

# School of Aging Studies

## Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy and Guidelines

### FACULTY TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICY

#### 1. Basic Philosophy

The primary mission of the School of Aging Studies (SAS) is excellence in applied aging research and education. The SAS conducts research that is aimed at improving the well-being of older adults; provides educational programs that prepare students for careers in aging research, practice, administration, and policy; and provides service by disseminating the latest knowledge in applied aging. In particular, SAS priorities for research, education, and service include:

**Research:** The faculty and students of the SAS conduct applied, basic, and policy research that improves our knowledge of the aging process, age-related problems, and programs and policies, which can improve the well-being of older persons. Research findings are communicated to the scientific community through scholarly publications and presentations.

**Education:** The SAS educates the next generation of gerontologists so that they can promote the well-being of older persons and advance the field of aging studies through the development and administration of appropriate services and programs and through the conduct of significant applied, basic, and policy research in aging studies, gerontology, and geriatrics. The SAS educates students specializing in other academic and professional areas about aging issues, and educates practicing professionals about important issues in the fields of aging studies, gerontology, and geriatrics. Students gain knowledge of key aging studies content, and the ability to communicate this knowledge in both oral and written formats. Professionals in the field gain knowledge of current best practices and updates about the field through continuing professional education programs.

**Service:** The faculty and students of the SAS share their knowledge and expertise related to aging via service to individuals, community organizations, professional societies, state and federal agencies, and other units at the University of South Florida. Service activities include lectures, workshops, consultations, community engagement, memberships on boards and committees, and other efforts to promote knowledge about aging and improve the well-being of older persons. Our highest priority for service activities are those that enhance our primary mission of recognition as a center for excellence in applied aging research and education.

In developing appropriate procedures for promotion and tenure decisions, we have considered the goals we desire to attain in building our SAS as well as college and university policies.

We desire a SAS with high visibility in the national and international aging studies

community that makes substantial scholarly contributions to basic, applied, and policy aspects of aging. Research directly enhances the training activities of the SAS and its contributions to the university.

We desire a SAS with a reputation for excellent and stimulating teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. In this manner, we can attract the best students and serve them well.

Our SAS should help to serve those professional, university, and community needs which gerontologists are uniquely trained to meet.

Because our SAS is interdisciplinary, we must maintain high standards while being alert to the diverse paths to excellence that may occur among faculty whose research may include such diverse methods as laboratory research, field research, secondary data analysis, policy analysis, or qualitative inquiry. In addition, research in basic and applied aging studies and public policy areas may necessitate use of diverse publication outlets. Each faculty member has an obligation to demonstrate the significance of their work, and to be receptive to quality scholarship outside their own area of expertise.

The School of Aging Studies is not currently a multi-campus unit. If School faculty are hired at branch campuses, we will modify our T&P and Governance documents to ensure that those faculty are included in matters of Tenure & Promotion and to ensure they have a voice in promotion issues.

## 2. Procedures

Committee selection, composition and duties are presented in the SAS Governance Document.

\_\_\_\_\_ In addition to reading this document and the relevant sections of the SAS Governance Document, faculty members should familiarize themselves with the University and College guidelines for promotion and tenure, as well as any other contractual details. For example, the faculty need to know the rules for the probationary period for the College of Behavioral & Community Sciences (CBCS), including the fact that the period is six years of full-time employment (or equivalent, when adjustments or exceptions to the standard have been made), where the candidate will be evaluated in year six. Please see the CBCS Tenure and Promotion Guidelines for details.

The requisite degree for tenure earning faculty in this SAS, and by national standards, is a doctoral degree in Gerontology/Aging Studies or closely related discipline from an appropriately accredited program or school. In a special case of clearly demonstrated meritorious performance, this requirement may be waived by the SAS after consultation the Dean of the CBCS. This is, however, quite unlikely.

Evaluative judgments regarding tenure, promotion, and retention are made at two

levels within the SAS: the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the Director of the SAS. The Tenure and Promotion Committee reviews relevant data and makes a recommendation, including a minority recommendation, if necessary, to the SAS Director. The Chair of the Committee will prepare a summary of the recommendation and its rationale, which (s)he will circulate to the other Committee members for approval. The candidate's promotion/tenure packet, the results of the faculty ballot (when appropriate), and the Committee's recommendation will be made available to the candidate for review and comments, if so desired, prior to forwarding on to the SAS Director.

The SAS Director independently makes a parallel recommendation. The candidate again has the opportunity to review and comment, if so desired, prior to the Director forwarding the packet on to the College Tenure/Promotion Advisory Committee and the Dean.

The candidate's promotion/tenure packet, the results of the faculty ballot (when appropriate), the committee's recommendation and the SAS Director's recommendation are forwarded through the Director of the SAS to the College Tenure/Promotion Advisory Committee and the Dean. Before forwarding these materials, the SAS Director will inform the candidate of the outcomes of this process.

It is recognized throughout the field of gerontology that simple numeric indices of faculty performance do not exist and should not be created. Faculty activity is multivariate and demands careful and detailed scrutiny of all relevant aspects weighted as appropriate to the case. Faculty members may also vary greatly in their annual assignments, and must be evaluated in the context of those assignments.

Untenured faculty will receive annual feedback regarding their progress toward tenure and/or promotion. This will occur both through feedback from the Director, and from the members of the SAS Tenure and Promotion Committee and will be included as part of the Annual Evaluation process. A more rigorous and extensive pre-tenure review will be conducted at the approximate mid-point of the probationary period (typically the third year). The review will refer to written school- and college-level criteria for tenure that have been made available to candidates. The mid-point review will be conducted by the school's tenure and promotion (or appointment, promotion, and tenure) committee, the school director or other appropriate administrator, the college tenure and promotion committee, and the CBCS Dean. A summary review of progress toward tenure will be forwarded to the Provost.

All mid-point reviews shall address the performance of annual assignments including teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service occurring during the preceding tenure-earning years of employment. In addition, all reviews should critically assess overall performance and contributions in light of mid-point expectations. The mid-point review will be based on documentation of performance, including: a current vita; annual evaluations; student/peer evaluation of teaching; selected examples of teaching materials; products of research/scholarship activity; service commitments and accomplishments; and a brief self-evaluation by the faculty member.

The mid-point review is intended to be informative and encouraging to faculty who are making solid progress toward tenure; instructional to faculty who may need to improve in selected areas of performance; or, where progress is significantly lacking and apparently unlikely, bluntly cautionary about the potential for dismissal.

Faculty at the rank of Associate Professor will receive feedback on progress toward promotion from the Director and SAS Tenure and Promotion Committee during their fourth year after promotion to Associate Professor. In addition, Associate Professors can request feedback concerning progress toward promotion coinciding with any other annual evaluation and the Director and SAS Tenure and Promotion Committee will provide this feedback.

It is reasonable to expect that tenure/promotion decisions would be consistent with the annual feedback documents and faculty should pay special attention to them. All faculty are provided with yearly performance appraisals of their teaching, research, service, advising and when appropriate, administration. Although it is reasonable to expect continuity between the annual performance appraisals and tenure/promotion decisions, the two processes are functionally independent. The Director and the Tenure and Promotion Committee will carefully consider these annual evaluations but they are not bound by them.

The SAS' Faculty Evaluation policy includes detailed statements on standards for evaluation of teaching, research, and service. These standards are not all repeated in this section but will also apply to deliberations concerning tenure and promotion.

### 3. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion – Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

#### **Criterion Areas**

When a faculty member is considered for tenure and promotion in this department, we review his or her contributions in three major areas:

- a. Scholarship in the candidate's area(s) of specialization,
- b. Teaching,
- c. Service.

A favorable decision requires clear and compelling evidence of the candidate's contributions, impact, and recognition in each of these areas. In addition, this evidence must be documented and verifiable to support a recommendation for tenure and promotion. The content of materials that bear on determining if there is "clear and compelling" evidence for tenure is described in the sections that follow. Among the various forms of evidence a candidate for tenure must present, scholarship is weighted most heavily in an effort to promote the department's desire to be ranked among the most productive programs in Gerontology/Aging Studies.

The granting of tenure is a prediction of future performance rather than a reward for past achievement. Tenure will be recommended by the department if, and only if, in the judgment of the Department, the candidate will continue to be one of the leading scholars in Aging Studies, a first-rate teacher, and a good citizen of the Department.

a. Research

There should be evidence of sustained commitment to excellence in research. In the evaluation of research, consideration should be given to both the quality and quantity of scholarship. Quantity must be interpreted in the context of the nature and scope of the work. For example, longitudinal research takes longer to conduct than cross-sectional research, and research requiring primary data collection takes longer to complete than research using secondary data analysis. Review of the quality of research should include attention to at least three factors: a) the degree of scrutiny that the work has received by peer reviewers; b) the prominence of the outlet of publication; and c) the amount of contribution of a given author to a scholarly work. For the promotion to associate professor with tenure, there should be evidence of a body of work of sufficient quality and quantity that has produced at least the beginning of a national reputation for significant and creative contributions to the candidate's field of research, and there should be evidence of the promise of continued growth.

For promotion to professor, an established national or international reputation is expected, as well as the indication of sustained high quality work.

Research contributions can come in many forms, including conference presentations, invited book chapters, books, extramural grant funding, and peer-reviewed publications. In the School of Aging Studies, we particularly value publications in top tier peer-reviewed scholarly journals. Top tier peer-reviewed publications receive extensive scrutiny by experts in contrast to other forms of publication. We consider the development of a strong program of research published in top peer reviewed journals to be **the essential indicator of excellence in research**. Pursuit of extramural research funding is also highly valued. Because funding agencies can vary considerably over time in their availability of funding, paylines, and preferences for funding different types of research, we view obtaining research funding as a preferred, but not required, indicator of research excellence. Finally, although we acknowledge the many benefits of collaborative scholarship, we value faculty members who also have the ability to lead a program of research that is recognizable as their own.

The Indicators and Means of Evaluation listed below are consistent with both the SAS mission/vision and university strategic priorities. In particular we include indicators of numbers of publications, number of citations, fellowships and awards, competitively funded extramural research, and PhD completion, all of which are key outcomes measured as part of USF’s Strategic Plan.

There are multiple means through which faculty can demonstrate excellence in research. For some indicators, there are multiple possible sources of evaluation, at least one of which should be attained in order to demonstrate excellence. For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the faculty member should demonstrate excellence in all of the following required indicators. For promotion to Professor, the faculty member should demonstrate excellence in all of the following required indicators, and some of the following preferred indicators:

<b>Required Indicators of excellence</b>	<b>Example means of evaluation</b>
Appropriate quantity of publication	Average publications per year since hire or most recent promotion <b>External reviewer evaluation</b>
Appropriate quality of publication	Journal Impact Factor relative to rankings in the field of Aging Studies or other fields Ranking of Impact Factor within category Citations per year <b>External reviewer evaluation</b>
Pursuit of extramural funding	Grant or contract applications as a PI Grant or contract applications as a Co-PI Grant or contract applications as a Co-Investigator Strong scores on submitted proposals Efforts at resubmission of unfunded proposals
Research addresses a program of research	Multiple papers on related topics Papers build on previous publications and findings Papers show increased methodological and/or theoretical sophistication over time
Leader of a program of research	Lead authorship on some papers Second author to students on papers Senior (last) author on papers

	Publications independent of prominent mentors Research Narrative Statement <b>External reviewer evaluation</b>
--	--

<b>Preferred Indicators of excellence</b>	<b>Example means of evaluation</b>
Growth of numbers of publications	Average publications per year
Growth of impact of publication	Increasing numbers of citations per year
Exceptional number and impact of publications	H-Index or other indices compared to available normative data Citation of research in meta-analyses or review articles
Attaining extramural funding	Funding of research grants after peer review Funding of contracts Size and years of grant funding Consideration of candidate's role in attaining funding
National distinction in research	Elected Fellow in scientific societies Research Awards Editorial Board membership for journals Nominated for office in scientific societies Elected to office in scientific societies Invited presentations Invited chapters or other publications Appointment to study sections of funding agencies Appointed to task forces or committees by scientific societies or research agencies Reference letters Organizing/Chairing conference symposiums
Global impact of research	Invited talks for international conferences or universities Citation of research by international scholars Evidence of impact of research on practice, policy, or policy in other countries Publications and presentations with international colleagues or students Collaboration with scientists abroad
Impact of research on clinical practice, public policy, or quality of life	Citation of research in meta-analyses or review articles Citation of research in practice guidelines

	Citation of research in government policy documents Evidence of impact of research on legislation or policy Evidence of dissemination of assessment, practice, or policy innovations
Impact of research on business or economic development	Patents issued Start-up companies formed
Contributions to community-based research	Grants and contracts for community-based research Publications related to community-based research

b. Teaching

There should be evidence of a sustained commitment to excellence in teaching by the candidate. Teaching can include not only in-class and online instruction, but also directed readings, directed research, internship supervision, mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students, and development of new courses, course revisions, and program proposals. Noncredit instructional activities, such as continuing education, professional training, development of textbooks or teaching materials used by others, research on aging studies instruction, and grants to support aging studies instruction can also be included.

We believe that there are certain common core elements of excellence in teaching that should be met by all candidates for tenure and promotion. Beyond these, there are multiple means through which faculty can demonstrate excellence in teaching. For example, given the limited number of PhD students in our program, and the varying areas of interest of PhD students admitted to the program, not every faculty member may be heavily engaged with or have an opportunity to demonstrate excellence in mentorship of PhD students. Similarly, some faculty members may have programs of research that lend themselves to engagement of undergraduate students in their research programs, and demonstration of excellence in mentorship of undergraduate students.

For some indicators, there are multiple possible sources of evaluation, at least one of which should be attained in order to demonstrate excellence. Each candidate for tenure and/or promotion should demonstrate excellence in the required indicators, and some the

following preferred indicators. These indicators and means of evaluation are meant to be representative, and not exhaustive.

<b>Required Indicators of excellence</b>	<b>Example means of evaluation</b>
Readings, lectures, and other course materials are appropriately challenging to the course audience	Rating by faculty committee Observation by faculty Student evaluations and comments of instruction
Readings, lectures, and other course material include up to date materials that represent the state of the science in aging studies	Rating by faculty committee Observation by faculty
The faculty member uses varied and appropriate teaching strategies including lecture, discussion, and engaging students in critical thinking with consideration of the course enrollment size.	Rating by faculty committee Observation by faculty or related expert Student evaluations and comments of instruction Teaching Narrative Statement
The faculty member uses student evaluation strategies and provides feedback to students appropriate to course level, enrollment size, and objectives	Rating by faculty committee Observation by faculty or related expert Teaching Narrative Statement Examples of graded papers/exams Grade distributions

<b>Preferred Indicators of excellence</b>	<b>Example means of evaluation</b>
The faculty member successfully manages the classroom to provide a productive learning environment	Observation by faculty or related expert Student evaluations and comments of instruction
Successful mentorship of PhD students	Chairing completed dissertation committee Serving on dissertation committees Coauthorship with PhD students Conference presentations w/PhD students PhD student wins awards PhD student publishes dissertation PhD student obtains funding PhD student hired for postdoc PhD student hired for job PhD student publishes beyond dissertation

	<p>PhD student excels in job</p> <p>Letters of reference for PhD students</p>
<p>Successful mentorship of post-doctoral fellows</p>	<p>Post-doc hired for job</p> <p>Letters of reference for Post doc</p> <p>Gaining funding for postdoctoral fellows</p> <p>Coauthorship with postdocs</p> <p>Conference presentations w/postdocs</p> <p>Postdoc hired for job</p> <p>Continued record of publication for postdoc</p> <p>Postdoc excels in job</p> <p>Letters of reference for postdocs</p>
<p>Successful mentorship of MA students</p>	<p>Coauthorship with MA students</p> <p>Conference presentations with MA students</p> <p>MA student hired for degree-relevant job</p> <p>MA student admitted to graduate/prof program</p> <p>Letters of reference for MA students</p> <p>MA student awards</p>
<p>Successful mentorship of undergraduates</p>	<p>Chaired completed Senior Honors Thesis</p> <p>Served on Senior Honors Thesis committees</p> <p>Coauthorship with undergraduates</p> <p>Conference presentations w/undergraduates</p> <p>Undergraduates work in research lab</p> <p>Student awards</p> <p>Letters of reference for undergraduates</p> <p>Admitted to graduate/professional program</p> <p>Student hired in degree relevant job</p>
<p>National/international impact on aging studies instruction</p>	<p>Presentations on instruction</p> <p>Publications on instruction</p> <p>Awards for teaching, mentorship</p> <p>Service on national committees focused on aging studies instruction</p>
<p>Contribution to curriculum development</p>	<p>Service on curriculum revision committee</p> <p>Producing draft curriculum revision documents</p> <p>New development or revision of face to face courses</p> <p>New development or revision of web-based courses</p> <p>New development or revision of courses in response to the current, specific needs of the</p>

	community to facilitate properly educated workforce
Development of new instructional materials	Textbook publication Contributions to SAS shared slide sets Contributions to other aging studies scholars' courses/teaching materials
Noncredit aging studies instruction	Training grants CE workshops or presentations Planning committees for CE workshops Instructional workshops Professional Education courses
Viewed well by students	Evaluation of instruction—undergraduate Evaluation of instruction—graduate Letters/Emails from students
Local and global engagement	Service learning courses taught Internships or field placements supervised Teaching of courses through USF abroad
Engagement in professional development in teaching	Attendance at teaching workshops
Demonstration of impact of instruction on student knowledge, skills or competencies	Pre-post tests of knowledge, skills, or competencies Evaluation of student theses and defense Evaluations of PhD student dissertations and defense

c. Service

Service includes positive contributions to the school and programs within it, to the college and the campus, to the profession, and to the community. In evaluating service, we consider, for example, participation in school, college, and university committees; editorships of various sorts, reviewing for publications and granting agencies, office in professional organizations, tenure review for other institutions; and activities related to gerontology in the community such as consulting with community

agencies, media interviews, and public lectures relevant to the discipline. In addition, because collegiality and citizenship are integral parts of faculty performance, we consider faculty members' ability and willingness to work cooperatively within the school, college, campus, and/or profession. For tenure, it is required that faculty members demonstrate excellence in service to the school, college, or university, or service to the profession. For promotion to Professor, faculty members should demonstrate excellence in service to the school, college, or university as well as in service to the profession. Excellence in community service is preferred but not required for tenure or promotion.

Indicators of excellence	Example means of evaluation
Service to the School, College, or University	Membership on SAS, College, or University Committees Mentoring junior faculty Engagement in faculty governance such as Faculty Council or Faculty Senate
Service to the profession	Reviewing for scholarly journals Serving on editorial boards Reviewing for conference presentations Reviewing for awards Grant reviews Holding office in professional/scientific societies Serving on committees for professional or scientific societies Program reviews for other universities External Reviewer for Tenure and Promotion or Awards
Service to the community	Community lectures Service on community boards relevant to field Community volunteer relevant to field of aging studies Service awards Service to address critical societal issues and contribute to the public good

d. External Reviews

External review of the credentials of all candidates for tenure or promotion is required. Consistent with CBCS policies, the candidate and the Director, or another school appointed administrator, will both generate suggestions for external reviewers. Ideally, the external reviewers will hold senior tenured appointments and/or will hold appointments at [AAU institutions](#), [USF national peer](#) institutions, and USF aspirational peer institutions. Either may also submit a list of reviewers who should be disqualified for professional reasons. A minimum of three letters (but not to exceed six) will be included in the packet. The Director or the school appointed administrator and the candidate will jointly select the reviewers; in the event of a disagreement, each party will select one-half the number of the qualified reviewers to be utilized (e.g., 2 of 4, 3 of 6). The school Tenure and Promotion Committee may also suggest external reviewers. These reviewers should have no significant relationship to the candidate (e.g., major professor, co-author, or other close associates), unless there are mitigating circumstances that would indicate otherwise (e.g., to review scholarship so specialized that few expert reviewers exist). The content of all solicited letters that are received from external reviewers should be in the candidate's file prior to any vote by the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

e. Review process and timeline

The candidate must familiarize themselves with the detailed college timeline of the application process, which is published annually at <http://intra.cbcs.usf.edu/TenurePromotion/>. In brief, application for promotion and tenure shall be initiated by the candidate during the spring term, with the list of external reviewers finalized by the end of the spring term. The School committee review and vote occur at the beginning of the fall term, followed by Director review about halfway through the fall term. College Committee review and evaluation, and Dean's Evaluation, occur during the second half of the fall term. The candidate reviews the evaluative comments around the end of the calendar year and the application is due to the Provost's Office at the start of the following calendar year. The candidate has at least 10 working days to review the evaluative comments before the application is due to the Provost's Office.

**Approved by School of Aging Studies faculty vote on May 7, 2020**

**Approved by Dean's Office on May 12, 2020**

**Approved by Vice Provost Garey on May 13, 2020**

**Effective Implementation Date: May 13, 2021 (or sooner pending UFF review)**