

College of Marine Science Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Guidelines

Drafted and approved by the TP&PT committee on 09/13/2023

Approved by the Office of the Provost: 09/18/2023

5-page CV limit removed per new USF guidelines 9/27/2023

Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Criteria and Procedures

College of Marine Science, University of South Florida, St. Petersburg, FL 33701

Introduction

The USF Tenure and Promotion Guidelines dated July 1, 2020, establish general performance standards for all academic units of the University of South Florida, including the USF College of Marine Science (CMS). These guidelines require that each academic unit of the USF define tenure and promotion standards appropriate to the unit, with specific requirements for types and levels of achievement and how they are measured and documented. The guidelines note that academic units may specify more stringent standards than those articulated in the USF guidelines document, but may not specify less stringent standards. As noted in the USF guideline document, variances can be requested in exceptional cases. USF Regulations for Post-Tenure Faculty Review were added by the USF Board of Trustees on August 22, 2023 and incorporated herein on September 13, 2023. [Florida state law requires that the Post-Tenure Faculty Review guidelines (Appendix A) take immediate effect, starting September 18, 2023, the day that the Provost Office approved the September 13, 2023 revision.]

The criteria described in the CMS document below will:

1. Assist faculty members applying for tenure and promotion in the CMS, as well as those subject to post-tenure faculty review, to anticipate how they will be judged,
2. Assist members of the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee in making well-reasoned tenure, promotion, and post-tenure faculty review judgments, and
3. Assist the USF Provost in determining how decisions and judgments were made by the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee.

This document has been accepted by majority vote of the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee, which is comprised of all tenured faculty of the College. It is expected that the standards described herein will be met by CMS applicants unless (1) there are clearly stated mitigating circumstances in the applicant's file as to why certain variances should be allowed, and (2) these variances are approved by (a) a majority of the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee, (b) the CMS Dean, and (c) the USF Provost.

In view of the requirement for consistency between the CMS and USF guidelines (as noted above), the CMS criteria for Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Faculty Review described below are organized with the same structure as the USF Tenure and Promotion Guidelines (July 1, 2020; amended August 22, 2023). This CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Faculty

Review document may be revised by two-thirds vote of the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee. Such changes will then be sent to the Provost's Office for final approval before implementation.

I. Expectations and Evaluations

A. Tenure

1. Expectations of Tenured Faculty

The University of South Florida expectations of tenured faculty notes that "... the granting of tenure...carries enormous responsibility..." including "...maintenance of the highest academic standards, continued scholarly productivity, sustained teaching excellence and ongoing beneficial service...". The three essential elements of the CMS mission (research, teaching and service) as a graduate research program are fully consistent with these expectations.

2. Evaluation for Tenure

A favorable recommendation for granting of tenure is considered as acknowledgment that the faculty member's record presents an unequivocal indication of sustained productivity and accomplishment, with high impacts on science and society.

Each recommendation for tenure will be described in terms of consistency with the CMS mission, goals and educational expectations, as expressed in the most recent CMS strategic plan, and the applicant's past contributions, and probable future contributions, to the mission of the College.

Strict attention will be given to the candidate's record of collegiality with faculty and staff, and a responsible, intellectually-nurturing attitude toward students.

- a. **Research:** Consistent with the primary CMS mission as a graduate research program, the first component of a CMS tenure decision process is an evaluation of effectiveness in research and scholarly activity. CMS faculty members are expected to develop and maintain a research program meeting the highest scientific standards at the national and international level.

Clear demonstration of excellence in research at CMS is most convincingly exhibited in the form of peer-reviewed publication. At the Assistant Professor level, first-authored publications, or publications that are first-authored by the tenure-seeking applicant's students or postdoctoral associates, are of special importance. Absence of productivity in one of these two forms can be detrimental to an applicant's ability to demonstrate the high level of accomplishment that is requisite to granting of tenure. Additionally, publication in highly regarded journals in the applicant's field is highly desirable.

Sustained effectiveness in research and scholarly activity requires acquisition of funding from federal, state, local or private sources. Demonstration of ability to generate funding sufficient to maintain a robust program of research is a critically important requirement for demonstration of effectiveness in research and scholarly activity. Acquisition of funding as PI or co-PI through a critical peer-review process is essential to

a demonstration of funding effectiveness.

Other substantial evidence of effectiveness in research and scholarly activity can include research impact through invention (i.e., patents), development and commercialization of intellectual property, technology transfer, citation of the candidate's publications, invited presentations at national and international meetings, and evidence of the candidate's impact on policy.

b. **Teaching:** Effectiveness and excellence in teaching is another essential component in the tenure-decision process. Teaching in the College of Marine Science includes both (a) formal graduate classroom instruction and (b) mentoring individual graduate students and postdoctoral scientists in research design, implementation (data acquisition), interpretation of results, and scientific communication (oral and written) of outcomes. Teaching in the CMS includes not only to graduate students, but also mentoring of post-doctoral associates, visiting researchers and undergraduate interns. Although undergraduate instruction is not required, undergraduate teaching and research experiences that enhance the university mission are also considered positively. Teaching outside of the classroom at CMS includes, quite importantly, mentoring efforts during research expeditions and other field work.

The CMS expects its faculty members to teach high caliber graduate-level courses in their specialty and to participate in teaching of college core courses as appropriate. It is expected that at least one specialty course will be taught per year, with teaching equivalent of two courses per year. Evaluation of formal classroom teaching is generally accomplished via the detailed instructor evaluations that CMS students fill out at the end of each formal course. As a benchmark for success, it is desirable that tenure applicants strive to match the overall CMS performance average, which is predominantly established by tenured members of the faculty.

The ultimate outcome of successful student mentoring in the CMS is a successful MS or PhD defense, submission and acceptance of a thesis or dissertation, and accompanying peer-reviewed, student-authored publications. It is expected that a tenure applicant will have graduated at least one student prior to the tenure-review process and have other students in progress working toward their degrees. Because peer-reviewed publication may occur after the student's graduation, the most effective evaluation of the tenure applicant's success in mentoring outside the classroom is likely to be the quality of student thesis and dissertation defenses as expressed by CMS faculty in attendance. Other cogent forms of mentoring success can include student awards for poster and oral presentations, both within CMS and at national and international meetings, and success in acquiring scholarships and fellowships.

c. **Service:** Substantive contributions are expected of tenure-seeking CMS faculty in the areas of professional service, university service and community service. As noted in the USF Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, excellence in service involves consideration of both extent of service and quality of service, and activities should be consistent with

the missions of CMS and USF. Professional service can consist of contributions to professional organizations on the local, regional, national and international level. National and international service contributions are especially desirable. Public and university service activities associated with good citizenship are also valued. Service in all categories should involve a faculty member's core professional expertise. Forms of community engagement that directly support a faculty member's teaching, research and creative/scholarly work may also be considered as faculty assignments in support of teaching or research and scholarly activity.

B. Promotion

1. Evaluation for promotion

Promotion of ranked faculty, either tenured or non-tenured, is based on careful evaluation of candidate contributions in research, teaching and service. Criteria applicable to tenure evaluations also apply to promotion decisions. It is emphasized that, in addition to specific written expectations in the categories of research, teaching and service, promotion requires favorable assessments with respect to collegiality and productive university citizenship.

Standards for appointment to the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor are given below. Appointment at all ranks is contingent on a candidate's prior receipt of a PhD.

a. Assistant Professor

- i. Promise of long-term productivity in independent and collaborative research as evidenced by publications, reviews external to CMS, and candidate interviews.
- ii. Promise of continued growth as a teacher.
- iii. Promise of substantive contributions in university, professional and public service.

b. Associate Professor

As noted in the USF guidelines for faculty on tenure-track appointments, advancement to the Associate level is simultaneous with granting of tenure. The requirements for advancement to Associate Professor are thereby indistinguishable from CMS requirements for tenure.

- i. Advancement to Associate Professor requires publication of high quality research products in peer-reviewed journals. A substantial portion of these publications should be first-authored by the Assistant Professor or the Assistant Professor's students. A substantial portion of the candidate's publications should appear in journals that are judged to be high impact in the candidate's discipline.

Prior to advancement to the rank of Associate Professor the candidate's funding record should clearly demonstrate a capability to sustain a high quality program of research. Although patents are not a substitute for publications, generation of

intellectual property can enhance a candidate's record of effectiveness in research and scholarly activity. Excellence in research is a prerequisite to promotion in CMS.

ii. A clear demonstration of effectiveness in teaching is required for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Annual student evaluations of teaching outcomes should hold promise that the candidate's evaluations at the Associate Professor level would rise to the CMS average for senior faculty. It is essential that candidates for promotion to Associate Professor establish a record of excellence in mentoring MS or PhD students and guiding their research products through the peer-reviewed publication process. Prior to promotion the candidate is expected to have graduated at least one student and have other students making good progress toward graduation.

iii. Consistent with the USF tenure and promotion guidelines, candidates for promotion to Associate Professor should have "a record of substantive contribution of service to the university, profession and/or public."

c. **Professor**

Recommendation for promotion to the rank of Professor must include compelling evidence of significant achievement among peers in the candidate's discipline.

i. Advancement to the level of Professor requires a record of excellence in research of international visibility. For advancement to Professor, expectations of excellence in research include all of the requirements for advancement from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, but with unambiguous evidence of an improved level of performance. Indicators of excellence in research of particular importance include (a) first-authored publications or publications that are first authored by the candidate's own students and postdoctoral associates and (b) a robust funding record where, in most instances, the candidate serves as PI or co-PI. The candidate's cumulative research record should predict a sustained level of excellence throughout the candidate's career.

ii. Advancement to Professor requires a record of excellence in teaching at the graduate level. Excellence in teaching at CMS consists of a substantial record of well-received classroom teaching, and an outstanding record of mentoring through active service on doctoral and thesis committees. Special importance is attached to mentoring students in the process of conducting high quality, innovative research and guiding students through the process of peer-reviewed publication. Service as the principal advisor on at least one completed doctoral dissertation is prerequisite for advancement to the rank of Professor.

iii. Service contributions consistent with promotion to Professor should include contributions to the college, the university, the public, and the candidate's profession at the national and international level. For promotion to Professor, expectations for meaningful service contributions should exceed those expected of candidates for advancement to Associate Professor.

II. Timing of Promotion Applications and Review

Procedures regarding the timing of promotion applications and review of application materials closely follow the USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines (effective July 1, 2020).

A. Probationary period for tenure

The College adopts a six-year probationary period. In practice this means that the application for tenure is initiated early in the sixth year of an Assistant Professor's USF employment.

B. Early applications for tenure or promotion

Following an initial period in rank, normally at least two years but after the mid-point review (see section III A), a candidate may apply for tenure earlier than the last year of the probationary period or, for promotion, earlier than the normal point in the post-tenure period if the candidate has fully met the applicable criteria. Such applications must be endorsed by the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee and the CMS Dean. Merit criteria beyond those normally used for advancement are not required.

C. Extensions to the standard tenure-probationary period

At the end of the tenure-earning probationary period, a faculty member will ordinarily either be awarded tenure or be given a one-year notice that further employment will not be offered. However, exceptions to the standard probationary period may be considered in situations covered by FMLA or ADA legislation, or in other extenuating circumstances approved by the USF or as specified in the USF Collective Bargaining Agreement. Extension requests in exceptional circumstances must be made in writing and approved by both the CMS Dean and the USF Provost. Extensions of more than two years beyond the six-year CMS probationary period will not ordinarily be permitted.

D. Tenure upon initial appointment

In rare circumstance, tenure may be awarded upon initial appointment. The guiding principle in such circumstances will be to follow the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee procedures in an expedited process that does not inordinately delay hiring decisions. Review of tenure eligibility is required by the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee and CMS Dean, with a recommendation forwarded to the USF Provost. Prior to making an offer that includes tenure without a probationary period, approval must be obtained from the USF Office of the Provost. In support of CMS recommendations for tenure upon initial appointment, the USF Provost must receive the following information:

- Written review statements from the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee and the CMS Dean;
- Candidate's vita;
- Official proposed starting date for the position, and a draft of the letter which includes

- explicit description of the tenure offer pending Board of Trustees approval; and
- Compelling description of the unique achievements of the candidate that support the basis for tenure.

Persons considered for administrative CMS appointments accompanied by an academic appointment will be interviewed by the tenured CMS faculty and the CMS Dean. The CMS Dean will then report the judgment of the faculty and make a recommendation on tenure to the Provost. If the academic appointment is for an incoming CMS Dean, the outgoing or Interim CMS Dean will report the judgment of the faculty and make a recommendation on tenure to the Provost.

III. REVIEWS

A. Review of Progress Toward Tenure

During the probationary period for tenure, the CMS Dean, and a review committee appointed by the CMS Dean, will produce an annual progress-toward-tenure report as part of the annual evaluation for all faculty. The annual review will reference written CMS criteria that have been made available to candidates. At the approximate mid-point of the probationary period, a more rigorous and extensive pre-tenure review will be conducted by the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee and the CMS Dean. A summary review of progress toward tenure will be forwarded to the Provost.

Mid-point reviews must address the candidate's performance during the preceding tenure-earning years of employment with respect to the candidate's annual assignments in research, teaching and service. All such reviews must critically assess overall performance in light of mid-point expectations. The mid-point review will be based on performance documentation, including (a) a current CV, (b) annual evaluations, (c) student/peer evaluations of teaching and mentoring, (d) publications, grants and patents, (e) service commitments and accomplishments and (f), as described below, external review evaluations. The summary review sent to the Provost will include a CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee evaluation of collegiality and a brief self-evaluation by the faculty member.

The mid-point review is intended to be (a) informative and encouraging to faculty who are making solid progress toward tenure, (b) instructional to faculty who may need to improve certain areas of performance, and (c) bluntly cautionary in cases where performance and progress is significantly lacking.

B. Review of Progress Toward Promotion

The annual performance review for faculty members below the rank of Professor should include evaluations of progress toward promotion. At approximately the midpoint of the typical interval between appointment to Associate Professor and advancement to Professor, CMS faculty members will ordinarily be given a more comprehensive review of progress toward promotion. Such a review can be initiated by the faculty member after two full years at the rank of Associate Professor. The review will include assessment by the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee. Mid-point reviews are intended to

be informative: encouraging to faculty who are making solid progress toward promotion, and instructional to faculty who may need to improve in certain areas of performance.

C. External Letters for Tenure and Promotion Applications

The tenure and promotion packet will include between four and six evaluations from external reviewers who are recognized experts in the candidate's field or a closely related field; two or three of the letters coming from international scientists. Some of these external reviewers should hold senior tenured appointments at respected peer institutions. The candidate and the CMS Dean will suggest reviewers, and the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee can suggest additional reviewers. These reviewers should have no significant recent relationship with the candidate (e.g., co-authors, former academic advisors, etc.) unless there are well-defined mitigating circumstances. In the case of mitigating circumstances, an exception request must be submitted in writing by the candidate and approved by the CMS Dean. The candidate and CMS Dean will select reviewers from the approved list of potential reviewers. In the event of disagreements, the candidate and the CMS Dean will each select equal numbers of potential reviewers from their respective lists. The content of all solicited letters that are received from external reviewers should be in the candidate's file prior to final recommendations by the CMS Tenure and Promotion Committee.

In the interest of improving the level of candor in external reviews, procedures may be adopted to protect reviewer privacy, while also ensuring candidates' access to the summary assessments of the external reviews. Accordingly, reviewers may be advised that their names and other identifying information will be held confidentially and that candidates will have access only to the narrative content of their review letters. The redactions required to assure confidentiality will be performed by the Chair of the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee with the assistance of the CMS HR Administrator.

D. Post-Tenure Faculty Review

The purpose of Post-Tenure Faculty Review at the USF is to ensure continued high standards of quality and sustained productivity among tenured faculty consistent with the mission of the university and with assigned duties in research, teaching, and service. This proposed regulation aligns the requirements of the BOG with current USF annual review and promotion processes to ensure compliance and efficiency.

Post-tenure review is required of all tenured faculty members at the University of South Florida in accordance with State law. As stated above, the purpose of this review is to ensure continued high standards in research, teaching, and service. In addition, post-tenure review is intended to recognize and honor exceptional achievement. As a formative assessment process, post-tenure review is also intended to provide continued academic professional development, enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a performance improvement plan and return to expected levels of productivity, and, when necessary, identify patterns of performance that are unacceptable

or inconsistent with professional standards or employment in the Florida State University System (SUS).

1. Post-tenure review will include only the faculty member's "review packet," comprised of the following materials:

- a. The faculty member's narrative record of accomplishments for the past five years (not to exceed 12,000 characters), provided in a university-designated template,
- b. The last five years of annual performance reviews by the CMS Dean and annual review committee,
- c. The faculty member's current curriculum vita and
- d. The faculty member's disciplinary record (if any exists) in their personnel file covering the past five years to ensure compliance with state laws, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies. Only substantiated disciplinary matters will be considered for the purposes of a post-tenure review.

2. Timing and Eligibility

Each tenured faculty member will have a comprehensive post-tenure review of five years of performance in the fifth year following the last promotion or the last comprehensive review, whichever is more recent. For faculty hired with tenure, the hire date will constitute the date of the last promotion. Faculty who have given written notice that they are leaving the university at the end of or during the academic year, including those retiring or resigning with a delayed date in the subsequent academic year, are excluded from the post-tenure review process. Also excluded are faculty in the process of a comprehensive promotion review during the current academic year. Exceptions to the post-tenure review clock may be considered, such as medical exigencies or parental situations covered by FMLA or ADA legislation or other extenuating circumstances approved by the University. A tenured faculty member under such circumstances may request an extension of his/her 5-year clock. The request must be made in writing and must be approved by the CMS Dean, and the institution's designated senior academic officer overseeing the candidate's unit. Ordinarily, extensions of more than two years beyond the 5-year clock will not be permitted.

- a. The following timing will be followed for post-tenure review:
 - i. In the first year following the effective date of this regulation, 20% of tenured faculty will be evaluated, in addition to faculty in the fifth year as explained above.
 - ii. In each of the second, third, fourth, and fifth years following the effective date of this regulation, 20% of tenured faculty who have not received a comprehensive review will be evaluated in addition to faculty who are in the fifth year as explained above.
 - iii. Beginning with the sixth year, following the effective date of this regulation, the

process outlined above will be followed (i.e., review in the fifth year following the last promotion or the last comprehensive review, whichever is later).

- b. Tenured faculty in administrative roles (chairs, directors or higher) will be reviewed annually by their supervisors. Upon returning to a 1.0 FTE faculty role, these faculty will undergo post-tenure review in the fifth year following a return to a full-time faculty appointment.

3. Review Requirements

Tenured faculty are expected to perform satisfactorily in the areas of teaching, research, scholarship or creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities (e.g., extension, administration, etc.). Positive sustained contributions are expected in all assigned areas. Percent effort in these assignments may vary as a career evolves. A decrease in effort, and thus expectations, in one category should be balanced with a concomitant increase in one or more of the other categories. Administrative details (including relevant timelines) of the review process will be detailed in the document "Procedures for Post-Tenure Review at USF."

- a. The comprehensive post-tenure review includes consideration of the following:
 - i. The level of accomplishment and productivity relative to the faculty member's assigned effort and duties in research, teaching, service, and other assignments.
 - ii. The faculty member's history of professional conduct (inclusive of the review requirements in BOG Regulation 10.003) and performance of academic responsibilities to the university and its students.
- b. Development and approval of unit clarifications:
 - i. The evaluating unit may comprise a department, school or college, as appropriate. Evaluation criteria should clearly describe performance expectations for tenured faculty. These unit-specific criteria will (1) take into consideration the unit's mission and discipline-specific standards; (2) be adaptable to various assigned duties, so that unit faculty have an equitable opportunity to meet and exceed expectations; and (3) be detailed enough that a reasonable faculty member should be certain as to what performance or accomplishment is sufficient in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, service, and other assignments for each performance evaluation rating.
 - ii. The CMS will develop guidelines for post-tenure review. Guidelines for rating faculty performance will be based on quantifiable university, and college criteria for tenure, promotion, and merit as appropriate. Those guidelines must be approved by the CMS Dean and the Provost.
 - iii. Since tenured faculty at the University of South Florida undergo annual merit evaluations post-tenure, it is expected that the post-tenure review criteria for a comprehensive 5-year review will be based on currently approved college-level criteria consistent with rank and assigned duties.

iv. Evaluations will be based on rating categories of Post-Tenure Review BOG Regulation 10.003 or follow university-level guidance provided in Section D.4.

4. Rating categories for post-tenure review include the following university level guidance:

- a. **Exceeds expectations:** A clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performance of faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit. Performance is appreciably greater than the average college faculty member of the candidate's present rank and field at comparable research institutions. Must have a sustained and satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.
- b. **Meets expectations:** Expected level of accomplishment compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit. Sustained record commensurate with the academic standards of comparable research institutions; evidence of at least a satisfactory performance rating in each annual evaluation during the previous 5 years and satisfactory or greater assessment in each area of assignment; sustained and satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.
- c. **Does not meet expectations:** Performance falls below the expected range of annual variation in performance compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit, but is capable of improvement. A faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation during one of the previous 5 years without evidence of a trajectory of subsequent improvement or who has exhibited unsatisfactory performance in any single area of assignment over multiple years or has shown a pattern of non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies may be deemed to not meet expectations.
- d. **Unsatisfactory:** Failure to meet expectations that reflects disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance that involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in university regulations and policies. Performance of a faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation during two or more of the previous 5 years or unsatisfactory performance in two or more areas of assignment over three of the last five years of the review period may be deemed unsatisfactory. Demonstrates a consistent pattern of failing to perform duties assigned by the University or sustained violations of applicable state and federal law and applicable published College, University, and Board of Governors regulations, policies, and procedures.
- e. **Rating Criteria for Post-Tenure Review:** Details of the Post-Tenure Review rating criteria are shown in a matrix format within this document (Appendix A). Details

regarding the criteria and metrics for Annual Evaluation Review exist as an appendix within the CMS Governance Document. How the five CMS scores resulting from Annual Evaluations translate to the four USF ratings resulting from post-tenure review (a-d above) are summarized as follows:

USF Rating Description		Unsatisfactory	Doesn't meet expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
CMS Annual Evaluation Scores		0.0–1.5	1.6–2.5	2.6–3.5	3.6–5.0
USF Post-Tenure Ratings		4	3	2	1

5. Process Requirements

- a. The faculty member must complete a review packet, using a template provided for that purpose.
- b. The CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee will evaluate the review packet and faculty member's disciplinary file covering the past 5 years and provide a written assessment (not to exceed 12,000 characters) of the level of achievement. If applicable, the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee Chair will include in the assessment letter any concerns regarding professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance during the period under review. The Chair will also assign a performance rating consistent with the categories specified in Section D.4.
- c. The Dean of the CMS will evaluate the review packet submitted by the faculty member, and the evaluation letter and rating of the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee. The Dean will add to the packet a brief narrative (not to exceed 12,000 characters) assessing the level of achievement during the period under review. If applicable, the letter will include any concerns regarding professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance. The letter will also include the Dean's recommended performance rating based on the categories described above (Section D. 4.), using the criteria established by the CMS faculty and previously approved by the CMS Dean and USF Provost.

E. Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee Membership and Procedures

CMS tenured faculty will determine the role of the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee in developing recommendations for tenure, Promotion, and Post-tenure review. Procedures specified in CMS governance documents will be updated as needed. The CMS review process will consist of review by the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee followed by review by the CMS Dean.

1. CMS tenure and review processes must adhere to the following criteria:

Membership on the Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee is limited to tenured faculty who have been appointed within CMS for at least two years. The Dean of the CMS appoints the Chair of the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee. Discussion of committee business requires the presence of a majority of the entire committee. Any motions presented during CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee meetings with respect to committee procedures must pass with majority approval of those present.

- a. Committees considering candidates for promotion to Professor will comprise tenured faculty holding the rank of Professor who have been appointed within CMS for at least two years. If CMS lacks at least ten Professors, the CMS Dean may appoint one or more qualified Professors from the College of Arts and Sciences.
- b. Review of applications from faculty with joint appointments should have appropriate participation by the USF units to which faculty have been appointed. As such, chairs/deans from secondary units should have proportional input on review and recommendations, and the composition of reviewing-committees for faculty with joint appointments should have representation that is based on the faculty member's distribution of assignment.
- c. The CMS Dean will neither vote nor participate on any tenure and promotion committee. This exclusion applies, as well, to assistant and associate CMS deans.
- d. Participation in tenure and promotion processes is expected of all tenured CMS faculty who have been appointed within CMS for at least two years.

2. Specific Responsibilities

- a. Faculty mentors should be chosen for all untenured faculty through consultation between candidates for tenure and the CMS Dean. Within the first 6 months from the faculty appointment date, the Dean of CMS will appoint a member of the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee to act as a faculty mentor for Assistant and Associate professors. The mentor's duties are to interact periodically with the candidate to provide advice, encouragement, and honest assessment on how the candidate is progressing toward tenure and promotion. The candidate's mentor and the CMS Dean should discuss the progress of the candidate toward tenure after each annual CMS review.
- b. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure prepare appropriate application files under CMS and USF guidelines in conjunction with the CMS Dean.
- c. Once a candidate's file is complete, the Chair of the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee and the candidate's mentor review the file for completeness and notify the CMS Dean and the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee that the file is ready for review.
- d. Members of the Committee must read the entire file and affirm completion of their review with a paper or digital signature. Committee members should neither vote

nor participate in discussions if they have not read the applicant's file. All members of the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee are expected to review application files prior to discussion, or voting.

3. Meeting of CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee

- a. The Chair of the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee schedules and conducts a meeting of the Committee.
- b. The Chair invites a Committee member, normally the candidate's mentor, to act as an advocate for the candidate. The advocate will prepare an oral summary of the applicant's achievements.
- c. Perspectives on the applicant's achievements also can be presented by ranked faculty members in the college who are not members of the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee. Faculty members who wish to make such a statement must be approved by the candidate and the Chair of the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee, and a written summary of their comments must be provided by the faculty member and placed in the candidate's file. The candidate will have the opportunity to review the written comments.
- d. Committee deliberations will include only members of the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee eligible to vote. The applicant's files will be discussed after
 - i. the Committee Chair reviews relevant committee procedures, and
 - ii. the candidate's advocate describes the applicant's file.
- e. CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review guidelines and the candidate's application files should be available at the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee meetings.
- f. Committee members should be mindful of the confidential nature of these discussions.
- g. The CMS Dean will ensure participation by all CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee members at all levels of review.
- h. Following a discussion of the applicant's file by the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee, all committee members present will vote by secret ballot. The ballots are counted immediately in the presence of committee members, and the tally is recorded by the Chair of the CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee and a faculty assistant designated by the Chair of the Committee.
- i. Absentee voting is permitted if the absent faculty member is able to effectively participate in CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee deliberations from a remote location. Secret ballots received from remote locations will be made in conference with only the CMS Committee Chair and the designated faculty assistant.

- j. Each committee member's vote will consist solely of either a positive or a negative recommendation for advancement to higher academic rank.
- k. Written narratives from majority and dissenting minorities, if any, may be included with the record.
- l. The CMS Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee Chair will prepare a summary of the committee's assessment of the candidate that reflects both majority and minority perspectives. This statement is then given to the CMS Dean for recommendation to the USF Provost.

APPENDIX A: College of Marine Science

Post-Tenure Review Evaluation Matrix

This matrix will be used by the Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review (TP&PT) Committee and then the Dean, to complete post-tenure review. The Dean will consult with the TP&PT Committee on any cases that are initially assessed as anything less than meets expectations.

RESEARCH

Evaluation ratings in the area of Research (which includes scholarship) generally reflect the faculty members research productivity and impact. Research/scholarly productivity should generally be commensurate with the proportion of faculty duties assigned in the research category (e.g., productivity expectations for faculty with a 70% research assignment will be higher than for faculty with a 35% research assignment). As the review criteria are written toward an approximate 50% research workload commensurate with a greater graduate research assignment expectation, the criteria below must be adjusted proportionally for any deviations from this average. Partial scores (e.g., 2.5 or 3.5) are allowable for borderline cases within each scoring category. Additionally, there is flexibility within each scoring category to compensate for a faculty member exceeding in one criterion but lacking in another.

Post-Tenure Expectations: Tenured faculty are expected to achieve a record of excellent record of research compared to their peers in CMS and within their broader discipline.

Exceeds Expectations (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (4)
Faculty exceed expectations when they demonstrate a clear and significant accomplishment that is exceptional in comparison to CMS faculty and broader discipline by: (a) continuous and successful efforts toward external funding for their research;	Faculty meet expectations when they demonstrate average performance within the CMS and broader discipline by: (a) demonstrated efforts to attain sufficient internal and/or external funding to support their research;	Faculty do not meet expectations when they demonstrate performance below that expected in the CMS and discipline, including: (a) no efforts to obtain internal or external funding for research during the five-year period, especially when	Faculty demonstrate unsatisfactory performance when they are not actively engaged in research or scholarship consistent with their research assignment, for more than two years of the five-year period or

<p>(b) above-average publication rate as co-author in high impact peer-reviewed journals, books, book chapters, and/or monographs (e.g., average of 3 papers per year);</p> <p>(c) other research impacts that support their position as a leading scholar in their discipline, as determined from completed annual reviews and their narratives.</p>	<p>(b) co-publish research results in high impact, peer-reviewed journals, books, book chapters, and/or monographs (e.g., average of at least 1 paper per year);</p> <p>(c) provide evidence of significant research impact or professional as a leading or emerging scholar in their field, as determined appropriate for discipline from completed annual reviews and their narratives. Candidates may submit evidence of academic or applied impacts in quantitative (e.g., impact factors, citation metrics) or qualitative terms (e.g., awards, honors, scholarly recognition by peers, appointments), as best suited to their discipline.</p>	<p>funding is needed to complete research in the discipline;</p> <p>(b) little progress on any scholarly products or few completed research products (i.e., no more than 3 co-authored papers, or equivalent products, over 5 years);</p> <p>(c) lack of documentation showing research impact or professional recognition.</p>	<p>productivity is cumulatively below the standards for a rating of (3 – Does Not Meet Expectations).</p>
---	---	---	---

TEACHING

Teaching activities may pertain to formal courses and to student mentoring, professional development, and advising. Teaching activity will be evaluated holistically, not just based on student evaluations. The College of Marine Science recognizes (a) that teaching “performance” is multidimensional, (b) that excellence in teaching can be demonstrated in different ways, and (c) ratings for some courses and for some types of courses (regardless of instructor) are typically higher or lower than others. The CMS also acknowledges that student evaluations can be biased based on gender, race, and other categories and will take that into consideration during review. In terms of advising, evaluating student advising and mentoring must be commensurate with both workload and access to students. Partial scores (e.g., 2.5 or 3.5) are allowable for borderline cases within each scoring category. Additionally, there is flexibility within each scoring category to compensate for a faculty member exceeding in one criterion but lacking in another.

Post-Tenure Expectations: Tenured faculty are expected to achieve a record of excellent teaching compared to their peers in CMS and within their broader discipline.

Exceeds Expectations (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (4)
<p>Faculty exceed expectations when they demonstrate exceptional performance as compared to the CMS and broader discipline:</p> <p>(a) teaching duties are performed effectively and support both undergraduate (when appropriate) and graduate education; courses are innovative, transformative, engaging, or have a high impact in some facet;</p>	<p>Faculty meet expectations when they demonstrate average performance as compared to the CMS and broader discipline:</p> <p>(a) teaching duties were performed as assigned, ideally supporting both undergraduate (when appropriate) and graduate students. Existing courses are maintained and updated, as needed;</p> <p>(b) student evaluation comments</p>	<p>Faculty do not meet expectations when:</p> <p>(a) teaching duties were only performed partially, or not as assigned;</p> <p>(b) student evaluation comments and/or ratings consistently raise clear and obvious problems, such as unresponsiveness to student questions, ineffective communication, disrespect</p>	<p>Faculty demonstrate unsatisfactory performance when they do not provide clear evidence of adequate teaching performance and/or effectiveness at the level expected for the rank for more than two years; or failure to complete assigned teaching duties in undergraduate</p>

<p>(b) faculty makes other instructional contributions to the CMS or discipline outside the classroom, such as through general education certification, mentoring, professional development activities, community education, etc.;</p> <p>(c) student evaluation comments and/or ratings convey a positive student experience and do not consistently raise clear or obvious problems with instruction;</p> <p>(d) successful supervision and mentoring of undergraduates (when possible), graduate students, and/or post-docs, as demonstrated by number of advisees and graduates, job placements, etc.</p>	<p>and/or ratings do not consistently raise clear and obvious problems with instruction;</p> <p>(c) evidence of supervision or mentoring of undergraduate (when possible), graduate students, and/or post-docs.</p>	<p>to students, or failure to provide required disability accommodations;</p> <p>(c) there is limited to no supervision of graduate and undergraduate students, or comparable activities.</p>	<p>courses, graduate courses, graduate student, or post-doc advising.</p>
---	---	---	---

SERVICE/ADMINISTRATION

The College of Marine Science recognizes (a) that university service (and administration, where applicable) activities of equal importance or impact can occur at different “levels” (e.g., university and college); (b) that service activities of equal importance or impact can occur in different domains (e.g., university, professional), (c) that excellence in service can be demonstrated in different ways, and (d) that service expectations fluctuate with workload, work leave, and rank . The following rating guidelines will be interpreted with respect to these factors. Partial scores (e.g., 2.5 or 3.5) are allowable for borderline cases within each scoring category. Additionally, there is flexibility within each scoring category to compensate for a faculty member exceeding in one criterion but lacking in another.

Post-Tenure Expectations: Tenured faculty are expected to achieve a record of excellent service compared to their peers in CMS and within their broader discipline.

Exceeds Expectations (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (4)
<p>Faculty exceed expectations when they demonstrate exceptional performance as compared to the CMS and broader discipline:</p> <p>(a) continuous service within the college, including either leadership activity (administrative duties, committee chair, program director, or equivalent) and/or regular intensive service (multiple committees, heavy workload or responsibility);</p>	<p>Faculty meet expectations when they demonstrate average performance as compared to the CMS and broader discipline:</p> <p>(a) evidence of service within the college, and/or university, such as participation in activities, committees, meetings, events, etc.;</p> <p>(b) evidence of professional service, through the academic discipline, community, or other outlet.</p>	<p>Faculty do not meet expectations when:</p> <p>(a) university service activity is below expectations within the college for most years during the review period, such as unwillingness to serve on college committees;</p> <p>(b) external service to discipline or community is lacking during most years</p>	<p>Faculty demonstrate unsatisfactory performance when they display no effective service activity at the level expected for their rank, for more than two years.</p>

<p>(b) evidence of service at the university level;</p> <p>(c) evidence of leadership and service within the academic discipline or community, such as holding offices, positions, or other leadership roles; participation in special task forces or boards; serving as an editor or associate editor; significant engagement with the community; etc.</p>		<p>of the review period.</p>	
---	--	------------------------------	--

OVERALL POST-TENURE REVIEW RATING

Based on the Post-Tenure Review assessment, an OVERALL rating will be assigned using the 4-point ordinal scale specified in USF's Post-Tenure Review regulation II(3)(c). This OVERALL rating will be a weighted total, derived by multiplying scores from each of the three evaluative domains (i.e., Research, Teaching, and Service/Administration) by the faculty member's assignment percentage in that domain and using the sum of those figures; the overall rating will be reported as the nearest whole number.

Exceeds Expectations (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (4)
A clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performance of faculty across the faculty member's discipline and broader discipline. Performance is appreciably greater than the average college faculty member of the candidate's present rank and field at comparable research institutions. Must have a sustained and satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.	Expected level of accomplishment compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and broader discipline. Sustained record commensurate with the academic standards of a comparable research institution; evidence of at least a satisfactory performance rating in each annual evaluation during the previous 5 years and satisfactory or greater assessment in each area of assignment; sustained and satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law,	Performance falls below the expected range of annual variation in performance compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit but is capable of improvement. A faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation during one of the previous 5 years without evidence of a trajectory of subsequent improvement or exhibited unsatisfactory performance in any single area of assignment over multiple years or pattern of non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors'	Failure to meet expectations that reflects disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance that involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in university regulations and policies. A faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation during two or more of the previous 5 years or unsatisfactory performance in two or more areas of assignment over three of the last five years of the review period may be deemed

	Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.	regulations, and university regulations and policies, may be deemed to not meet expectations.	unsatisfactory. Demonstrates a consistent pattern of failing to perform duties assigned by the University or sustained violations of applicable state and federal law and applicable published College, University, and Board of Governors regulations, policies, and procedures.
--	---	---	---

Drafted and approved by the TP&PT Committee on 9/13/23

Approved by the Office of the Provost: 09/18/23