

College of Allied Health Professions Guidelines and Procedures Pertaining to Promotion and Tenure

Faculty appointed to Tenure Track appointments will be subject to the same promotion and tenure policies as specified in Sections 3.10 and 3.11 of the Faculty Handbook. Traditional ranks of tenure-track faculty are Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor.

Faculty appointed to Non-Tenure Track appointments will be subject to the promotion policies as specified in Section 3.10 of the Faculty Handbook. All Non-Tenure Track appointments are made per 3.15 of the Faculty Handbook.

Depending upon credentials and qualifications, a faculty member who earned a terminal degree in their field (or related field) could be appointed as Assistant Professor of Instruction, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. For those individuals without a terminal degree in their field (or related field), the rank of Instructor or Senior Instructor are available. The terminal degree is determined by the discipline's accrediting body as well as CHEA and SACS.

Candidates for promotion to Professor and those seeking tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will be required to follow the processes and procedures described in the Faculty Handbook and any directives from the Office of Academic Affairs.

Pre-Tenure Review of Assistant Professors

In addition to the Annual Faculty Evaluation Form, tenure-track faculty members are reviewed annually for progress toward tenure during their probationary period by the departmental committee and Department Chair. The annual pre-tenure reviews should address all aspects of the faculty member's performance relevant to tenure. As part of this annual review, the faculty member has the responsibility of providing timely and accurate documentation to ensure adequate consideration. The chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss the results of the review and will provide the faculty member with a written evaluation that addresses all aspects of the faculty member's performance relevant to tenure, including scholarship, teaching, service and collegiality. The college dean will review all annual reviews for compliance with University policy and procedures.

A mid-probationary review is conducted at the department level or comparable academic unit for all untenured tenure-track faculty no later than the completion of the third year of probationary service (or near the mid-point of the probationary term for those faculty members whose probationary term includes credit for prior service). The mid-probationary review will also function as the annual pre-tenure review for that year. The mid-probationary review should address all aspects of the faculty member's performance relevant to tenure. As part of this review, the faculty member has the responsibility of providing timely and accurate documentation to ensure adequate consideration. The Departmental Chair will conduct the mid-probationary review in consultation with the tenured faculty of the department or comparable unit.

The departmental mid-probationary tenure committee shall be notified by the Department Chair to review a faculty member who is in the mid-probationary review year of service, as defined above. The departmental mid-probationary committee, just like the tenure committee, is normally composed of all tenured faculty members in the department except the Chair. The committee shall have an opportunity to examine whatever supporting information and materials the candidate may have submitted in support of his/her review. Following the mid-probationary review, the departmental committee shall submit a written report to the Department Chair.

The chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss the results of the review and will provide the faculty member with a written summary that addresses all aspects of the faculty member's performance relevant to tenure, including scholarship, teaching, service and collegiality. The Chair will also provide the faculty with a copy of the written report submitted by the mid-probationary review committee.

The Chair will forward his/her written summary and the written report from the mid-probationary tenure review committee to the Dean of the college. The Dean will submit these materials for an additional college-level review. The college-level review will be conducted either by the College Tenure Committee or by a special committee composed of faculty appointed by the Dean, which may include administrators appointed by the Dean. Once the review is completed, the Dean and Chair will meet with the candidate undergoing review to discuss the findings. A copy of the written summary of the college level committee's review will be provided to the candidate.

The college dean will review the mid-probationary evaluation for compliance with University policy and procedures.

Excerpt from the 2021 USA Faculty Handbook (3.11.3.2)

Application for Promotion and Tenure (see also Appendix 2)

I. Role of the Faculty Member in the Application Process

The faculty member initiates the application for promotion and tenure, in consultation with the Department Chair, via the submission of an electronic dossier of evidence of professional accomplishment. **This dossier will provide the main source of information to review the candidate's credentials.**

The electronic dossier is compiled via Watermark Faculty Success (formerly known as Digital Measures) software. In addition to the dossier, candidates are required to submit a cover letter. Candidates may also submit a traditional curriculum vitae at their discretion. Candidates will be provided access to a shared Google Drive folder. At the time of submission, candidates will submit their electronic dossier as one pdf document entitled "T&PReport". The cover letter (and CV if the candidate chooses to include it) will be

submitted as one pdf document entitled “Portfolio”.

In the absence of faculty initiative, no consideration of promotion or tenure will occur. A faculty member may elect to withdraw the application at any time during the process by notifying the Department Chair and Dean. However, in the absence of written notification of voluntary withdrawal, the application will be considered at each level in the process. After the first three levels of review (External Reviews, Departmental Committee Review, and Departmental Chair Review), the Department Chair will meet with the candidate and will inform the candidate of the recommendation of promotion, tenure, or both. If a faculty member does not complete the application for **tenure (submission of a completed electronic dossier and portfolio to the Google Drive)** by the stated deadline, a letter of non- reappointment will be issued.

II. Role of the Department Chair in the Faculty Application Process:

It is the responsibility of the Departmental Chair to remind the faculty member in writing when eligibility occurs with sufficient time for the application to be completed. The faculty member must ensure that their application is complete by the assigned deadline. The Department Chair will facilitate and communicate with External Reviewers. After the review by the departmental promotion and tenure committee (where applicable), the Department Chair will review the electronic dossier and all accompanying documents for professional accomplishments in areas of teaching, scholarship, service, and professional collegiality. After the first three levels of review (External Reviews, Departmental Committee Review, and Departmental Chair Review), the Department Chair will meet with the candidate and will inform the candidate of the recommendation of promotion, tenure, or both.

III. Description of the process:

Considering that the evaluation of an individual for promotion or tenure must be as impartial as possible, the review process requires that the candidate’s record be reviewed at the following levels:

1. The Departmental Level

- a) External review (3-5)
- b) Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee
- c) Department Chair

2. The College Level

- d) College Promotion and Tenure Committee
- e) Dean of the College

3. The University Level

- f. Executive Vice President and Provost
- g. President of the University
- h. Board of Trustees

IV. Description of steps in the review process:

A. External Review of Candidates for Tenure

An external review of the candidate's scholarship will be included in all tenure applications. External reviewers must be professionally competent to evaluate the academic credentials of a candidate; thus, reviewers must be external to the university and should normally be at or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered. Exceptions are discouraged, and must be justified in the chair's report. The candidate may submit the name(s) of individuals that could have a conflict of interest in serving as an external reviewer. The list should be accompanied by a description of the potential conflict. External reviewers who have a conflict of interest or the appearance of one or whose objectivity may be questioned may not serve in this role.

Obtaining the reviews will be the responsibility of the Department Chair in accordance with the following procedures:

- The candidate, the Chair of the Departmental Tenure Committee, and tenured faculty of the department each will submit a list of names of external referees who are recognized scholars in the candidate's field of scholarship.
- The Chair of the Departmental Tenure Committee will select name(s) from each of the three lists and will request that the Department Chair contact reviewers. The Department Chair will request that these external reviewers provide a written review of the candidate's scholarship. The candidate will be notified of the names of those selected to serve as referees. The external review will then be included in the candidate's tenure portfolio and will be a component of all levels of the tenure review process.

Excerpt from the 2021 USA Faculty Handbook (3.11.3.4)

The Department Chair will submit the external reviews saved as one pdf file titled "Reviews" in the Google Drive folder.

B. External Review of Candidates for Promotion

An external review of the candidate's scholarship will be included in all applications for Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor. In cases where the candidate is simultaneously under review for tenure, the external review for tenure will suffice for promotion as well. External reviewers must be professionally competent to evaluate the academic credentials of a candidate; thus, reviewers must be external to the university and should normally be at or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered. Exceptions are discouraged, and must be justified in the Chair's report. The candidate may submit the name(s) of individuals that

could have a conflict of interest in serving as an external reviewer. The list should be accompanied by a description of the potential conflict. External reviewers who have a conflict of interest or the appearance of one or whose objectivity may be questioned may not serve in this role.

Obtaining the reviews will be the responsibility of the Department Chair in accordance with the following procedures:

- The candidate, the Chair of the Departmental Promotion Committee, and tenured faculty of the department each will submit a list of names of external referees who are recognized scholars in the candidate's field of scholarship.
- The Chair of the Departmental Promotion Committee will select name(s) from each of the three lists and will request that the Department Chair contact reviewers. The Department Chair will request that these external reviewers provide a written review of the candidate's scholarship. The candidate will be notified of the names of those selected to serve as referees after the tenure and promotion process has been completed. The external review will then be included in the candidate's portfolio and will be a component of all levels of the promotion review process. All reviews received by the deadline must be included in the file.

Excerpt from the 2021 USA Faculty Handbook (3.10.3)

The Department Chair will submit the external reviews saved as one pdf file titled "Reviews" in the Google Drive folder.

C. The Departmental Review

The Department Chair convenes the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee. The committee shall include all tenured faculty and all other faculty holding the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. For **candidates requesting promotion to Professor**, only the members of the committee holding the rank of Professor shall participate in the evaluation of that candidate. **For candidates requesting tenure**, all tenured faculty except for the Department Chair shall participate in the evaluation. The Departmental Review involves several steps:

- i. **Review by the Departmental Committee:** The committee members elect a Chair and deliberate without the Department Chair being present. The committee's recommendation concerning tenure and/or promotion must be supported by a rationale shared in the committee's recommendation and will include the final voting record. **All members must sign the written report.**

The report is added to the Google Drive folder by the committee chair and is saved as the top document of the Reviews document with the external reviews on the subsequent pages of the Reviews document.

- ii. **Department Chair's Review:** The Department Chair has as many as four sources of information for his/her evaluation of the candidate: a) the recommendation letter from the Departmental Committee; b) the information provided by the candidate in his/her dossier; c) documentation from annual faculty evaluations between the Department

Chair and the candidate; and d) evaluation by external reviewers. After reviewing the available information, the Department Chair will “develop a written recommendation for or against tenure/promotion along with a justification for the recommended action. The [Department] chair meets with the candidate and informs the candidate of the recommendations [Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee and Department Chair], giving the candidate a copy of the written recommendation and justification (which should omit the names of external reviewers) and the departmental review notification form giving them one week to submit the form to the Dean (*Faculty Handbook* section 3.10.3 and 3.11.3.4, 2021). The Department Chair will provide a written recommendation to the College Committee summarizing his/her rationale for supporting or not supporting the candidate’s application for tenure and/or promotion.

The Department Chair shares their signed written review in the Google Drive folder as the top document of the Reviews pdf with preceding reviews on the subsequent pages of the pdf titled Reviews.

D. College Level Review

- i. **College Committee Review:** The Dean of the College appoints **five** faculty members holding the rank of tenured Associate Professor or Professor, for the College Promotion and Tenure Committee during the Fall semester and appoints the Committee Chair. For **candidates requesting promotion to Full Professor** only the Full Professor faculty may be appointed to the committee. **For candidates requesting tenure**, only tenured faculty at the same or higher rank shall be appointed to the committee. In the case where there are not a sufficient number of appropriately ranked professors available in the College, the Dean may appoint faculty members from other Colleges.

The College Promotion and Tenure Committee will be convened by the Committee Chair. The committee will be provided access to the candidate’s Google Drive folder. The Google Drive folder will include the electronic dossier, portfolio, and reviews from all previous levels (External reviews, Department Committee, and Department Chair), and a summary of the percentage (FTE) of teaching, scholarly, service and administrative assignment of the candidate during his/her employment at the university. Upon completion of deliberation, the Committee will provide a written recommendation to the Dean stating the rationale for their decision and the final voting record. **All committee members must sign the written report.**

The Committee Chair shares their signed written review in the Google Drive folder as the top document of the Reviews pdf with preceding reviews on the subsequent pages of the pdf titled Reviews.

- ii. **Dean Review:** The Dean of the College will provide a statement and rationale in support or non-support of the candidate’s application for both tenure and/or promotion.

The Dean shares the signed written review in the Google Drive folder as the top document of the Reviews pdf with all previous review documents on the subsequent pages. The Google Drive folder will then be forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost and all materials within will be available for review by the Executive Vice President and Provost.

E. University Level review

- i. Executive Vice President and Provost :** The Executive Vice President and Provost shall review all the previous materials received from the Dean of the College and make a recommendation to the President per general university guidelines in this regard.
- ii. President:** The President shall review the evaluations received from the Executive Vice President and Provost Affairs and make recommendations to the Board of Trustees per general university guidelines.
- iii. Board of Trustees:** Recommendations for promotion and/or tenure are not official until approved by the Board of Trustees.

V. Evaluation Criteria Weighting

- A.** It is recognized that the workload assignments of faculty will vary as a function of individual strengths, professional areas of expertise and as a function of the educational needs of the department. The assignment of faculty Full Time Equivalent (FTE) workload is a negotiated collegial process between the Department Chair, the Dean, and the faculty person. While the assignments may vary as the circumstances and demands of the department change over time, the general emphasis of the workload across teaching, scholarly activity, service, or administration is set forth at the time of employment and specifically allocated annually by the department chair with approval of the Dean.
- B.** Regardless of the effort assignment, promotion to successive ranks and/or tenure in the Pat Capps Covey College of Allied Health Professions is based on the expectation of a demonstrated commitment to excellence in teaching and quality scholarly productivity. Promotion is never automatic, regardless of the number of years of service.
- C.** Evaluation for promotion is based on assessment of scholarship, teaching, and service. The percentage of FTE previously assigned to each of these areas shall be reported in the promotion/tenure dossier and provided at all levels of evaluation.

Summary of Tenure and Promotion Deadline Dates

July/August	Dean's office informs first time eligible candidate and Department Chair of candidacy
September 1	Faculty member initiates application by providing a letter to their Department Chair. Chair then notifies the Dean's office.
Fall Semester	Candidate prepares dossier via Watermark Faculty Success (aka Digital Measures). Note: All materials supplied by the candidate must be submitted via Watermark Faculty Success. The candidate additionally prepares a cover letter.
October 1-15	Deadline for candidate to submit their updated CV for external review to the Department Chair. Departmental T&P Committee convenes. Candidate, Chair of Departmental T&P Committee, tenured faculty, and/or faculty senior in rank to candidate (except Assistant Professors) in the department submit list of names of external referees (see USA faculty handbook Ch. 3, pg. 95). Chair of Department T&P Committee selects referees. Department Chair contacts external reviewers.
October 16- November 1	Department Chair communicates with external referees by this date and provides relevant candidate information (i.e. letter and CV) as well as due date for review (November 15).
November 15- December 1	External reviews received by the Department Chair. Department Chair adds these letters to the portfolio for review at all levels.
December 1	Deadline for the candidate to complete their dossier and submit it to the Google Drive (saved as T&PReport). Deadlines for candidate to complete their cover letter and optional inclusion of traditional curriculum vitae. The cover letter and CV should be saved as one pdf file titled "Portfolio"
December 15	Deadline for the Departmental T&P Committee to submit their report to the Department Chair
December 16 to January 8	Department Chair reviews and develops a written recommendation.

January 8	Deadline for the Department Chair to meet with the candidate and inform the candidate of the recommendation for promotion, tenure, or both. The chair shares with the candidate their written recommendation for or against tenure (which should omit names of external reviewers) and gives the candidate a copy of this written recommendation and justification. Additionally, the Department Chair provides the candidate with the Departmental Review Notification form. See USA Faculty Handbook Ch. 3, pg. 96.
January 15	Deadline for the candidate to include any additional materials supporting their candidacy. Deadline for the candidate to submit the Departmental Review notification form. Department Chair's recommendation and all materials are submitted to the Dean.
By January 20	Dean convenes College Committee
By February 15	College Committee reviews applicant's portfolio and submits written recommendation to the Dean
February 28	Deadline for a candidate for tenure and/or promotion to submit a written request to their Department Chair and Dean withdrawing their application for tenure and/or promotion
By March 1	Dean's review of applicants and preparation of recommendation to Executive Vice President and Provost
June	Candidate informed of outcome Department Chair to notify candidate names of external reviewers
August 15	If promotion is earned the new rank begins on this date

*Note: In the event that any of the dates specified in the timeline fall on a weekend or Holiday, the deadline is the next business day. On the above dates, when access is granted this occurs at 8am and when access is removed this occurs at 5pm. Note that access is granted at 8am on the date above and access is removed at 5pm on the date above.

CAHP Tenure and Promotion Information

Formerly Appendix 2 of CAHP Manual

Dossier

The dossier should be submitted via Watermark Faculty Success (formerly known as Digital Measures) software to include the following information:

Curriculum Vita/Biographical Data

- A) Name
- B) Academic Rank
- C) Dates of Appointment to the University of South Alabama to Current Rank
- D) Educational Credentials
 1. Baccalaureate degree earned, date conferred, granting institution and discipline
 2. Master's degree earned, date conferred, granting institution and discipline
 3. Doctorate degree earned, date conferred, granting institution and discipline
- E) Professional designations/licenses
- F) Other credit-earning higher education courses completed
- G) Other courses attended for professional development, including course title, date completed, organization/institution conducting course

Teaching

A) Teaching Experience

1. Undergraduate and Graduate courses taught at U.S.A.
2. Courses taught (both credit and non-credit) at other institutions indicating title, academic level, and dates
3. Chronology of academic appointment at all institutions of higher learning beginning with current academic appointment

B) Teaching Effectiveness

Use any appropriate indicators applicable to your field such as:

1. Short statement of your teaching philosophy and goals
2. A list of any course syllabi developed by the candidate
3. A list of representative supplementary materials prepared by the candidate
4. Innovative teaching methods
5. A list of audiovisual materials developed by the candidate
6. New courses or new academic programs developed in the past five years
7. Any laboratory experience/experiments devised, revised, or utilized
8. Academic Advising Assignments/Activities
9. Supervision of Independent Research
10. Guest Lecturer Presentations
11. Student Evaluations; graphic summary of teaching evaluations
12. If appropriate, evidence of continued development as a clinical practitioner

Research/Professional Development

1. Publications and manuscripts accepted for publication (upload pdfs).
2. Manuscripts submitted for publication (upload pdfs)
3. Grant and Contract Awards; Grant and Contract Submission
4. Research activities
5. Paper presentations
6. Participation in professional organizations (offices held, sessions chaired, etc.) - indicate national, regional, state, or local organizations and dates of service
7. Activities as professional advisor, consultant, clinician, workshop leaders, editor, etc.
8. Honors and awards earned for professional publications, performances, etc.
9. Participation in short courses, workshops, etc.

Other supporting documentation, (books, photographs, etc.), should not be included with the portfolio, but should be made available if requested by any of the reviewers.

University Service

1. University-level committees, including Faculty Senate
2. College-level and departmental-level committees
3. Extracurricular activities, i.e., student organization advisor, counseling, etc.
4. University-related community services which involves field of expertise, i.e., clinical service, public/community health activities

Procedures/Policy & General Guidelines for Review of Faculty Candidates for Tenure and Promotion

The Faculty Handbook addresses the University Policy for Promotion and Tenure
<https://www.southalabama.edu/departments/academicaffairs/resources/faculty-handbook.pdf>

Reviewers are reminded that the applicant's file is available for the purpose of this review and is otherwise a confidential document that may not be reproduced in any form. The contents of the applicant's file and any other aspect of the review may be discussed only during convened meetings of the committee.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING TENURE

The criteria for tenure include **four** areas of consideration: **scholarship, teaching, service and collegiality**. There must be evidence of respectable strength by national standards in all areas while in service at the University of South Alabama.

The award of tenure demonstrates a belief in a faculty member's future promise and constitutes a long-term investment and commitment to the future career and success of this faculty member. Therefore, the decision to tenure must be based on evidence of sustained past performance in teaching, services, research and collegiality and the potential for continued achievement. The following questions should serve as a guide in reviewing the candidates:

I. SCHOLARSHIP:

1. Is there evidence of a **national** standard of quality?
2. Is there evidence of a **sustained** output of quality?
3. Is there evidence of sufficient **quantity** of output?

Scholarship includes various professional activities pertinent to the advancement of a particular discipline and the generation of new knowledge. The USA Faculty Handbook defines three different forms of scholarship: basic, applied and instructional. Measurements of scholarship include publications, books, reports, grants, presentations, offices held in professional organizations, editorships, participation in study sections for grant evaluation and other significant contributions. The committee members are expected to distinguish between research for scholarly purposes and activities that are essentially service oriented. The evaluation should include an assessment of the quality of the journals in which papers have been published and distinction between refereed and non-refereed journals. Co-authored articles should be evaluated taking into consideration the relative contribution of the candidate. The evaluation of the candidate must also be supported by the opinions of other experts in the field.

II. TEACHING/ADVISING:

Is there evidence of effective teaching and advising including classroom and laboratory performance, academic advising and counseling, availability to students, supervision of students, independent research, course and curriculum development, and guest lectures?

III. SERVICE:

Is there evidence of a commitment to high quality service in committee and other administrative service work at the Department, College and University levels?

IV. COLLEGIALITY:

Is the applicant compatible with colleagues in the Department?

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING PROMOTION

The criteria for **promotion** include three areas: **teaching, scholarship and service**. Promotion constitutes an award/distinction for past accomplishments and performance.

The following questions should serve as a guide in reviewing the candidate. Each question is derived from the criteria and should be defined in accordance with standards appropriate to the discipline/department.

I. SCHOLARSHIP:

In addition to the criteria for scholarship described above, under **criteria for evaluating tenure**, the committee addresses the following questions:

1. Is there evidence of **outstanding** quality based on a nationally accepted standard?
2. Is there evidence of a **sustained** output of quality in accordance with the rank sought?
3. Is there evidence of **sufficient quantity** of output in accordance with the rank sought?

The candidate's publications should be evaluated according to:

- The quality of the journals in which papers have been published
- A distinction between refereed and non-refereed journals
- An evaluation of the candidate's contributions to co-authored articles

II. TEACHING/ADVISING:

Is there evidence of effective teaching and advising, including classroom and laboratory performance, academic advising and counseling, availability to students, supervision of students, independent research, course and curriculum development, and guest lectures?

III. SERVICE:

Is there evidence of a commitment to high quality service in committee and other administrative service work at the Department, College and University levels?

SAMPLE LETTER FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

(Date)

(Address)

Dear Dr. _____:

We are requesting that you serve as an external reviewer for Dr. _____'s application for _____ of _____ at the University of South Alabama. I am enclosing a copy of ***(his/her)*** curriculum vita for your review. Also, if you require additional information, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Although the criteria for _____ include various areas of consideration, we are asking that you review this candidate only in the area of scholarship. Three major questions that are derived from the criteria at the University of South Alabama that should serve as a guide in reviewing the candidate are:

1. Is there evidence of a national standard of quality in scholarship?
2. Is there evidence of a sustained output of quality in scholarship?
3. Is there evidence of sufficient quantity of output in scholarship?

I would appreciate it if you would review Dr. _____'s scholarly record with the three questions posed above serving as a guide. Please send your written recommendation to me in the enclosed stamped, pre-addressed envelope by no later than November 30th _____.

Thank you very much for your willingness to participate in this important process.

Sincerely,

Chair, Tenure and Promotion Committee

Enclosure