# **CAS Departmental Instructor Promotion Charge and Deadline**

The charge for each CAS Department, according to the <u>2010 Career Path for Instructors: Promotion</u> <u>Guidelines</u>, is to

... establish **procedures for processing** career ladder applications and **develop standards for promotion** within that unit. Included in those standards should be specifications for criteria to be used in determining requests for early promotion. Such procedures and standards are subject to review and approval by the College under which the department is situated.

**October 26, 2018** is the deadline for submitting a *draft* of departmental Instructor Promotion Criteria to the CAS Dean's Office. Reviews, revisions, and approvals will take place in November 2018.

# **Important Considerations**

Start at this CAS Faculty Affairs webpage, "Career Path for Instructors," for links to the University Guidelines and the CAS Instructor Promotion application and timeline. <u>https://www.usf.edu/arts-sciences/faculty-staff/faculty-affairs/tenure-promotion/career-path-for-instructors.aspx</u>

Please read carefully the <u>2010 Career Path for Instructors: Promotion Guidelines</u>. Nothing in departmental criteria may contradict these Guidelines. Nor do you need to repeat these Guidelines in your departmental criteria.

Review the "Instructor Career Path Application Form" downloadable on this page. It is only ten pages long! As you read through the application, note that

- Instructor Promotion utilizes **rankings** for each area of the Instructor Assigned Duties: Outstanding, Strong, Satisfactory, Weak, Unacceptable, and Not Applicable. As you develop criteria, remember to delineate what constitutes "Outstanding," "Strong," etc. and how these ratings will be measured.
- Instructors are evaluated on their **Assigned Duties**, and each Instructor's duties may be unique; hence, the flexibility in the following chart:

Activity Type	% Effort Assigned (5 yr. Avg.)	Primary, Secondary, or Tertiary Responsibility
		Responsibility
TEACHING		
ADVISING		
RESEARCH		
SERVICE		
ADMIN.		
OTHER		
[Indicate]		

As you develop criteria, it will be important to consider *typical* assigned duties in your department for instructors and create specific expectations for those.

### Preliminary Items to Include in Criteria

1. **A mission statement with the department's goals regarding teaching, research, and service**. How do these promotion criteria contribute to the achievement of these goals?

#### 2. A description of the instructor promotion procedures in the department.

This brief section should outline the typical procedure in your department, including the involvement of eligible faculty, faculty committees, writing of narratives, and the timing of each step.

### **Required Sections**

You must cover three specific situations:

- 1. **specific criteria for promotion from Instructor I to II**. The Guidelines note that the comprehensive department review "should assess the individual's holistic contributions to the department" and ratings in the application should be "Outstanding" in the primary assigned duty and "Strong" in any additional areas of assignment.
- 2. **specific criteria for promotion from Instructor II to III**. The Promotion Guidelines insist that promotion from II to III is on "the basis of meritorious performance" and departments "must assess whether the individual has demonstrated continuous professional development and has achieved significant accomplishments beyond that considered at the Level 2 review." It will be important to make this distinction.
- and additional criteria for early consideration (any application earlier than the fifth year in rank). You should be creating standards for what is an "exceptional candidate" (for early promotion from I to II) and for "outstanding candidates" (for early promotion from II and III).

# **Evaluating Assigned Duties**

Below is a list of categories you may wish to consider as part of your criteria for rating the applicant in each category of assigned duties. Each department/discipline will have items specific to it.

Classroom Teaching Effectiveness Curriculum Development Student Mentoring/Advising Research Experiences & Supervision Internship/Service-Learning Study Abroad Field Work Supervision Honors College Teaching Honors Thesis Advising Committee Membership Professional Development Leadership Roles Student Organization Advising Community Engagement Publications Conference Participation Speaking Invitations Professional Training Awards/Honors

But more than a list, you should develop measures for determining *how* these activities will be evaluated: departmental peer review, impact on student success, required/suggested numbers of activities, etc. For example, this paragraph does a good job laying a ground work for activities and their measurement:

The Department of \_\_\_\_\_\_ expects that successful Instructor II applicants will achieve student course evaluation ratings that meet or exceed Department and college averages; will demonstrate effective classroom teaching as measured by reviews of syllabi, course materials, and peer observations; will contribute to curriculum development and course redesign; and will successfully supervise undergraduate students in undergraduate research experiences.

Some departments may wish to use this kind of phraseology:

For consideration for promotion to Instructor II, applicants must have achieved these accomplishments:

- at or above department average on student evaluation scores
- pedagogically sound syllabi reviewed by peers
- a written peer observation of classroom teaching

In addition to the above list, applicants must have one or more of the following activities:

- a record of student advancement from departmental FKL classes to upper-level courses
- conference participation
- new course proposal submission
- course redesign submission
- training in online teaching/development
- pedagogy workshop participation
- efforts in collaborative course development and team-teaching

Utilizing a "In addition to this list, applicants should also" format can be useful for distinguishing among levels of promotion and early consideration, as well as easily tailored to specific duties assigned to Instructors in varying departments.