UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA
College of Education
Department of Leadership, Policy, and Lifelong Learning

SHARED GOVERNANCE GUIDELINES

This document represents the consolidated Department of Leadership, Policy, and Lifelong Learning (LPLL), effective academic year 2023-24. This document supersedes any document that was previously published and will govern all three campuses. The LPLL Department recognizes the principles of equity of assignment, resources, and faculty opportunities across a multi-campus university. Faculty on all three campuses will have an equitable opportunity to engage in faculty governance and evaluation.

MISSION STATEMENT
The Department of Leadership, Policy, and Lifelong Learning provides advanced graduate study at the master's, educational specialist, and doctoral levels to prepare professionals who demonstrate transformative, critical leadership in scholarship, research, service, and professional development. We prepare our graduates to promote global awareness, diversity, equity, and well-being in various education organizations and agencies.

PROGRAMS
The Department comprises four program areas: Career, Workforce & Adult Education; Counselor Education; Educational Leadership & Policy Studies; and Higher Education & Student Affairs.

FACULTY SHARED GOVERNANCE
Shared governance reflects a commitment by faculty and administrators to work together toward a common goal - strengthening the educational mission of programs, departments, the college, and the university. Shared governance is dependent on a) responsible exercise of academic freedom; b) acknowledgment of the importance of the professional judgments of faculty as well as accountability of administration to exercise due diligence in the implementation of policies and guidelines; and c) joint acceptance of responsibility in the development of academic policies and processes that maintain program quality and rigor, and support student academic and professional success. Shared governance represents mutual respect for the contributions that all members bring to this common goal.

DEPARTMENT REPRESENTATION ON UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES

A. USF 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 that pertain to the academic climate of the University. The department has one seat in the Faculty Senate; the term of service is 3 years, for a maximum of 2 consecutive terms. The department will conduct elections to fill the LPLL Faculty Senate seat when vacant, following

guidelines in the Faculty Senate Constitution. The results of the election will be sent by the Department Chair to the Faculty Senate Office.

B. College 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 Department has two faculty representatives on the FPC. All members of the Department faculty are eligible for election to the FPC. Instructors and Assistant Professors must have 3 years of full-time service at USF before being eligible to serve on the FPC. Faculty at the rank of Professor are particularly encouraged to serve. Representatives will be elected following the procedures determined by the College Constitution. If faculty members whose primary assignments are at Sarasota- Manatee, St. Petersburg, and Tampa campuses are not elected to represent the department, an at-large member(s) from the missing campus(es) will be elected (College of Education Faculty Constitution, Article 2C). Department representatives shall serve staggered 2-year terms, limited to no more than two consecutive terms. The term of service begins with the first contract day for 9-month faculty.

C. College Tenure and Promotion Committee. The College Tenure and Promotion (T&P) Committee serves in an advisory capacity to the College Dean on matters of tenure and promotion. The Department has two tenured faculty representatives on the College T&P Committee. Representatives will be elected following the procedures determined by the College Constitution; representatives will serve a two-year term. Members should not serve consecutive terms. One representative must hold the rank of Professor, and the other member needs to be tenured and have the rank of Associate or Full Professor. If faculty members whose primary assignments are at Sarasota- Manatee, St. Petersburg, and Tampa campuses are not elected to represent the department, an at-large member(s) from the missing campus(es) will be elected (College of Education Faculty Constitution, Article 3.A.1).

D. College Instructor Promotion Committee. The Instructor Promotion Committee (IPC) serves in an advisory capacity to the College Dean on matters of instructor promotion. The Department has one faculty representative on the College IPC. Representatives will be elected following the procedures determined by the College Constitution; representatives will serve a 2-year term. Members may not serve consecutive terms. Preference for appointment to this committee will be given to individuals who have held an appointment within the Instructor Promotion Career Path Levels 2 or 3 for at least 2 years. If there are not yet instructors in a department who have been at Levels 2or 3 for at least 2 years, faculty in all career paths within the COEDU, who have held assignments that include teaching, and who hold the rank of Associate or Full Professor, will be eligible to serve on this committee. Faculty in career paths other than Instructor will relinquish their position on the College IPC instructors once enough qualified instructors are available to serve on the committee. If faculty members whose primary assignments are at Sarasota- Manatee, St. Petersburg, and Tampa campuses are not elected to represent the department, an at-large member(s) from the missing campus(es) will be elected (College of Education Faculty Constitution, Article 3.B.1).

E. Graduate Program Committee. The Graduate Program Committee (GPC) acts for the College faculty in matters related to graduate education and advise the FPC, College Dean, and

College Dean's designees on policy matters. The department has two faculty representatives who will serve 2-year staggered terms, with no representative serving more than 2 consecutive terms. Representatives will be elected following the procedures determined by the College Constitution. If faculty members whose primary assignments are at Sarasota- Manatee, St. Petersburg, and Tampa campuses are not elected to represent the department, an at-large member(s) from the missing campus(es) will be elected (College of Education Faculty Constitution, Article 3.D.1). The term of service begins with the first contract day for 9-month faculty.

F. Undergraduate Program Committee. The Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC) acts for the College faculty in matters related to graduate education, and advise the FPC, College Dean, and College Dean's designees on policy matters. As the department has no undergraduate programs, the department may elect one representative to serve a 2-year staggered term, serving more than 2 consecutive terms. The department may also opt out of having a representative on the Undergraduate Program Committee. If a faculty member whose primary assignment is at Sarasota- Manatee, St. Petersburg, and Tampa campus is not elected to represent the department, an at-large member(s) from the missing campus(es) will be elected (College of Education Faculty Constitution, Article 3.C.1). The term of service begins with the first contract day for 9-month faculty.

Department faculty are encouraged to nominate colleagues or self-nominate for positions on University and College councils and committees.

ARTICLE I: The Faculty of the Department

A. Membership. The membership of the Department Faculty shall consist of all full-time faculty members on continuing, full-time appointments with the rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor on all three campuses. Faculty with joint appointments will have a vote within the department for which they are allocated 50% or more FTE (paid from the College/Department). Affiliate and courtesy faculty do not have voting rights in the department. Faculty members who are employed as adjunct faculty, or visiting faculty, regardless of rank, and non-instructional and non-research faculty, as well as emeritus faculty, are not included within this definition of department faculty.

The faculty of the Department has responsibility for program planning and for curriculum development; subject matter and methods of instruction; research; faculty recognition; faculty guidelines for annual evaluation; and department guidelines for tenure and promotion.

B. Faculty Hiring. The Department Chair will solicit faculty hiring requests from Program Area Coordinators. Program faculty shall review program data and determine the extent to which additional faculty are needed to support programmatic needs and goals, including the number of graduates within a specified timeframe, the number of tenured-faculty, instructors/lecturers, adjuncts, and graduate assistants teaching courses within the specified timeframe, and the number of students enrolled in departmental offerings, to include degree-seeking and elective-seeking students.

The Department Chair will present to the College Dean requests for faculty positions. The College Dean will determine the availability of resources for the positions requested. The College Dean may prioritize requests based on students' needs, availability of resources, and the strategic goals of the University and mission of the College. A request for faculty positions is made by theCollege Dean to the Provost. If a faculty's home campus will be on a branch campus, the CollegeDean will consult with the Regional Vice Chancellor prior to making the request to the Provost.

> *Faculty Search Committees.* All faculty positions require a national search, and a search committee is required for all faculty positions. The primary function of the search committee is identifying, recruiting, screening, and recommending applicants for consideration by the hiring authority (College Dean and Provost). Regional Chancellors or their designee will serve as a voting member on all search committees for faculty hiring on branch campuses.

> The Department Chair will work with the appropriate Program Area Coordinator to identify members of the Search Committee. Generally, 4-5 members comprise a search committee: at least 2 program area faculty, 1 faculty from another program area in the department, and 1 community partner and/or student. The Department Chair in consultation with the Program Area Coordinator appoints the Search Committee Chair. The Search Committee develops selection criteria, creates a rating system to evaluate applicants, reviews applicants' credentials, recommends finalists to be interviewed by a diverse body of individuals and groups, develops interview questions for the search committee and feedback mechanisms for those participating in interviews, and provides written assessment of finalists' strengths and limitations to the department chair and hiring authority after the interview process is completed.

> The Department Chair will assign support staff to work with the Search Committee Chair in the implementation of the search. The Department Chair will provide support to the Search Committee Chair and committee members during the search process to ensure that all policies and procedures pertinent to the search process are followed (e.g., Sunshine Law, Human Resources Recruitment and Hiring Procedure, and Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Equal Opportunity).

C. Affiliate Faculty. The purpose of affiliate appointments is to strengthen interdisciplinary scholarship and teaching and create a sense of community that benefits faculty and students. Affiliate appointments are designed to foster collaboration and communication across: (a) different programs within a department in the College of Education; (b) different programs between departments in the College of Education; and (c) different programs between Colleges and Schools at the University of South Florida.

According to the Graduate Catalog (2020-2021), Affiliate Faculty are eligible to serve on masters, specialist, and doctoral level committees, to direct master's and specialist's level committees, and to co-direct doctoral level committees. Affiliate Faculty can only serve as the Instructor of Record when they have a terminal degree in the discipline and are approved to teach graduate courses in that field.

Requests for Affiliate Faculty appointment may be initiated by an individual seeking appointment or by a faculty member nominating an individual. Requests/nominations (including self-nominations) should be made to the Department Chair via a written letter or email. The request/nomination should include a rationale for seeking Affiliate Faculty appointment, a description of the individual's possible contributions to the department, and a current curriculum vitae (CV).

The Chair will forward the nomination/application materials to the appropriate Program Area Coordinator. The Program Area Coordinator will share the nomination/CV with program faculty. A vote of approval of two-thirds of the program faculty is needed. If approved by the program faculty, the Program Area Coordinator will notify the Department Chair regarding whether or not the Program Faculty endorse the nomination. To serve on masters, specialist, and doctoral level committees and to serve as the Instructor of Record for graduate courses, the Affiliate Faculty must be special credentialed as Graduate Faculty. The Department Chair will complete the required College forms and obtain appropriate signatures for review and approval by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

The appointment process may be initiated at any time; initial approval is for 3 years and for 5 years for subsequent re-appointment. The re-appointment process will follow the same process as the initial appointment. Affiliate Faculty may terminate his/her status at any time or be denied continued or reappointment by a two-thirds vote of the program faculty.

Affiliate faculty will be listed on websites (program, department, College) and recruitment materials. Affiliate faculty may also attend and participate in program/department meetings as invited.

Affiliate faculty are not eligible to: (a) serve on the department's standing committees, including department annual evaluation and tenure and promotion, or (b) vote in the department's elections and governance decisions.

D. Courtesy Faculty. Persons appointed as Courtesy Faculty do not hold a primary position of employment at the university but provide service or connections that are of benefit to the unit in which the appointment is held. The services delivered may or may not be compensated. When appointing individuals as Courtesy Faculty, ranked titles may be assigned, but they should be commensurate with expectations of the university associated with the academic credentials of a faculty member at that rank.

Requests for courtesy faculty appointments may be initiated by an individual seeking a courtesy appointment or by a faculty member nominating an individual. Nominations (including self-nominations) should be made to the Department Chair via a written letter or email. The nomination should include a rationale for seeking courtesy appointment, a description of the individual's possible contributions to the department, and a current CV/resumé.

The Chair will forward the nomination materials to the appropriate Program Area Coordinator. The Program Area Coordinator will share the nomination and CV with program faculty. A vote of approval of two-thirds of the program faculty is needed. If approved by the program faculty,

the Program Area Coordinator notify the Department Chair regarding whether or not the program faculty endorse the nomination. If an individual seeking a courtesy appointment is endorsed by the program faculty and supported by the Department Chair, the Chair will complete the relevant College forms and obtain the appropriate signatures for review and approval by the College Dean or designee. If a Courtesy Faculty will be asked to serve on a masters, specialist, or doctoral level committee, the Courtesy Faculty must be special credentialed as Graduate Faculty. The Department Chair will complete the required College forms and obtain appropriate signatures for review and approval by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

The appointment process may be initiated at any time; initial approval is for 3 years and for 5 years for subsequent re-appointment. The re-appointment process will follow the same process as the initial appointment. Courtesy Faculty member may terminate his/her status at any time or be denied continued or reappointment by a two-thirds vote of the program faculty.

Courtesy Faculty may be listed on websites (program, department, College) and recruitment materials. Courtesy faculty (a) may attend and participate in program/department meetings as invited and (b) may be special credentialed to serve as a member on graduate students' supervisory committees in the affiliated program.

Courtesy Faculty are not eligible to: (a) serve on the department's standing committees, including annual evaluation and tenure and promotion, (b) vote in the department's elections and governance decisions, or (c) serve as Instructor of Record for graduate level courses.

ARTICLE II: Department Administration

A. Department Chair. A Chairperson will be appointed by the College Dean, with input from department faculty. The Department Chair shall be tenured and hold rank at the Professor or Associate Professor level in the department. The College Dean can someone from outside of the department, or from another department, if a suitable and acceptable candidate is not identified from the department. Additionally, an external search may be conducted for a chairperson of the department based on the 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; conduct elections to fill the LPLL Faculty Senate seat when vacant; 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; approval of faculty and staff leave and travel authorizations. The Chair provides support for College mission and goals; responds to requests for data related to metrics on College mission and goals; and liaisons with accreditation staff and responds to requests for data on all accreditation and reporting processes. The Chair shall foster a culture of scholarly productivity in the department, completes tenure and promotion evaluations, and completes annual evaluations of faculty and

staff. 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 and 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.

Department Meetings. General department faculty meetings will be convened by the Department Chair at least twice during the fall and spring semester, at which time the faculty council representative and chairs of other department, college or university committees will have opportunity to report on their actions. Faculty may participate in person or virtually. Provision will be made for electronic participation in meetings and for electronic and/or proxy voting where needed.

All department meetings require an agenda, and meeting notes will be distributed for the approval of the faculty at the next department meeting. Once approved, all meeting notes are electronically published and communicated through the USF email system. The Chair, with the faculty, may modify procedures for the orderly operation of the faculty meeting and its committees. Faculty with voting privileges will represent the department on college or university committees.

B. Program Area Coordinators. The role of the Program Area Coordinator is to work with program faculty to establish program goals and to facilitate the work of the academic program to include assisting the Chair with supervision of the program of instruction, curriculum and scheduling, student recruitment, advising and placement, and with other duties/tasks assigned by the College Dean or Associate Deans. The Program Area Coordinator collaborates with the Chair and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs to implement University, College and Department policies governing student admission, degree matriculation and completion. The Program Area Coordinator collaborates with the Director of Field and Clinical Education to establish appropriate policies and procedures for student placement and appropriate placement for students. The Program Area Coordinator liaisons with the College Office of Continuous Improvement to maintain program assessments in SAMS and respond to data requests for accreditation or other required reporting. The Program Area Coordinator has no supervisory function over program faculty.

The program faculty will recommend to the Department Chair the faculty who will serve as Program Area Coordinator. This is often a volunteer position. All faculty can serve, but ideally, a tenure-track faculty member will not be asked to serve in this role. Instructors at the Instructor Ilevel may serve as Program Area Coordinators when no tenured faculty member or instructors at Instructor II or III ranks agree to serve. The Program Area Coordinator may serve a term of 3-5 years, depending on willingness to serve and the approval of the Department Chair.

The Program Area Coordinator will meet with the Department Chair at least twice a semester. The Program Area Coordinator will convene a meeting of program faculty at least twice each semester to monitor student data and progress, program curriculum, program requirements, course offerings and scheduling. The Program Area Coordinator ensures that all University policies and deadlines are met for program delivery.

ARTICLE III: Department Committees

A. Standing Committees. Standing committees advise the Department Chair and department faculty on department matters and initiate or respond to need for review, revision and/or recommendation related to the committee's purpose.

1. Tenure and Promotion Committee

The department Tenure and Promotion Committee reviews mid-tenure applications, tenure and promotion applications, and promotion applications. The department Tenure and Promotion Committee is an elected committee composed of one tenured faculty member from each of the program areas in the department.

For consideration of tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, associate and full professors are eligible to serve on the committee. For consideration of promotion to Full Professor, only full professors can serve on the committee. In tenure and promotion or promotion cases for faculty on branch campuses, a representative from the candidate's campus will be added to the committee if a department member from the branch campus is not elected to the committee.

Elected members will serve staggered 2-year terms. If an elected committee member is not able to complete his/her term, the faculty member with the next highest number of votes in the program area from which the exiting committee member comes will serve as Alternate. The elected members of the committee will select their own Chair of the committee.

Faculty who are elected to the department Tenure and Promotion Committee are responsible for reviewing the document(s) submitted by candidates in the Faculty Information System (FIS), evaluating each candidate in line with the College and University Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, and considering each candidate independently for his/her own merits and not relative to other candidates being reviewed.

The Chair of the department Tenure and Promotion Committee is responsible for writing summary narrative in consultation with committee members and for entering the narrative and the committee's vote into the Faculty Information System (FIS).

Additional guidelines can be found in College and USF guidelines (i.e., tenured faculty voting).

Promotion of Instructors. In the case of Assistant Professors of Instruction (previously designated as Level I) seeking promotion to Associate Professor of Instruction or Full Professor of Instruction, the department Tenure and Promotion Committee will review the applications for Instructor promotion. An Associate or Full Professor of Instruction will be added to the department Tenure and Promotion Committee to participate as a voting member in the consideration of instructor promotion applications. For promotion to Associate Professor of Instruction, an Associate or Full Professor of Instruction will be added; for promotion to Full Professor of Instruction, only a Full Professor of Instruction can be added. In instructor promotion cases for faculty on branch campuses, a representative from the candidate's campus will be added to the committee if a department member from the branch campus is not elected to the committee.

Faculty serving on the department Tenure and Promotion Committee are responsible for reviewing the document(s) submitted by instructors seeking promotion in the Faculty Information System (FIS), evaluating each candidate in line with the College of Education and Consolidated USF Instructor Promotion Guidelines (effective July 1, 2020), and considering each candidate independently for his/her own merits and not relative to other candidates being reviewed.

The Chair of the department Tenure and Promotion Committee is responsible for writing summary narrative in consultation with committee members and for entering the narrative and the committee's vote into the Faculty Information System (FIS).

NOTE: Regional Chancellors will provide a formal review in promotion and tenure cases for all faculty members on branch campuses "prior to a College Dean completing and forwarding a recommendation to the Provost" (USF Consolidation Handbook, Volume 2, p. 20).

2. Annual Evaluation Committee
Annual evaluation is foundational to promotion and tenure review, as well as to continued faculty growth, providing evidence of consistency of faculty performance over time. Faculty service on the department Annual Evaluation Committee is an important professional responsibility. This committee, elected by the faculty annually, meets in the spring semester to conduct the department annual evaluation process according to the College guidelines approved by the College Faculty Policy Council (April 18, 2014).

Tenured faculty and Instructors (Level II Associate and Level III Full) are eligible to serve on the committee. The committee is an elected committee composed of one tenured faculty member from each of the program areas in the department and one Instructor II or III. The instructor participates in the evaluation of other instructors only. Committee members are elected for the next academic year by the eligible faculty as a whole during the last spring semester department meeting. Program unit faculty recommend their unit representative; the eligible faculty as a whole approve the roster of committee members.

In the annual evaluation of faculty on branch campuses, a representative from the candidate's campus will be added to the committee if a department member from the branch campus is not elected to the committee. The committee will select its chair when the annual evaluation process is launched at the beginning of the spring semester.

When the department has more than two Instructors, they may have a separate committee to evaluate the performance of Instructors. All promoted faculty (tenured faculty and Instructors at the rank of Associate and Full) are eligible to serve on such a committee. The committee is an elected committee composed of one Instructor (Associate or Full), or tenured faculty member, from each of the program areas in the department Committee members are elected for the next academic year by the eligible faculty as a whole during the last spring semester department meeting. Program unit faculty recommend their unit representative; theeligible faculty as a whole approve the roster of committee members. In the annual evaluation of faculty on branch campuses, a representative from the candidate's campus will be added to the committee if a department member from the branch campus is not elected to the committee. The committee will select its chair when the annual evaluation process is launched in the beginning of the spring semester.

Annual Evaluation Criteria. The purpose of the annual evaluation is to assess and communicate the nature and extent of an employee's performance of assigned duties consistent with the criteria specified in Article 10.4 of the UFF-USF Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Faculty assignments are made by the Department Chair at least six weeks prior to the beginning of the academic year. The assignment is discussed between and chair and the faculty member. Each faculty member will be given assignments, which provide equitable opportunities, in relation to other employees in the department regardless of the geographic location of the faculty member, to meet the required criteria for tenure and/or promotion and merit salary increases (UFF-USF Collective Bargaining Agreement (Article 9.3, D; USF Consolidation Handbook, Volume 2, p. 34).

The College of Education Annual Review Guidelines (effective January 1, 2015, pp. 4-6) describes the following characteristics of teaching effectiveness, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service, together with potential sources of documentation:

Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching effectiveness includes thorough knowledge of subject; ability to communicate knowledge clearly through appropriate media; ability to stimulate students' thinking and/or creative abilities; development or revision of curriculum and course structure; ability to work with, motivate, and model and instruction for students; and adherence to accepted standards of professional behavior in meeting responsibilities to students. Teaching may occur in many places, including classrooms, field experience settings, research settings, and one-on-one or group mentoring opportunities.

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness is considered in the context of the department's academic mission, class size, scope and sequence within a curriculum, format of delivery and media used, and discipline/field-appropriate pedagogy and learning outcomes.

Potential Documentation Sources: student evaluations of teaching, peer observations and evaluations; teaching awards; course syllabi and/or instructional materials; assessment activities and products; student performance on pre-/post- assessment measures; samples of exemplary student work and outcomes, including abstracts of theses and dissertations; new course development; course redesign; adaptation to new formats and media; publications on teaching practice (e.g., a literature review that is a descriptive summary of existing research, books about teaching, or other publications involving research of instruction); professional development activities; records of advising and mentoring; supervision of internships; and supervision of teaching and research assistants.

Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity

Faculty Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity narrative sections should demonstrate an original, coherent program of activity and productivity. Faculty should distinguish between work that is published and work that is in significant progress, demonstrating a clear pipeline of work in process, under review, in press and published.

Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity may take many forms, which include but are not limited to independently conducted research and/or creative works, collaboratively generated contributions, or outstanding accomplishment in one or more of these forms. Activities can range from research (whether basic or applied) to creative products, substantive advancement of a field of inquiry or practice, substantive contribution to a body of knowledge of the discipline, to community improvement or to the arts; translating research and the scholarship of teaching into new and/or enhanced practices for educators at all levels (PreK-20 and adult education); and new research directions.

Performance in research/scholarship/creative activity should be judged against appropriate standards within an area of research and creative scholarship, balancing the significance and quality of the contribution with the quantity of publications and other scholarly products. Consideration should be given to the faculty member's role and contributions to collaborative work and co-authorship.

Recognition should be given to continuity in activity and productivity and to continuing impact on the field/discipline.

Potential Documentation Sources: Published books, articles and papers in professional journals; papers presented at meetings of professional societies; reports to national or international agencies; research and creative activity not yet published; reviews of books and articles, or criticism of creative work; reviewers' comments received for grant applications submitted by the faculty member; citations of the faculty member's work; impact on policy and practice; quality of refereed journals and presses; external peer recognition from academic or professional communities or as demonstrated by funded

research or impact of applied work (inventions, development and potential commercialization of intellectual property, technology transfer); awards; distribution of publications, number of copies sold; additional formats such as hard copy, paperback, electronic editions).

Service

Service activities may include professional and public service work for professional organizations; public service to local, state, federal or international boards, agencies, commissions, or institutions related to the basic mission of the University and capitalizing on the faculty member's special professional expertise; and/or participation in the governance processes of the University through significant service on committees, councils, and senates beyond that associated with and expected through participation in regular department or college meetings.

Evaluation of administrative and other professional services to the University is to extend beyond enumeration of activities and include an evaluation of the extent and quality of the services rendered as well as a discussion of the relationship of the service activities to the faculty member's area(s) of expertise. Faculty members are encouraged to list activities by service category, such as professional, public, institutional, and administrative.

Potential Documentation Sources:

1) Professional service – offices held, committees chaired or served as a member, proposal or manuscript review, conference session chair, discussant or panel organizer, quality/prominence of professional organizations served (e.g., status of the organization in the field and at national or state levels);

2) Public service and outreach – dates and brief description of activities (e.g., community presentations, consultancies paid and non-paid, professional development programs or workshops delivered, teaching and resource materials developed, media presentations, brochures or newsletters produced); results of participant evaluations and/or testimonies regarding the individual's contributions through service from organizational officers, contractors or committee chairs;

3) Institutional committees and councils – role played, e.g., committee chair or member, nature of service, period of service, reports or documents produced;

4) Administrative - preparation of accreditation or formal program evaluation reports, including dates and brief description of role played; program coordination/development, including period and nature of service;

5) Service awards;

6) Demonstrated efforts to develop skill pertaining to service activities – dates and brief descriptions of pertinent workshops or conferences attended.

E. Other assigned university duties, such as advising, counseling, supervision of interns, and academic administration, or as described in a Position Description, if any, of the position held by the employee.

Annual Evaluation Process. Individual faculty complete their Annual Evaluation Reports in the Faculty Information System (FIS) in Archivum. Faculty submit narratives describing their achievements in the areas of assigned duties. In addition to these narratives, faculty should submit a current CV and supplementary, supporting documents that may provide the committee with further information in relation to achievements addressed in the narratives.

The Annual Evaluation Committee reviews each faculty member's evaluation report in FIS and meets to prepare an overall assessment of each individual faculty member's performance during the prior year. This report includes an assessment of each individual's teaching effectiveness; research, scholarship, and creative activity; service to the public, profession, and to the department, College, and University; and other assigned duties. The committee chair enters the assessment narratives into the FIS system, as well as a rating of performance in each area of assigned duties. Following are the ratings used in the FIS System and the current definitions used in the College of Education Annual Review Guidelines (pp. 7-8):

5/Outstanding – exceptional performance; demonstrates and provides evidence of extraordinary quality and quantity of professional activity beyond fulfillment of required expectations of assigned duties.

4.5/Strong to Outstanding

4/Strong – distinctive performance; demonstrates and provides evidence of significant quality and quantity of professional activity in fulfillment of required expectations of assigned duties.

3.5/Satisfactory to Strong

3/Satisfactory – meets expected performance; demonstrates and provides evidenceof fulfillment of required expectations of assigned duties.

2.5/Weak to Satisfactory

2/Weak – demonstrates and provides evidence of less than fulfillment of required expectations of assigned duties.

1.5/Unacceptable to Weak

1/Unacceptable – fails to demonstrate or provide evidence of fulfillment of required expectations of assigned duties.

NOTE: Regional Chancellors or their designees will provide "formal written input" for all branch campus faculty prior to completion of the annual evaluation process and review by the College Dean.

Progress toward Tenure and/or Promotion. The annual performance evaluationfor a faculty member holding a rank below that of Full Professor or Full Professor of Instruction (previously designated Level III) should include an evaluation of progress toward tenure and/or promotion. In the case of a tenure-track Assistant Professor, progress toward mid-tenure would be included in the committee's narrative, and if successful in mid-tenure review, progress toward tenure and promotion. In the case of an Associate Professor seeing promotion to Full Professor, progress toward promotion would be includedin the committee's narrative. For an Instructor I (Assistant Professor of Instruction) seeking promotion to Instructor II (Associate Professor of Instruction), the annual evaluation committee would address progress toward promotion, and for an Associate Instructor (Level II) seeking promotion to Full Professor of Instruction (Level III), the committee would also address progress toward promotion.

A faculty member in consultation with the Department Chair may request a more comprehensive evaluation of progress toward tenure and/or promotion. This may include seeking additional input and evaluation from Full Professors who are eligible for membership on the College Tenure and Promotion Committee but who are not currently on that committee.

Evaluations of progress toward tenure and/or promotion at this stage are intended to be informative: to be encouraging to faculty who are making solid progress toward promotion, and instructional to faculty who may need to improve inselected areas of performance.

The annual evaluation guidelines are attached as an Appendix.

B. Credentialing Committees

1. Adjunct Faculty Credentialing
Adjunct Faculty Credentialing is conducted by voting faculty in the respective Program Areas. Program Faculty will meet at the request of the Program Area Coordinator to review adjunct instructor applicants as needed.

Program Faculty are responsible for ensuring quality by certifying the disciplinary expertise of each adjunct instructor applicant. To teach graduate courses applicants must possess a doctoral degree, in a field relevant to the teaching assignment, or have a doctoral degree in a related field and at least 18 graduate credit hours in the discipline relevant to the teaching assignment. Applicants must have relevant teaching experience and must present evidence of teaching success. College teaching experience is desirable. Applicants must present evidence of recent knowledge in the discipline relevant to the teaching assignment.

Doctoral students may be considered for teaching undergraduate level courses and credentialed on an ad hoc basis *in special circumstances*; they will be supervised by a full-time faculty member.

The Program Area Coordinator presents the program's recommendation to appoint an adjunct instructor to the Department Chair for approval. Approved applicants will be processed by the Department Chair through the appropriate USF Human Resources procedures. Adjunct instructors are evaluated annually by the Department Chair in consultation with the Program Area Coordinator in cases of ineffective teaching evaluations.

2. Graduate Faculty Credentialing
The University of South Florida recognizes Graduate Faculty and Affiliate Graduate Faculty. Only Graduate Faculty, and Affiliate Graduate Faculty approved for such purposes, may serve as the Instructor of Record for graduate level courses.

In the USF Graduate Catalog, 2020-2021, Graduate Faculty are defined as "all tenure-track or tenured faculty appointed at the Assistant, Associate, or Professor rank, who holds a terminal degree or equivalent in their discipline." Graduate Faculty may teach graduate courses and may direct and serve on masters, specialist, and doctoral level committees.

To chair a doctoral level committee, "a Graduate Faculty member must engage in current and sustained scholarly, creative, or research activities, such as publications, performances, exhibitions, patents, inventions and research grants." The Graduate Catalog defines "active in scholarly pursuits" as evidenced by at least one refereed publication in the last three years.

In addition to the minimum requirements established in the Graduate Catalog, the department follows these guidelines:

(1) Only full-time Graduate Faculty will serve as major professors of dissertations;

(2) A major professor should have published at least 2 refereed publications during the last 5 years to be considered publishing on a regular basis. **Faculty who fail to publish the minimum** will be allowed to remain as major professor until students under their supervision complete their degree or drop from the program. They will not be allowed to accept new students unless there are extenuating circumstances to be evaluated by department credentialed graduate faculty.

(3) Tenure-track Assistant Professors may be credentialed as Graduate Faculty if their record of publications complies with the department minimum requirements and if they have served as member on dissertation committees within the previous two years.

Affiliate Graduate Faculty may serve on masters, specialist, and doctoral level committees, direct master's and specialist's level committees, and co-direct doctoral level committees. Affiliate Graduate Faculty can also teach in the affiliated program with concurrent approval of the affiliated and home department chairs. Affiliate Graduate

Faculty must demonstrate "active in scholarly pursuits" as evidenced by at least one refereed publication in the last three years.

3. Emeritus Status Requests.
The department follows the USF Emeritus Status Guidelines approved by the USF Faculty Senate, September 24, 2015:

a. **Initiation of process.** Typically, a letter from a retiring faculty member is submitted to the Department Chair, indicating an interest in holding the Emeritus title and summarizing contributions made to the program, department, college and university. Alternately, a nomination letter from a faculty member in the department indicating nomination of the retiring faculty for Emeritus status and summarizing contributions made to the program, department, college and university can be submitted to the Department Chair.

b. **Timing.** The process should begin during the faculty member's final semester of full employment and be submitted to the Provost's Office no later than one month before the end of that semester.

c. **Consultation with Program Faculty.** The Department Chair will inform the program faculty that a request for Emeritus status has been received and seek comments on contributions and indication of support from Program faculty.

d. **Notification of Department.** The Department Chair will notify department faculty at the regular department meeting following receipt of the request/nomination for Emeritus status. An indication of Department faculty support will be requested.

e. **Department Chair Endorsement.** The Department Chair will forward the faculty member request or nomination letter to the College Dean, accompanied by a Letter of Endorsement or Disapproval of granting Emeritus status. The letter will briefly evaluate the candidate's record as a faculty member and include a statement regarding the candidate's contributions to the program, department, college, university, the discipline, the profession, and student learning. The Department Chair's Letter of Endorsement/Disapproval will be accompanied by the candidate's current CV.

f. **Granting of Emeritus Status.** Emeritus status is granted by the President of the University upon the recommendation of the chair/director of the department from which the faculty member is retiring. The chair's/director's recommendation will normally be endorsed by the College Dean and the Provost. However, the College Dean or Provost is free to conduct a separate evaluation and to reach a decision regarding the candidate that may deviate from the chair's/director's or College Dean's recommendations.

f. **Appointment to Emeritus Status.** Approved appointment is reported through appropriate channels for personnel changes in Human Resources.

C. Periodic Review Committees
A periodic review committee supports and advances organizational effectiveness and learning through advisory and oversight responsibilities.

1. Governance Document Review Committee
This committee works with the Department Chair to review, update and/or revise the Department Shared Governance Guidelines. A representative from each program area would be selected by the program faculty or appointed by the Department Chair. The committee will select its chair.

2. IRB Review Committee
The IRB Review Committee reviews the applications for Internal Review Board approval for faculty and students in the department. A representative from each program area will be selected by the program faculty. A member of the IRB Review Committee who is the Chair or Co-Chair of dissertation committee cannot review/approve that doctoral candidate's IRB proposal.

3. Academic Program Review Committee
An Academic Program Review committee (masters, specialist, or doctorate) completes a self-study and makes recommendations for updates to program curriculum and procedures in response to institutional or accrediting body requests for review. Academic Program Review Committee membership consists of the Program Area Coordinator and at least two faculty members. Depending on the size of the program review task, other committee members may be selected as appropriate by the program faculty.

D. Ad Hoc Committees
Ad hoc committees may be formed for a specific task or objective or to address a specific issue that is temporary, non-recurring and on a specific timeframe for completion. Such committees are often established in response to calls for information/participation from College or University administration, for accreditation review, or for other tasks that are sporadic in nature. Ad hoc committees generally dissolve after the completion of the task or achievement of the objective.

Generally, a request to establish an Ad Hoc committee comes to the Department Chair. Depending upon the nature of the task or objective, ad hoc committee members can be selected by program faculty or by department faculty; ad hoc committee members can also be appointed by the Department Chair.

E. Committee Reports
All standing and ad hoc committee reports should be included on the department meeting agenda, and committee chairs or representatives should be prepared to give a progress report. If no business has been conducted between department meetings, a statement of no report is sufficient.

If a committee has a report, the report should be given for informational purposes with appropriate documents prepared for distribution either at the meeting or via email. If a committee brings a report that requires a faculty vote, a motion should be provided and a vote taken.

ARTICLE IV: Program Curriculum
Program Area Coordinators and Program Faculty have responsibility for program planning and curriculum development; subject matter and methods of instruction; programs of study and student success; learning and program outcomes assessment; schedule and delivery of courses; and processing of course and program changes through College and University approval structures.

A. Program Curriculum
Program curriculum should be aligned with appropriate learned societies, be research-based and reflect appropriate current accreditation standards.

B. Changes to Curriculum
Program Faculty are responsible for regularly reviewing courses for currency. Approved program syllabi should be on file in the department for courses taught each semester.

Changes to courses or program curriculum or proposals for new courses are developed by Program Faculty in consultation with the Program Area Coordinator and, where needed, with the Department Chair. The Program Area Coordinator will work with program faculty to complete required curriculum approval processes.

Sponsoring Program Faculty and the Program Area Coordinator are responsible for overseeing the progress of the curriculum change through College Graduate Program Committee, the Faculty Policy Council, and the University Graduate Council.

C. Assessment
Program Faculty are responsible for collecting and reporting program assessment data as required by College and University Offices of Continuous Improvement and Strategic Planning. Program Area Coordinators are responsible for completing degree program assessments in the System for Assessment Management (SAM), as well as ensuring that student outcome data (e.g., comprehensive exams, qualifying exams, critical task assessments, etc.) are on file in the Department and in the College Office of Continuous Improvement.

D. Reporting Curriculum Actions to the Department
Program Area Coordinators are responsible for reporting program curriculum actions to department faculty at the regularly scheduled department meetings. If no curriculum actions have been taken, a statement of no report is sufficient.

ARTICLE V: Changes to Shared Governance Guidelines and Other Departmental Guidelines

Proposals for change(s) to Shared Governance Guidelines or other departmental guidelines may be distributed for discussion in writing at any scheduled department meeting; voting will not generally be conducted until the next regularly scheduled department meeting to enable faculty review and referral of the proposed change(s) to a department committee if needed. On matters of governance and other departmental guidelines, all voting faculty members have the opportunity to comment and provide feedback on a proposed change to the guidelines before a vote is taken. If a proposed change is raised between department meetings, information on the issue will be sent to faculty via email. Department faculty should be prepared to discuss the issue at the next meeting. When a vote is taken, a change(s) is approved if the majority of those faculty voting agree to the change(s).

The department's shared governance guidelines are consistent with university guidelines that specify operating procedures in matters of collegial governance at the department level. All procedures approved by the department will be consistent with applicable law and the Rules, Regulations, and Policies of the University and, as applicable, the Florida Board of Governors, collective bargaining agreement(s) between the University of South Florida Board of Trustees and certified employee bargaining agent(s).

The department will review and update procedures as needed. Revised department governance documents will be submitted to Faculty Policy Council and College Dean's Office to check consistency with COEDU and USF Regulations and Policies.

Revised and Approved by the Faculty on July 6th, 2022
Approved by the Provost's Office July 27th, 2022

APPENDIX TO THE LPLL SHARED GOVERNANCE GUIDELINES OF 2020

**LEADERSHIP, POLICY, AND LIFELONG LEARNING (LPLL) DEPARTMENT
ANNUAL EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE GUIDELINES**

Conflict of Interest
The Florida Code of Ethics defines Conflict of Interest as follows: "Conflict" or "conflict of interest" means a situation in which regard for a private interest tends to lead to disregard of a public duty or interest" (Florida Statutes, Title X, §112.312). A conflict of interest occurs when one's interests – family, friendships, financial, or social factors – *could* compromise one's judgment, decisions, or actions in the workplace. One who suspects they may have a conflict of interest as an evaluation of a faculty's annual performance *must* notify the department chair (Chair), who will advise or seek advice on removing or managing the conflict.

The Annual Evaluation Performance Indicators reflect the mission of the College of Education and department and are organized around three areas: teaching, research /scholarship/creative works, and service. The performance indicators address the following within the review period:
· *The intensity and significance of one's performance (efforts, activities).*
· *The quality and quantity of products (outcomes) resulting from performance.*

As participants in the annual evaluation process, faculty are responsible for providing evidence of their efforts (*what I attempted*), activities (*what I did*), and outcomes (*what resulted from me putting effort into an activity*) to meet performance expectations in assigned areas. The guidelines assume assignments that align with practices typical in research-intensive academic units (i.e., Teaching 20-50%; Research 30-50%, Service 10-20%). Higher and lower assignment percentages will result in increased or decreased expectations for each evaluation area. Evaluators **must** consider the weight of the evidence in determining the rating.

Evaluative statements about expectations are guidelines. Therefore, the ratings will be based on information provided by faculty members to indicate effort (demonstrate performance) and consideration of the amount of effort in areas where effort is expected and assigned (i.e., teaching, research, and service). The following sections provide guidelines on how the annual review committee and department chair can work toward making appropriate judgments about and recommendations for improving the quality of performance (i.e., outstanding, strong, satisfactory, weak, unsatisfactory). Performance (indicators are rated using ordinal rankings: 5-outstanding, 4-strong, 3-satisfactory, 2-weak, and 1-unsatisfactory). Table 1.0 depicts the five levels of performance ratings on the evaluation scale. Mid-points between each level are depicted as 4.5-Strong to Outstanding, 3.5-Satisfactory to Strong, 2.5-Weak to Satisfactory, and 1.5-Unacceptable to Weak. The ratings in Table 1 are those used in the FIS System of Archivum and are nearly identical to those of the College of Education's Annual Evaluation Guidelines from 2015 (pp. 7-8).

Between each whole number rating is a midpoint rating that indicates where there is not a preponderance of adequate evidence, definitive judgment, or consensus on the quality or quantity of efforts, activities, or outcomes suggesting the lower or upper level is the best rating. The half-point or midpoint ratings reflect the interpretive process, meaning evaluations rely on subjectivity and informed professional judgment when determining how to weigh and balance evidence, expectations, and narrative explanations. Commitments to *core principles* such as *equity, diversity, social justice, and human rights* and supporting or studying the role of education in the *transformation of* society add value and ***may*** be the basis for a higher rating as these principles and actions echo the strategic plan, University's Initiatives in the Provost's office, and mission statements of the LPLL Department and College of Education.

TABLE 1. Five Levels of Performance Ratings

Rating (textual)	Expectation Levels	Rating (numerical)
Outstanding	Demonstrates (provides evidence of) extraordinary quality and quantity of professional activity beyond fulfilling the required expectations of assigned duties. A.K.A. Exceptional performance.	5
Strong to Outstanding	Demonstrates (provides evidence of) significant quality and quantity of professional activity beyond strong in fulfilling assigned duties, guided by core principles, but not distinctive performance (outstanding).	4.5
Strong	Demonstrates (provides evidence of) significant quality and quantity of professional activity that meets the required expectations in fulfilling assigned duties. A.K.A. Distinctive performance.	4
Satisfactory to Strong	Demonstrates (provides evidence of) quality and quantity of professional activity that meets expectations (satisfactory) guided by core principles but does not quite meet the next level of performance (strong).	3.5
Satisfactory	Demonstrates (provides evidence of) quality and quantity of professional activity that meets expectations in fulfilling assigned duties.	3
Weak to Satisfactory	Demonstrates (provides evidence of) quality and quantity of professional activity that seldom meets expectations of assigned duties (weak) and guided by core principles, does not meet the next level (satisfactory).	2.5
Weak	Demonstrates (provides evidence of) less than the fulfillment of required expectations of assigned duties.	2
Unacceptable to Weak	Demonstrates (provides evidence of) having not met *expectations* of assigned duties *(unacceptable), guided by core principles, but does not quite meet the next level of quality* OR *quantity (weak).*	1.5
Unacceptable	Fails to demonstrate or provide evidence of attempting to fulfill required expectations of assigned duties.	1

Constructive Feedback

Written and verbal feedback provided to faculty is vital to fostering a healthy department. Feedback from peers and supervisors should be descriptive and specific while addressing behavior (i.e., performance). Below are examples of various types of feedback that can inform faculty when communicating about their performance, outcomes, and goals. The examples below can also inform those conducting the evaluation, the department chair and committee members, who are expected to provide constructive feedback within the evaluation narrative.

Descriptive Feedback: Describe rather than evaluate. Using descriptive language may avoid provoking one to take a defensive stance in response to the feedback and seeking descriptive responses can provoke reflection and dialogue.

Example: "*In your graduate class last semester, students indicated that you did not give them a chance to ask questions about the presented materials and were unavailable after class for clarification. Can you describe any dynamic or event that might have sparked their shared perception?*"

Specific Feedback: Offer personalized and relevant feedback that provides specific actions or guideposts.

Example: *"As noted in our Annual Evaluation conference last year, you anticipated that three articles would be published in peer-reviewed journals this year, but only one has been submitted, and it has not yet been accepted for publication. To present a stronger application for promotion, increase your research assignment this year and create a timeline and work plan to submit the two most promising ones this summer."*

Behavioral Feedback: Use terminology that indicates behavioral traits that could change and NOT personal traits that might be more fixed as personality, disposition, or attitude. Behavioral feedback targets the performance, not the performer.

Example: "Students commented you did not attend scheduled meetings with them. Others across three courses you taught last year described you as having repeatedly arrived late to class, suggesting a pattern of behavior. I suggest you identify your attendance and timeliness barriers and test one solution that allows you to better honor your commitments and meet students' needs.".

The Constructive Feedback section above was adapted from the University of Texas, El Paso's https://www.utep.edu/liberalarts/_Files/docs/department-chair-resources/RIT-Constructive_Feedback.pdf adaption of Michigan State University's ADAPP. http://www.adapp-advance.msu.edu/annual-performance-review-tenure-systemtoolkit#constructive-feedback.

Performance Improvement Plan: A performance improvement plan can be requested by faculty or recommended by evaluators, colleagues, and the department chair. Faculty being evaluated can co-construct and voluntarily follow a plan to improve their performance. The following are some activities that ***could*** be included to improve teaching, research, or service:

Subjecting their teaching to peer review, co-creating accountability plans, cooperating with an accountability partner, participating in a mentoring network, seeking reassignment of courses or course load, reallocating weight of the assignment, consulting with knowledgeable others (e.g., with full professors, associate dean of faculty affairs).

Any of the activities above ***may*** be recommended by evaluators to complement constructive feedback without a specified plan. Performance in assigned areas can be enhanced or improved through plans that identify sources of support (i.e., resources, opportunities).

Support: Institutional support(s) ***may*** be provided, and their availability can vary by semester or year (e.g., Student Instructional Learning Assistants, Graduate Assistants, course releases). Some resources may be provided by the Department guided by decision-making that considers factors such as faculty productivity, equity in the distribution of resources, budgeting priorities, faculty performance improvement plans, and goals of the institution. The following list of supports is not exhaustive. Instead, it is a snapshot of what has been and what might be available. It is incumbent upon faculty to inquire into what is available and request what may be helpful to improve in the areas of research, teaching, or service.

- Faculty Success (Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President): https://www.usf.edu/provost/faculty-success/ and calendar https://www.usf.edu/provost/faculty-success/professional-development/faculty-events.aspx
- Online Pedagogy: https://www.usf.edu/innovative-education/digital-learning/digital-learning-resources/online_pedagody.aspx
- Faculty Insight (via Academic Analytics): User's Guide https://usf.app.box.com/s/nos47xq5siwr48lxh5rdtzotzqt0ntnd
- National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (NCFDD): https://www.facultydiversity.org/Join
- Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning: https://www.usf.edu/innovative-education/citl/
- Fellowships and Scholarships: https://www.usf.edu/provost/faculty-success/professional-development/fellowships-scholarships.aspx
- Consulting Office for Research in Education (CORE in the COEDU): https://www.usf.edu/education/areas-of-study/educational-measurement/research/
- Internal Awards: https://www.usf.edu/research-innovation/sr/internal-awards-program.aspx

TEACHING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Outstanding Performance (5)
Outstanding performance demonstrates an unusually high degree of quality in teaching (e.g., instructing, advising, mentoring, planning) as shown by the following indicators.

Performance indicators that support outstanding ratings:
a. Numerical student evaluation data: Overall rating of instructor documenting statistical exceptionality between 4.5 and 5.
b. Students' comments in course ratings communicate they experienced transformative learning.
c. Teaching awarded for a high caliber of performance
d. Leadership promoting high-quality teaching is evident; curriculum, pedagogical, or assessment practices were used, applied, or advanced via research, mentoring, or professional development.
e. Teaching contributions are disseminated through publication.
f.   Provides teaching support to graduate assistants, faculty, or students (apprenticeships, workshops, peer reviews, doctoral committees). Including serving as a major advisor, co-major advisor, member of a dissertation committee, or thesis/project advisor; serving as major advisor for students who complete their degrees or win dissertation awards, serves as major advisor on (at least 5) doctoral committees of students who have passed a milestone that year (e.g., passed the qualifying examination, successfully defended their proposal, defended their dissertation in the year under review, and/or gained employment or promotion for which the degree was required).

Strong Performance (4)
Strong performance represents consistent, high-quality teaching (e.g., instructing, advising, mentoring, planning) with positive student outcomes, as reflected by the performance indicators below.

Performance indicators that support strong ratings:
a. Student evaluations overall rating averaging between 4.0 and 4.5.
b. Student comments in the evaluation reflect consistently positive learning experiences or unsolicited feedback in the following semesters(s) reflect learning internalized and applied.
c. Teaching philosophy demonstrated through revisions to Syllabi (e.g., course plans, activities, expectations/learning outcomes, assessment practices or products, pedagogy, and student support practices.
d. Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices have led to favorable   results, but the faculty member is underutilized as a major advisor.
f. Completed special teaching assignments (e.g., honors thesis, capstone) with demonstrated student benefits.

Satisfactory Performance (3)
Satisfactory performance demonstrates overall teaching effectiveness (e.g., instructing, advising, mentoring, planning) but some minor areas for concern.

Performance indicators that may be used to support satisfactory ratings:
a. Student evaluation data document adequate performance (overall rating averaging between 3.5 and 4.0).
b. Student comments in evaluations suggest teaching provoked learning/thinking.
c. Teaching philosophy provided coherence in course planning and activities.
d. Advising, mentoring, or supervision practices helped a student reach a milestone.
e. Curriculum, pedagogical, or assessments are enhanced, applied, or shared publicly.
f. Applied lessons learned from participating in teaching development activities.

Weak Performance (2)
Weak performance demonstrates some positive teaching role (e.g., instructing, advising, mentoring, planning) outcomes but produces major areas of concern for the department. This level of performance requires a performance plan.

Performance indicators that support weak ratings:
a. Student evaluation data document areas of moderate concern (overall rating averaging between 3.0 to 3.5).
b. Student comments in evaluations do not indicate they have been helped to learn
c. Teaching philosophy coheres with planning and support.
d. Advising, mentoring, and student supervision fails to produce good outcomes for a diverse cadre of students.
e. Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies) are incomplete or poorly executed.
f. No professional development opportunities were pursued and experienced.

Unsatisfactory Performance (1)
Unsatisfactory performance demonstrates *serious* problems in attaining success in teaching (e.g., instructing, advising, mentoring, planning) as reflected either by (1) a combination of many negative indications or (2) fewer but more extreme behaviors that produce substantial negative outcomes on students and their learning. This level of performance requires an extensive performance plan with details, timelines, and specific goals.

Performance indicators that support unsatisfactory ratings:
a. Student evaluation data document a pattern of substantive problems (ratings well below the department average – between 1.0 and 2.5).
b. Students' comments describe perceived unprofessionalism or mistreatment (e.g., being late to or absent from class, not responding to email, showing favoritism, ignoring students' human rights or academic rights).
c. Teaching philosophy, syllabi, pedagogy, or assessment (in some combination) fail to produce

coherence in the teaching/learning plan.

d. Fails to participate as an advisor on student academic or social committees.
e. No evidence of having sought professional development in teaching.
f. Fails to submit materials to support the annual evaluation.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS OF RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE WORKS

Outstanding Performance (5)

Outstanding performance demonstrates an unusually high degree of skill in the design and execution of research/scholarly/creative works, as shown by the performance indicators below that build upon the performance indicators for excellence. The weight of evidence in this performance *exceeds* department criteria for excellence.

Performance indicators that support outstanding ratings:
a. Both quantity and quality measures exceed average department performance for research productivity (i.e., publications, creative works, grants funded).
b. Wide national or international audience evidenced by citations, posts, or invitations.
c. National or international recognition earned for quality evidenced by commentary, quotations, or honors.
d. Awards received for scholarly or creative projects.
e. Achievements in continuing professional training provided show unusual merit
f. Strong record of grant pursuit, grant awards, and completion or dissemination of results.

Strong Performance (4)

Strong performance demonstrates good execution of scholarly or creative activity agenda, as shown by the performance indicators below.

Performance indicators that may be used to support strong ratings:
a. Refined scholarly agenda or creative plan to complement university or broader community initiatives or agendas.
b. Produced quantity and quality of scholarship equivalent to the departmental average.
c. Earned a favorable review from peers for scholarly creative works.
d. Completes an appropriate schedule of professional educational opportunities (e.g., licensure, technology training, etc.) in the required or ideal timeline.
e. Used external support to facilitate scholarship or creative activities agenda.
f. Produced in collaboration (e.g., group projects, creative activities, and grants).

Satisfactory Performance (3)

Satisfactory performance demonstrates moderate tangible progress in their research/scholarship/creative activity agenda, as shown by the performance indicators below, but the weight of evidence suggests that work falls mildly below the department standard considered strong.

Performance indicators that support satisfactory ratings:

a. Specific research/scholarly/creative agenda or creative plan identified, including appropriate timelines and preferred dissemination or display venues.

b. Research/scholarly/creative works or projects completed but fell short of department average completion rate or quality (i.e., dissemination venue, outlet).

c. Appropriate professional educational opportunities pursued.

d. Involvement with professional organizations that support research, scholarly, or creative goals.

e. Grants were developed and submitted to capture external support.

f. Commitments made and reasonably fulfilled in collaborative activity (e.g., group projects, creative performances, and grants).

Weak Performance (2)

Weak performance demonstrates only minor tangible progress toward executing one's research, scholarly, or creative agenda. The weight of evidence suggests that research, scholarly, and creative projects are moderately below the department norms. Performance improvement is recommended.

Performance indicators that support weak ratings:

a. A general focus of interest is identified but produces few research products.

b. Evidence of completing beginning stages of research/scholarly/creative process (e.g., data collection, manuscript outline, artistic plan) but falls short of the production required to illustrate continuity.

c. Exploration of possible research, scholarly, creative collaboration, or resource network.

d. Identified professional organizations that will support scholarly and creative goals, but no involvement has occurred.

e. Identified and pursued appropriate professional educational opportunities (e.g., licensure, technology training, special educational opportunities).

f. identified and explored sources of external support for scholarship or creative activities agenda.

Unsatisfactory Performance (1)

Unsatisfactory performance demonstrates *serious* problems in developing one's research, scholarly, or creative agenda. The evidence suggests that scholarly and creative production is well below the department norms attributed to inactivity or avoidance, absence of planning, unsatisfactory time management, problematic collaborative behavior, or ethical challenges. In such circumstances, major performance improvement efforts may be identified and pursued.

 Performance indicators that support unsatisfactory ratings:

a. Scholarly agenda or creative plan has not been identified (e.g., a central focus of career interest has not materialized).

b. Minimal pursuit of scholarly and creative projects.

c. There is no evidence of involvement in professional organization involvement   that could help disseminate or display faculty work.

d. Failed to participate in editorial or review processes.

e. Failed to pursue expected professional enhancement activities (e.g., licensure, continuing education, technology training).

f. Avoidance/neglect of grant exploration or pursuit.

SERVICE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Outstanding Performance (5)

Outstanding performance demonstrates a high degree of skill in service contributions, as shown by the performance indicators below that build upon performance indicators for excellence. In general, the weight of evidence in the faculty service contributions *exceeds* the criteria for strong.

Performance indicators that support outstanding ratings:

a. Leadership demonstrated through national and international service in the faculty members' discipline. (e.g., elected offices, editorial boards)

b. Service to the College and University in terms of leadership on committees and initiatives.

c. Service to the program in ways that meet program needs and support multiple agendas.

d. Clear provision of service across multiple dimensions (program, college, university, and national/international), synergistic with areas of expertise.

e. External recognition (local, national, international audiences) or awards for the quality of their service contributions.

f. Community service, if applicable, provides significant influence.

Strong Performance (4)

Strong performance demonstrates good execution of service contributions, reflected through the performance indicators below.

Performance indicators that support strong ratings:

a. Service agenda and leadership roles show increased leadership.

b. Scope of service contributes to the program, department, college, or university.

c. Service agenda well suited to program, department, college, or university mission.

d. Service contributions balance those of the discipline, university, and community.

e. Recognition from peers/colleagues inside and outside the university for good work.

f. Community service supports faculty's research or teaching.

Satisfactory Performance (3)

Satisfactory performance demonstrates *moderate* tangible progress in service contributions and may also reflect minor challenges that interfere with performance.

Performance indicators that support satisfactory ratings:

a. Emerging service agenda reflects a reasonable expectation for rank

b. Selection of service activity suggests a minimal understanding of how service is valued at USF

c. Usually participates actively and constructively in service activity

d. Usually effective in service to the department.

e. Failure to serve as a reviewer (i.e., peer, presentation, proposal, manuscripts).

f. Community service, if applicable, provided good synergy between the faculty member's area

of expertise and the service function.

Weak Performance (2)
Weak performance demonstrates only minor tangible progress in service contributions that may result from many factors, including the limited pursuit of service, passive participation, or inability to manage obligations. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that service is moderately below the department norms. Performance improvement planning is recommended to assist the faculty member in coming to terms with the service obligations and appropriate behaviors to achieve positive outcomes in this university context.

Performance indicators that support weak ratings:
a. Appropriate arenas for service identified and explored.
b. Minimal contributions made (e.g., "sits" on committees vs. actively participates).
c. Service commitments are unrelated to research, grants, or teaching assignments.
d. Over-commitment spreads faculty time or energy diminishes service effectiveness.
e. Provides limited service to the program, department, college, or university.
f. Provides limited service to the community or organizations.

Unsatisfactory Performance (1)
Unsatisfactory performance demonstrates serious problems in fulfilling appropriate service roles for faculty. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that service is well below the department norms. A performance improvement plan *is* required to help the faculty member develop an appropriate orientation and plan to provide service at various levels.

Performance indicators that support unsatisfactory ratings:
a. Service activity is non-existent or unsatisfactory in quality, producing a potentially adverse impact on the institution's goals (USF).
b. The significance of the service to this institution is not apparent (e.g., the faculty member seems resistant or oblivious to service needs).
c. Community service, if applicable, does not provide synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service function.
d. Refuses invitations to serve on committees within the institution (USF).
e. Provides no service to educational organizations in the community.
f. Provides no service to professional organizations associated with the field.

Revised and Approved by the Faculty on July 6th, 2022
Approved by the Provost's Office July 27th, 2022
Takes effect academic year 2023-24.