

# SCHOOL OF INFORMATION

## FACULTY TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES

### I. Introduction

#### Mission

The School of Information is concerned with interdisciplinary approaches to better understand the complexities, innovations, and challenges of a global and technologically complex information society. We are interested in impacting how people interact with information and technology, and the knowledge, tools, and processes that empower people in a variety of contexts at micro and macro levels.

#### Values

The core values of the School of Information are:

- Advocacy and promotion of intellectual freedom, literacy, and information access;
- High-quality, accessible educational programs that prepare leaders in the discipline;
- Bridging the gap between research and practice by generating new knowledge, processes, and tools geared toward understanding and improving the role of information in people's lives;
- Meaningful collaborations with community partners.

#### Overview

The School of Information evaluates candidates for tenure and/or promotion based on their contribution to the School's mission through performance in teaching, research, and service. The expectations for performance in teaching, research, and service appear below under the appropriate category.

The requisite degree for tenure earning faculty in this School, and by national standards, is an earned doctorate in Information Science or a related field from an appropriately accredited program or school.

In addition to reading this document, faculty members should familiarize themselves with the University and College of Arts & Sciences (CAS) guidelines for promotion and tenure, as well as the current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

*This School of Information is not currently a multi-campus unit. If departmental faculty are hired at branch campuses we will modify our governance and T&P documents to ensure that those faculty are included in matters of faculty governance and Tenure & Promotion to ensure they have voice in departmental issues. We recognize the principles of equity of assignment, resources and opportunities of faculty across a multi-campus university.*

### II. Procedures

**A. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

1. The tenured School of Information faculty recommend a departmental tenure and promotion committee (T/P Committee) composed of at least 3 tenured faculty members. The recommended T/P Committee must be approved by the Director.
  - a. The Director works with the candidate in developing a list of potential external reviewers and in submitting this for approval to the College Dean's Office.
  - b. The T/P Committee is responsible for reviewing the candidate's package and submits a narrative describing their review and recommendation supporting or opposing tenure and promotion for the candidate.
2. The report and candidate's package is then reviewed by all other tenured faculty. A request may be made for the T/P Committee to hold a meeting (online or in-person) to summarize their recommendation and answer questions. All tenured faculty then vote via a secret ballot to accept or reject the recommendation of the T/P Committee. The Director does not vote with the tenured faculty. The T/P committee's recommendation along with that of full tenured faculty, are then submitted for the next level review. In the event of a split decision, a minority opinion must also be submitted.
3. The Director performs an independent review and assessment of the candidate's package and makes a written recommendation supporting or opposing tenure and promotion.
4. The recommendations of the department (SI) T/P committee and the Director, accompanied by a clear, substantive summary of reasons for both positive and negative votes, will be forwarded to the College for School level review. A copy of the Department's criteria for tenure and promotion is also included.

**B. Promotion to Professor.**

1. The procedures for promotion to Professor are similar to those used for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor; however, the Promotion Committee may only be composed of full-time tenured faculty who hold the rank of Professor, and may be smaller than 3 people. In the event that the Director does not hold the rank of Professor, a different Professor from the faculty (or outside, if necessary) may serve as Surrogate Chair. The Promotion Committee helps select external reviewers and itself reviews the promotion package of the candidate, finally making a recommendation supporting or opposing promotion, including a minority opinion if needed.
2. The Director (or Surrogate if there is one) organizes a meeting of all tenured faculty at the rank of Professor. After discussion, all tenured faculty at the rank of Professor physically present at the meeting (even if remote) via a secret ballot to accept or reject the recommendation of the Promotion Committee. The full tenured Professor rank faculty vote and minority opinion (if needed) is included with the Promotion Committee recommendation.

3. The Director will perform an independent analysis of the candidate's package and make a recommendation supporting or opposing promotion.
4. The recommendation of the Promotion Committee, along with the recommendation of the Director, accompanied by a clear, substantive summary of reasons for both positive and negative votes, will be forwarded to the College for School-level review. A copy of the Department's criteria for promotion to Professor should be included.

### **III. Required and Recommended Materials to be Submitted**

1. Required materials:
  - a. Tenure/Promotion application,
  - b. Curriculum Vitae,
  - c. Narratives
    - i. A research narrative outlining the applicant's research area and activities;
    - ii. A teaching narrative outlining teaching activities and pedagogy;
    - iii. A service narrative;
  - d. Annual evaluations from FAIR/Archivum;
  - e. List of research outputs (published and accepted articles, research grants submitted, research grants won, other publications and research outputs);
  - f. Table of courses taught and student course evaluations, and a spreadsheet, prepared by the Academic Services Administrator, or other staff member, aggregating the student assessment of teaching; and,
  - g. (for Tenure applications only) Mid-tenure evaluations (all levels).
2. Recommended materials:
  - a. Research
    - i. Copies of publications. For materials "in press", provide external documentation regarding the status of the work or paper (e.g. correspondences from journals, editors, status updates, etc.).
    - ii. Evidence of submitted grant proposals or projects, including reviewer summary statements provided by the funding agency.
    - iii. Information on the impact of the applicant's research. Impact should include scholarly impact, as measured by bibliometric indices from Web of Science, Social Science Citation Index, Science Citation Index, etc., but may include evidence of broader impacts on influence, thinking, and practice within the discipline. Broader impact may include evidence of readership, use of the applicant's work/materials by other scholars, and applied use of the applicant's work/materials to guide practice.
    - iv. Documentation of research awards and acknowledgements, competitive awards, grant, and fellowships.
  - a.
  - b. Teaching
    - i. Course syllabi from each distinct course taught during the evaluation period.
    - ii. Other course materials that a faculty member wishes to report to support their package.

- iii. Evidence of curriculum design: new course creation, significant course modification, moving a course from classroom to online instruction, etc.
  - iv. Student written evaluations (a faculty member may supplement this section by adding any information pertinent to the review of student evaluations)
  - v. Other communications from students related to courses and/or outcomes
  - vi. Exemplary student work and outcomes.
  - vii. Peer evaluations of teaching.
  - viii. Documentation of attendance at workshops or other training to enhance teaching effectiveness, course design, or other pedagogic factors.
  - ix. Documentation of students advised and/or thesis/dissertation committee membership/leadership.
  - x. Documentation of teaching awards.
- c. Service
- i. Evidence of professional/public service activities, including minutes, any products from the committee's work, etc.
  - ii. Awards or honors given for service contributions.
  - iii. Any supporting evidence of excellence in service engagement and activities at all levels.

#### **IV. Evaluation for Tenure**

Evaluation for tenure involves three components appropriate to the unit:

- Research/creative/scholarly work;
- Teaching or comparable activity (including advising and mentoring);
- Service to the University, the profession, and the community

General standards for recommending tenure are a record of excellence in research/creative/scholarly work, a record of excellence in teaching or other comparable activity, and a record of substantive contribution of service to the University, profession and/or public. Expectations for what constitutes excellence in each of research/scholarly work, teaching, and service are detailed individually below.

## A. Research

Candidates for tenure and promotion in the School of Information are expected to demonstrate excellence in research that shows their independence as researchers and maintaining an active program of scholarship. Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to maintain an active program of scholarship following tenure. Excellence in research must demonstrate both quality and quantity.

The normal expectation of candidates for tenure is an average of at least two research/scholarship outputs per year, with at least half of these being in high quality outlets. The expectation for promotion to Professor is an international reputation and continued scholarly output production averaging two outputs per year, with at least half of these appearing in high quality outlets.

The School of Information recognizes that a candidate can contribute to the University's research mission through multiple forms of scholarship, including<sup>1</sup>:

1. High Impact Forms of Scholarship
  - a. External grants and contracts awarded
  - b. Articles in peer-reviewed academic or professional journals
  - c. Academic books, chapters in peer-reviewed books, monographs
  - d. Peer-reviewed, indexed papers presented at national/international conferences deemed as being highly impactful and competitive
2. Medium Impact Forms of Scholarship
  - a. External Grant/contract applications
  - b. Internal grants and contracts awarded
  - c. Juried papers, symposia, and posters at refereed professional meetings/colloquia
  - d. Invited addresses
3. Lower Impact Forms of Scholarship
  - a. Technical reports
  - b. Un-refereed/reviewed articles
  - c. Un-refereed conference papers, symposia, posters, and presentations
  - d. Book reviews, commentaries etc.
  - e. Instructional computer programs, videotapes, and other instructional materials
  - f. Digital media, including programs, web sites, social media, etc.

Assessments of quality are evaluated in the School of Information through a relatively standardized process of professional judgment. Journal article quality assessment includes, but is not limited to, factors such as: is journal peer-reviewed, ranking of the journal, acceptance/rejection rate of the journal, the apparent difficulty in conceptually framing and pursuing the study, originality of the research, estimates of the contribution made by the author (both in relationship to other authors in multiple authored pieces as well as the contribution to the field as viewed by the evaluators), the degree to which published works have been cited as measured by the relevant citation indices or scholarly communication analysis tools, and other measures of scholarly influence and applied

impact. Conference papers are evaluated on the basis of the stature of the meeting and the distinction of the presentation, including specially invited addresses to professional/academic groups, the review process and acceptance rate, whether the proceedings are indexed in major databases, and citation rate for the paper.

## B. Teaching

The School of Information expects candidates to establish a record of effectiveness in teaching, so that students master the body of theory, knowledge, and skills held essential to function as effective information professionals. To achieve “excellence” in teaching, candidates for tenure and also promotion are expected to demonstrate exemplary quality, through indicators like student evaluation ratings, results of peer review, implementation of innovative teaching methods, and development of new curricula.

The School of Information considers the teaching role to be multi-faceted, and evaluations of its effectiveness includes more than students’ quantitative and narrative evaluations of the instructor. The School of Information looks closely at those evaluations, but also considers such factors as student advising, availability to students, participation in the School’s curricular activities, development of new courses and continuous improvement of existing courses, student engagement, innovative teaching methods, teaching load and credit hour productivity, and professional development in subject area and pedagogic methods.

For evaluating teaching expectations, the following will be examined:

### 1. Teaching

#### A. Teaching courses

- i. Syllabi
- ii. Grade Distribution
- iii. Productivity, including course loads
- iv. Student evaluations, including quantitative and qualitative, with attention to data and comments that form a pattern—note that student evaluations will be considered in light of narrative information about classes provided by the instructor as well as factors that typically affect ratings of teaching, such as:
  - Delivery format (Online vs blended vs face-to-face delivery)
  - Class size
  - Class difficulty
  - Core course vs. elective
  - And other appropriate factors
- v. Communications from students or other stakeholders regarding course content, teaching methods, course outcomes, or other course related items
- vi. Development of new courses or substantial revision of existing courses
- vii. Adaptation to new formats and media using emerging technologies

- viii. Use of outcomes assessment data to improve teaching and student learning
- ix. Teaching awards and other recognition

## 2. Instruction-Related

### A. Advising and mentoring

- i. Academic advising, including office hours and availability to students
- ii. Writing letters of recommendation for, and assisting students with scholarships, internships, and job placement
- iii. Mentoring and involving students in professional activities, research, and publication, including support (as Director or Committee Member) of student Honors Theses or Doctoral Dissertations
- iv. Supervision of GAs

### B. Other teaching

- i. Guest lectures in SI and outside classes
- ii. Seminars/workshops for faculty and/or students in the School
- iii. In-service seminars/workshops for professional constituency

### C. Engaged scholarship with teaching/learning components

- i. Textbooks/Scholarly papers published on teaching in your field and not counted as research

### D. Professional development for improving teaching or subject matter expertise

### E. Training grants

### F. Other

Evaluation for tenure and promotion is performed on multiple measures from above, including student evaluations.

## C. Service

Faculty provide service to the School, the College, the University, the profession, and to local, state, national, and international communities.

To perform substantive service, candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to share their expertise by participating in School, College, and University committee service and to contribute to the profession or local or international community. The general expectation of candidates is to maintain at least two service activities each year, with at least one of those service activities generally being School/College/University related.

In evaluating service for tenure and promotion, the following will be examined:

### 1. Departmental Service

- A. Departmental committees and governance
- B. ASIST-USF, ALA-USF, SLA-USF, Beta Phi Mu, etc.
- C. Departmental administrative activities (e.g. Committee on Accreditation Self-Study assignments).

- D. Activities in student recruitment and outreach
  - E. Collection development liaison to USF Library
  - F. Oversight of Henrietta Smith Library
  - G. Oversight of technology and facilities
  - H. Management of SI electronic mailing lists and Web page, and other communication tools
2. University Service Outside of Department
    - A. Collaborative programs with other disciplines
    - B. College-wide and university-wide committees
    - C. Other organizations such as faculty governance or working groups appointed by the Faculty Senate, Provost, or University President.
  3. Professional
    - A. Relevant Organizations
      - i. Professional offices and committees
      - ii. Regional offices and committees
      - iii. State and local
    - B. General Academic
      - i. Editorships of professional/academic journals, service on Editorial Boards, and ad-hoc journal reviews
      - ii. Participation in grant review boards, national policy making, journal editing, program evaluation and similar activities.
      - iii. Organizing or in other ways facilitating conferences, workshops, or symposia.
      - iv. Officer or committee work such as AAUP, Beta Phi Mu, at national, regional, state, and local levels.
  4. Community
    - A. Public lectures relevant to discipline
    - B. Media coverage--community issue-oriented papers in the popular press.
    - C. Activities on behalf of local, state, and federal agencies

## **V. Evaluation for Promotion**

### **A. Promotion to Associate Professor**

Promotion to Associate Professor is considered at the same time as tenure and is evaluated using the same expectations for tenure.

### **B. Promotion to Professor (from USF Tenure & Promotion Guidelines)**

For promotion to the rank of professor, the candidate must offer conclusive evidence of a reputation beyond the University, among peers on a national or international level. The candidate is expected to demonstrate:

1. A continued record of excellence in teaching or other comparable activity appropriate for the unit,

2. A record of excellence in research/creative/scholarly work of at least national visibility of demonstrated quality supported by a record of ongoing publications or their equivalent following tenure,
3. A record of substantial contribution of service to the university and to the field, profession or community as appropriate to the mission and goals of the department, college and university. Expectations about the level of meaningful service contributions for candidates for professor are significantly higher than those for attaining the Associate rank.
4. Compelling evidence of significant achievement among peers in one's discipline or professional field at the national or international level. Any recommendation for promotion to the rank of Professor must contain evidence that such distinction has been identified.

This document may be amended by a two-thirds majority vote of the voting members of the Faculty at any regular meeting of the department. After amendment, it must be approved by the Offices of the Dean and Provost.

**School of Information Faculty Approved, May 6, 2020**

**Approved by Deans Office, May 11, 2020**

**Approved by Provost's Office, May 13, 2020**

---