Department Chair and committee members periodically as needed.
3) Chair prepares report for LLEEP Department meetings.
4) Chair calls meetings of the committee as needed.

D. Other Chair Duties/Suggestions

1) Keep track of number of submissions and number of completed reviews.
2) Periodically review the current list of submissions and status (to ensure that the review of a submission that is ready for organizational review is not unreasonably delayed).
3) Chair identifies at least one faculty member chairing the IRB committee for another department to communicate with as support.

Appendix D

Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Committee Procedures and Responsibilities

1. In consultation with the Department Chair, individuals elected to the Tenure and Promotion (T&P) committee convene to elect a chairperson. The name of the T&P committee chairperson is then communicated to the Department Chair, who, in turn, assigns "administrative role" to the T&P chairperson in the Faculty Information System (FIS) for T&P reviews.
2. In consultation with the Department Chair, the T&P chairperson troubleshoots and resolves outstanding issues with Archivum.
3. The T&P committee chairperson convenes the team to discuss the committee's charge based on the Governance Guidelines and Procedures of the Department of Language, Literacy, Exceptional Education, Ed.D., and Physical Education (LLEEP).
4. The T&P committee chairperson discusses with the team the distribution of responsibilities and T&P assignments. These assignments include reviewer and writer roles for different sections of each candidate's portfolio (i.e., teaching, research, and service sections with regards to T&P), the anticipated scheduled meeting times over the T&P timeframe, the particulars of the review process, the language of the review, and the format the review needs to follow to adhere to established practices for various faculty roles (teaching, research, service; progress towards tenure, where applicable).
5. The T&P committee chairperson maintains the complete list of all T&P reports and the due dates for the proposed final T&P recommendations by the combined T&P committee members. Given unforeseen circumstances, some built-in flexibility in report completions and/or submissions is advisable here (i.e., plan ahead timewise).
6. The T&P committee chairperson identifies the needed mechanisms for discussing concerns and/or conflicts of interest T&P committee members whom may have with a particular candidate (i.e., for reviews and/or recommendations). Establishing and maintaining an open line of communication of said concerns or conflicts is critical to the smooth operation of the T&P process. Absolute confidentiality is to be maintained at all times.
7. During scheduled review meeting times, the T&P committee chairperson establishes the procedures of sharing the T&P recommendations, the order of reporting, and the manner by which these recommendations are to be discussed and reported.
8. The T&P committee chairperson reviews all T&P reports for language and format and maintains established consistency across against the suggested formats.
9. The T&P committee chairperson enters all completed T&P evaluations in Archivum by the designated due date and informs the Department Chair accordingly.
10. The T&P committee chairperson acknowledges the service of each T&P committee member with a letter of appreciation to the Department Chair by May 1.

Appendix E

Voting Eligibility for LLEEP Faculty

Voting Event*	Faculty Serving as Administrators**	Instructor	Tenured, Tenure-Earning Faculty	Visiting Positions
Annual Review Committee Election	☐	☐	☐	
Governance Committee Election	☐	☐	☐	
Institutional Review Board Committee Election	☐		☐	
Standing Committee Creations	☐	☐	☐	
Tenure and Promotion Committee Election	☐		☐	
College of Education Tenure and Promotion Committee Election	☐		☐	
Tenure and Promotion Straw Poll	☐		☐	
College of Education Faculty Policy Council Departmental Election	☐	☐	☐	
College of Education Undergraduate Programs Committee Departmental Election	☐	☐	☐	
College of Education Graduate Programs Committee Departmental Election	☐	☐	☐	
College of Education Faculty Success and Community Initiatives Committee	☐	☐	☐	
College of Education Instructor Promotion Committee Departmental Election		☐		
University of South Florida Faculty Senate Departmental Election	☐	☐	☐	
General Departmental Elections	☐	☐	☐	

*All elections should take place by February 15 if practicable.
**Each faculty member is allowed one vote per voting event; that is, faculty may not vote twice for any voting event.

Appendix F

Ballots and Committee Constitution for Spring Elections

Name of Committee	Election Period	Eligibility to Serve	Eligibility to Vote	Number of Seats	Length of Service	Selection of Committee Chair
Tenure and Promotion Committee	Spring Semester *February-March*	Tenured Faculty; Only Full Professors may Review Associate Professors	Tenured and tenure-earning faculty, Administrators	3	Two years; Ineligible for 2 years on this committee after service; Staggered terms	Elected by Committee Members
Tenured and Tenure-Earning Annual Review Committee	Spring Semester *February-March*	Tenured Faculty	Tenured and tenure-earning faculty, Administrators	5	2 years; Ineligible for 2 years on this committee after service; Staggered terms	Elected by Committee Members with Preference to Full Professors who most recently served on the Annual Review Committee
Institutional Review Board Committee	Spring Semester *February-March*	Tenured, Tenure-Earning	Tenured and tenure-earning faculty, Administrators, Instructors	5-7 with preference for representation across programs	2 years; Ineligible for 2 years on this committee after service; Staggered terms	Selected by Committee Members
Governance Committee	Spring Semester *February-March*	Governance is comprised of IRB, T&P, and Annual Review Chairs.	Governance is comprised of IRB, T&P, and Annual Review Chairs	4	2 years; Ineligible for 2 years on this committee after service; Staggered terms	Elected by Department Faculty
College of Education Undergraduate Programs Committee	Spring Semester *February-March*	Full-time faculty, including instructional faculty	Full-time faculty, including instructional faculty	3	2 years; No more than two consecutive terms; Staggered terms	--

Name of Committee	Election Period	Eligibility to Serve	Eligibility to Vote	Number of Seats	Length of Service	Selection of Committee Chair
College of Education Graduate Programs Committee	Spring Semester *February-March*	Full-time faculty, including instructional faculty	Full-time faculty, including instructional faculty	2	2 years; No more than two consecutive terms; Staggered terms	Selected by Committee Members
College of Education Faculty Success and Community Initiatives Committee	Spring Semester *February-March*	Full-time faculty, including instructional faculty	Full-time faculty, including instructional faculty	2	2 years; No more than two consecutive terms; Staggered terms	Elected by Committee Members
College of Education Faculty Policy Council	Spring Semester *February-March*	Full-time faculty; Assistant Professors and Instructors with at least 3 years of full-time service at USF	Full-time faculty, including instructional faculty	2	2 years; No more than two consecutive terms; Staggered terms	Elected by Committee Members
College of Education Instructional Faculty Promotion Committee	Spring Semester *February-March*	Continuously Appointed full-time instructors	Continuously Appointed full-time instructors	1	2 years; Ineligible for 2 years on this committee after service; Staggered terms	Elected by Instructors
University of South Florida Faculty Senate	Spring Semester *February-March*	Full-time faculty, no less than three years of service at USF	Full-time faculty	1	3 years; Maximum of 2 consecutive terms	--