

## GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT

Approved by the WGSS Faculty September 12, 2024

Consolidation Language Approved by Dean's Office, April 20, 2020

Revised Document Approved by the CAS Dean's Office & Provost's Office, January 27, 2025

### Table of Contents

Preamble	2
Mission Statement	2
Membership, Voting Rules, & Meetings	2
Administration of WGSS	3
Chair	
Director of Graduate Studies	
Director of Undergraduate Studies	
Committees	5
Graduate Studies	
Undergraduate Studies	
Faculty Evaluation Committee	
Tenure and Promotion Committees	
CAS and University Committee Membership	
Faculty Hiring Procedures	7
Tenure and Promotion	8
Faculty Annual Review	8
Merit Salary Increases	10
Teaching Assignments, Releases, Banking, & Summer	10
Commencement Attendance Policy	11
Conflict Resolution & Grievances	12
Procedures to Amend this Document	12
Appendices	
Appendix A: Tenure and Promotion Criteria	14
Appendix B: Post-Tenure Review Criteria and Guidelines	31
Appendix C: Annual Review Guidelines	40

## Preamble

This document may not contravene the constitutions and laws of the State of Florida; rules, regulations, and policies of the Florida Board of Governors; rules, regulations, and policies of the University of South Florida; and/or any applicable collective bargaining agreement or legislatively-mandated management right. The foregoing authorities will govern in the event that any provision of a local governance document is inconsistent with or in conflict with them. WGSS recognizes the principles of equity of assignment, resources, and opportunities of faculty across a multi-campus university.

## Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies at the University of South Florida is feminist education, research, and practice. We promote social justice by engaging students in the discovery and production of knowledge that emerges from feminist perspectives on culture and society.

- We teach students to use the analytic skills that emerge from engaging the intersections of gender, race, ethnicity, class, sexuality, ability, and nation in order to promote responsible citizenship in a diverse transnational environment.
- We expose limits in traditional higher education caused by excluding women and other marginalized groups and create knowledge that is transformative and inclusive. We aim for knowledge that will better all people's lives, not just the lives of a few.
- We connect our work as academics with the social, political, and economic world outside the university to educate our students about social inequalities that result from sexism, heterosexism and homophobia, racism, classism, able-ism, and ethnocentrism. We link knowledge, research, teaching, and activism.
- We seek to empower students through a feminist critique of social, cultural, and institutional structures that enables them to think more critically about their own lives and that inspires them to work as active citizens for social change.

## Membership, Voting Rules, & Meetings

Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Core Faculty includes all full-time faculty on any USF campus whose appointments are 49% or greater in the Department and who are in continuing appointments. Phased retirement faculty who have appointments of 49% or greater in WGSS and who maintain active participation in the service-life of the department will also have voting privileges. WGSS Core Faculty members on leave, or who are serving in interim, temporary, or short-term administrative positions with the intention to return to the department retain voting rights. Faculty on leave or who have legitimate reasons for missing faculty meetings may vote via email. Retired faculty will not retain voting rights. Visiting, affiliated, and less than 49% jointly appointed faculty members may consult with

and advise the department faculty members, but do not have voting rights. Department decisions will be made by a majority vote. A quorum for conducting department business will be two-thirds of all faculty who would be eligible to cast a vote, present in person or virtually. Votes taken by email should be presumed to have a quorum so long as all faculty eligible to vote are included on the email. Department decisions will be made by majority of those in attendance.

Affiliate Faculty status is open to USF faculty members who are doing feminist / queer / womanist work in their scholarship, teaching, or activism, no matter which campus is their primary campus home. People who wish to be affiliate faculty may ask for this status at any time by submitting a CV and a letter describing their WGSS-related work. The department will also issue a university-wide call for affiliates at least every other year. Affiliate candidates will be reviewed by interested WGSS faculty members; if there is an objection to an applicant, that potential affiliate will be reviewed and voted on by the WGSS Core faculty. Decisions will be made based on a majority vote.

The department will typically meet once a month during the school year. If there are no significant action items that require discussion, department meetings may be held as “e-meetings” via email, with an understanding that such meetings will usually not comprise more than a third of department meetings. When faculty members cannot attend in person, meetings may be held virtually by videoconference; individual faculty members may opt to attend a faculty meeting virtually if the meeting is not held on their home campus and/or the faculty member has a compelling reason they cannot attend in person. Otherwise, faculty members are expected to attend in person. A schedule of all regular department meetings for a given semester will be distributed early in the semester; other meetings may be called as needed, and email notification of all meetings will be provided with at least 48-hours’ notice. Department meeting minutes will be made available to all faculty members via a shared online folder.

## Administration of WGSS

### Chair

**Selection.** When there is an impending or existing vacancy, all Associate and Full Professors, instructional or tenured, will be eligible to self-nominate for the position. Nominees will make presentations to the faculty regarding department leadership or vision. The faculty will vote by secret ballot and the results of that vote will be forwarded to the College Dean, who may appoint the department’s choice or direct the department to make a new choice.

**Term.** The Chair will typically serve for a four-year term that will be renewable, pending the approval of the faculty and the College Dean.

**Duties.** The Chair is the chief administrative and academic officer of the department and is responsible for maintaining the policies of the department, the college, and the university. The Chair is also the primary link between the department and other academic and administrative units on campus, and will serve as the representative of the faculty, staff,

and students of WGSS to the university. While the Chair has primary and final responsibility for all internal activities, the Chair should adhere to votes of the faculty except under the most unusual circumstances, and must explain to the faculty any decisions that contradict faculty votes.

The faculty will review the Chair once a year via a questionnaire distributed by the CAS Associate Dean of Faculty, and an ad hoc committee will summarize that report for inclusion in Archivum, or the university portal/platform in use for that purpose. The faculty may request that the College Dean remove the Chair for cause if 60% of faculty agree.

Chief duties of the Chair include:

- Managing and maintaining the department budget in consultation with the faculty, including resource allocation;
- Overseeing faculty teaching assignments;
- Making office assignments and overseeing space maintenance issues;
- Evaluating faculty annually, including working with the faculty to establish models for assigning merit increments to pay raises;
- Coordinating tenure and promotion reviews, including contacting external reviewers and (if needed) arranging for ad hoc promotion committees;
- Encouraging faculty research and teaching, including mentoring junior faculty and/or assigning mentors, and creating opportunities for funded research and teaching improvements;
- Attending College and Provost-level Council of Chairs meetings and keeping the faculty apprised of important developments;
- Handling student grievances in conjunction with the Directors of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies, following approved college guidelines for such grievance petitions;
- Supporting feminist scholarship on campus to the extent that resources allow;
- Building networks within and outside the university, including among: affiliated faculty and other departments at USF; other Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies faculty across the country; local Tampa Bay community groups and other external stakeholders;
- Approving all publications that emanate in the name of the Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies department;
- Working with development officers to encourage financial support of the department and college.

### **Director of Graduate Studies**

Appointment and term. The Director of Graduate Studies is appointed for a four-year, renewable term by the Department Chair in consultation with the faculty.

Duties. The Director of Graduate Studies is the chief administrator of the Graduate program and the Graduate Certificate whose duties include:

- Overseeing all graduate recruiting;
- Advising all first-year M.A. students and second-year students who have not chosen a thesis-director, internship supervisor, or portfolio advisor;
- Providing orientation each semester as relevant to all new graduate students;
- Meeting with all graduate students each semester to discuss progress toward graduation;
- Working with the Chair on teaching assistant assignments;
- Working with faculty to mentor new teaching assistants;
- Coordinating graduate SACS assessments annually;
- Collaborating activities with the Graduate Program Coordinator;
- Maintaining the Graduate Program Handbook;
- Submitting new graduate courses to the CAS Graduate committee.

### **Director of Undergraduate Studies**

Appointment and term. The Director of Undergraduate Studies is appointed for a four-year, renewable term by the Department Chair in consultation with the faculty.

Duties. The Director of Undergraduate Studies is the chief administrator of the undergraduate program whose duties include:

- Proofing of catalog copy;
- Submitting new undergraduate courses to the CAS UG curriculum committee, and attending CAS UG Committee meetings when our proposals are being considered, if needed;
- Working with the Chair and faculty to monitor the major and make sure the curriculum is current and meeting the students' needs;
- Working with the Chair on overseeing undergraduate SACS assessment;
- Participating in recruiting majors;
- Acting as liaison with University Honors;
- Meeting with other undergraduate directors when our curriculum interfaces with another department's or program's curriculum (e.g., a new minor or certificate that might include our department or be housed in our department).
- Offering a series of student-success and student-engagement workshops and events.

### **Committees**

Until the WGSS Core faculty reaches 10 active continuing members, the department will operate as a committee of the whole, and the business of those committees will take place at regular faculty meetings. The WGSS Core faculty may decide, on a year-by-year basis, to operate as a committee of the whole, although the chair will not participate. Visiting, adjunct, and retired faculty members are not eligible to serve on the committee of the whole. A

continuing faculty member whose appointment is 49% or greater in the department and who is on 100% sabbatical or on leave that isn't disciplinary may choose to serve on the committee of the whole but is not required to. When the faculty reaches 10 active members, we will revisit this document and decide, by a majority vote, whether and how to constitute membership in these committees. Until that time, the faculty as a whole may decide to create ad hoc special subcommittees to work on specific projects.

In general, the Faculty Evaluation Committee will operate as a committee of the whole (excluding the department chair) until such time as the faculty votes to alter this process. The FEC will include at least one tenured faculty member and at least one instructional faculty member at the rank of associate or full. Faculty members will not review their own evaluations.

Tenure-line Tenure and Promotion Committees will be formed on an ad hoc basis for mid-tenure review, tenure and promotion, and promotion. Department mid-tenure, tenure and promotion, and promotion committees will include all tenured faculty when considering tenure and promotion to the Associate Professor rank and will include all tenured Full Professors when considering promotion to Full Professor. Until there are more than five active tenure-line faculty members at any given rank among tenure-line faculty, tenure-line committees will consist of all tenure-line faculty at a given rank. When the department exceeds five faculty in rank, this document will be revised.

Instructional Faculty Promotion Committees will be formed on an ad hoc basis and will include all faculty at the rank of Associate or Full Professor of Instruction when considering promotion to Associate Professor of Instruction, and will include all faculty at the rank of Full Professor of Instruction when considering promotion to Full Professor of Instruction. If there are not enough WGSS instructional faculty members of appropriate rank to form a committee, such committees will include WGSS tenured faculty members at the appropriate rank. Until there are more than five active instructional faculty members at any given rank among the instructional faculty, instructional faculty committees will consist of all faculty at a given rank. When the department exceeds five faculty in rank, this document will be revised.

In all cases, such committees should include at least three faculty members; if there are not enough WGSS Core faculty of appropriate rank to form a committee, such committees will include members of the Affiliate Faculty sufficient to constitute a viable committee. The College Dean makes the decision about which Affiliate Faculty members to include in this committee, in consultation with the Department Chair, who will work to ensure that the candidate's disciplinary background is fairly represented to the Dean.

CAS and University Committee Membership will be by volunteer, with an understanding that typically members of the department will offer to serve on one CAS committee / year (though they may not be selected by CAS).

The WGSS department will hold elections whenever the Faculty Senate seat for the department is vacant; the result will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Office.

## Faculty Hiring Procedures

Each year, the members of the department will discuss priorities for new and visiting faculty lines and the Department Chair will present those priorities to the College Dean. In the event that the College Dean authorizes a search, the Chair will form a search committee to be made up of at least three full-time or jointly appointed faculty members and at least one graduate or undergraduate student; affiliated faculty may be asked to serve in addition to the formally appointed members of the department. The committee will determine who should chair the search committee; the Department Chair may serve on a search committee, if necessary, but, as the hiring authority, the Department Chair cannot serve as chair of the search. Regional Chancellors or their designee will serve as a voting member on all search committees for faculty hiring on branch campuses.

The Search Committee will meet to:

- Write the job description; and
- Develop the search plan in accordance with CAS rules and recommendations about conducting searches.

The Search Committee should circulate the job description to the faculty and revise based on their input, if the revisions seem appropriate.

The Search Committee will be responsible for reviewing application materials and constructing a short-list of candidates to interview via phone, video conference, or at a conference venue. Once the committee has formed a short list, it should make the application materials of the candidates on that list available for review by all the faculty in the department. Faculty members may review those materials, make suggestions of questions for the first round of interviews, and raise concerns about the make-up of the short list. The Search Committee should carefully consider any concerns raised by the faculty.

After the candidates on the short list have been interviewed, the Search Committee will make recommendations to the Department Chair on a smaller group of candidates to be invited for the next level of remote or campus interviews. The Department Chair will determine how to manage the number of campus visits based on budget and timing. The Chair of the Search Committee will work with the office administrator to schedule and arrange this next level of remote or campus interviews. This level of remote or campus interview should include at least one public presentation and should afford all members of the department with a chance to interact with the candidate.

After the campus visits, the Search Committee will hold a meeting open to the faculty to discuss candidates and the WGSS Core faculty should vote (according to College and University rules) on candidates and should rank candidates based on those votes. Only continuing Core Faculty who have met with all candidates and participated in departmental discussions are eligible to vote. Voting eligibility minimally will include having attended at least one formal presentation on the itinerary of every candidate invited to interview past the preliminary round during a particular search. The student and affiliated faculty member(s) of the committee may advise the department but do not formally vote. The Department Chair will present the list of ranked candidates in a hiring proposal to the College Dean and negotiate with candidate(s) on the final offer.

## Tenure and Promotion

Tenure and Promotion Guidelines are set out in Appendix A. For all faculty evaluations—annual reviews, tenure, and promotion—spouses and partners must be recused per university regulations.

## Faculty Annual Review

Once a year, faculty members will meet with the Department Chair to determine their goals for the year and to agree on their percentages for workload and effort assignments. Faculty will also upload their annual reports into the university-designated review system for evaluation; faculty may upload supplemental materials to the system or provide them directly to the Department Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Annual reports should include narratives describing teaching, research, and service; copies of student teaching evaluations; and copies of publications. Annual report packets may also include other evidence of teaching effectiveness, innovation, and improvement as well as copies of scholarly work in progress. Tenure-line faculty who want to have work in progress count toward their annual research productivity should plan to submit that work. Specific guidelines for annual reviews are set out in Appendix B.

Evaluations will be based on material included in the annual report materials and will be entered into the university-designated review system. Faculty will be reviewed, typically, on their teaching, research, and service; in some cases, faculty may have other responsibilities that should be evaluated (such as administration), but these will be stated in their annual workload and effort statements. Evaluation packets supporting the annual report may include (but is not limited to):

- Teaching Evidence
  - Material prepared for courses, including syllabi, reading lists, online presentations, etc.;
  - Reports on class observations and/or peer evaluations, when appropriate;
  - Student evaluations;



- Documents showing the development of new courses and/or the adoption of new teaching methods, technologies, or techniques;
- Lists of graduate student committees (specifying whether MA or PhD, whether director or member), lists of undergraduate Honors Thesis committees (specifying director or member); and any directed research, readings, or internships;
- Other evidence demonstrating teaching in non-traditional formats or situations.
- Research Evidence
  - Research, creative, and scholarly publications that appear during the year;
  - Letters of acceptance for publications that are forthcoming;
  - Manuscripts of long-term, ongoing projects or manuscripts that have been submitted;
  - Grants and contracts accepted and awarded;
  - Grants and contracts solicited and/or submitted, whether in process or unfunded;
  - Papers, symposia, posters, presentations, or performances at professional meetings/colloquia, including invited addresses;
  - Other work representing scholarly effort, including reports, op-ed articles, and documents related to community engagement.
- Service Evidence
  - Listings of any professional service and/or department-related community service organizations on which the faculty member has served;
  - Any evidence from those organizations indicating the level of service;
  - A list of committees on which the faculty member has served;
  - Documents from those committees that represent extraordinary service effort.

The Chair is responsible for review of the faculty by a deadline set by the College of Arts and Sciences and/or Academic Affairs. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will write a separate evaluation that will also be uploaded into the university-designated review system. Faculty members who find any part of their evaluations unacceptable should contact both the Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee, and ask for a reevaluation. Faculty members may provide additional materials to supplement the evaluation if it seems that something was overlooked in the original evaluation. The Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee should come to a consensus regarding the reevaluation; should that prove impossible, both the Chair and the committee will forward a written report to the Associate Dean for Faculty stating their positions concerning the evaluation. The College Dean will therefore have final say. “Regional Chancellors or their designee will provide formal written input prior to a College Dean or Vice President completing the performance appraisal” for faculty on the St. Petersburg or Sarasota/Manatee campuses.

## Merit Salary Increases

Merit salary increases are often determined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and will be subject to the terms laid out in the CBA; special merit raises are sometimes determined by the College of Arts and Sciences. As a set of general principles, however, if the Chair is asked to determine merit raises, the department holds that

- salary increases should endeavor to keep all members of the department who have been maintaining “Strong” and “Outstanding” performance above or as near to the average salary at our peer institutions + 10% as possible;
- and that we value pay equity among faculty members with equivalent rank and seniority.

We also subscribe to the spirit of the five-year rule to offset the vagaries of lean-year/fat-year salary increase distributions. Merit increases should be retrospective to the extent that they ensure that one colleague is not punished for having a particularly productive year when there are no or very small raises, while a similarly productive colleague is rewarded generously for happening to have had a good year in a year when raise pools are large. It is the intent of this statement of principle that faculty evaluations for merit raises reflect this concern for parity over the long term. Further, we recognize that publication of a major work may have been preceded by several years during which it appears that the scholar is relatively unproductive; a major publication therefore will carry with it at least four years of credit on annual evaluations of research. (This provision is for the purposes of assigning merit increases only; tenure-earning faculty members are expected to maintain a sustained record of scholarship during their tenure-earning years, and not rely on one large project that appears near the end of the probationary period.) During the years that a major work is underway, faculty members should submit work in progress to demonstrate that progress. Finally, while College doctrine holds that the Chair is responsible for the awarding of merit raises, the Chair should work with the faculty to establish criteria for those awards.

## Teaching, Research, & Service Assignments, Releases, Banking, and Summer

Tenured and tenure-track faculty in Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies will typically be assigned to teach five courses or the equivalent per year; instructional faculty will typically be assigned to teach eight courses or the equivalent per year. Teaching releases may be established for research time, departmental administration, professional or curriculum development, or other work agreed on by the faculty member and the Department Chair; certain teaching responsibilities may be understood to count as more than one “course.” Faculty workloads will be determined during the annual consultation between the Chair and the faculty member about faculty assignments and the Chair and the department as a whole will work toward a principle of equity of assignment, resources, and opportunities for all

faculty, irrespective of home campus. All teaching releases are subject to the terms of contracts and to the approval by the College Dean's office.

The Chair is responsible for scheduling faculty courses and for making course assignments; as a principle, the Chair should endeavor to make those assignments equitable across categories of faculty (i.e., instructional faculty should have assignments that are roughly equal to other instructional faculty, and tenure-line faculty should have loads that are roughly equivalent). The Chair should also, within the constraints of university rules about scheduling, attempt to accommodate faculty members' preferences for teaching schedules. Faculty members are responsible for bearing their fair share of the burden of service courses and less-than-ideal teaching slots.

Faculty members may, subject to the needs of the department and the terms of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, "bank" courses: that is, teach an overload for one or more semesters to save up (a) teaching release(s) for future semesters. (There is no back-pay for faculty who leave the university before they use the releases.) This should be done with the approval of the Department Chair.

Summer teaching is determined by student need, by the teaching budget for the summer session, and the student credit hour targets determined by the College of Arts and Sciences. Within the limitations of those constraints, however, the department values spreading the opportunity for extra summer remuneration as widely across the faculty as possible, so faculty members who have not taught in the past two summers have priority in the assignment of summer classes, so long as they are willing to teach a class with historically high demand and so long as the summer budget can accommodate their salaries. If there are not enough courses and/or budget to accommodate all faculty requests for summer teaching, decisions on who will teach will be made based on the following criteria (in order): considerations of constraints (demand, budget, SCH targets); ability to teach high-demand courses; and who has not taught most recently. Graduate Assistants will be assigned to summer duties based on a combination of seniority and quality of faculty evaluations of the quality of their assistant duties during the school year.

## **Commencement Attendance Policy**

While we recognize that we are a small faculty on whom regular attendance at graduation ceremonies can place a relatively high burden, we also recognize the importance of the achievement to many of our students. Therefore, the Department should have a representative at one graduation ceremony per term (May, August, and December). The Chair will represent the Department at least once per year at commencement ceremonies. Attendance should rotate through the faculty for ceremonies at which the Chair cannot be present, and for which there is not a volunteer.

## **Conflict Resolution and Grievances**

All members of the department are expected to comply with USF policies and procedures, therefore all grievance procedures function within the context of College, University, and USF-UFF procedures. Faculty members who feel they have a grievance case should consult the appropriate handbook and guidelines.

Following the CAS procedure for grievances, students with grievances against instructors should first attempt to work out their disagreement with the instructor. If that proves impossible or unproductive, students should, in accordance with the CAS procedure, bring their cases to the Chair, who will also consult the faculty member involved. If neither the faculty member nor the Chair can resolve the student's grievance, then the student will be directed to CAS-GUS to follow College and University grievance procedures. All members of the department are expected to maintain professional behavior and should seek to resolve conflicts before they become disruptive to the department's functioning. In the event of a conflict between faculty members, between faculty members and graduate assistants, or between graduate assistants that rises to the level of disruption of the workplace, the Chair (or the Director of Graduate Studies, in the case of graduate assistants) will try to mediate the conflict and/or refer the parties involved to appropriate university conflict-resolution resources. Conflicts between a faculty member and the Chair that cannot be resolved through discussion may be referred to the College Dean for mediation. All conflicts that disrupt the workplace are subject to the policies outlined in the faculty handbook and by the Human Resources department.

## **Procedures to Amend this Document**

This document must be thoroughly reevaluated at least once every five years and/or when the number of active voting faculty reaches 10. It should be subject to annual review at the beginning of each academic year. Faculty members who wish to revise, add, or delete a provision should draft a proposal and bring it to the faculty in September for discussion. If a change is approved by 60% of the faculty, this document may be amended. Any amendments must be approved by the CAS Dean's Office.

This document was approved by the WGS faculty on October 14, 2015 by a vote of 7-0 on a secret ballot.

This document was revised in Spring 2020 and approved on May 4, 2020 by a vote of 7-0. Minor consolidation language was added per requirement of the Provost's Office June 19, 2020.

This document was revised in Spring and Summer 2024 and approved on September 12, 2024, by a unanimous vote to reflect the Department's name change to Women's, Gender, and

Sexuality Studies in 2023, to make minor revisions to search committee voting procedure, and to update the language referring to and the promotion process for Instructional Line Faculty.

This document was approved by the College of Arts and Sciences Dean's Office on: March 21, 2018.

The revised consolidation language was approved by the College of Arts and Sciences Dean's Office on: April 20, 2020.

This revised document was approved by the College of Arts and Sciences Dean's Office on: January 27, 2025 and by the Provost's Office on January 27, 2025.

This document will be formally reviewed every five years (on years ending in 0 or 5). It may be revised at any time if a majority of full-time faculty members vote to revise it.

**Appendix A: Tenure and Promotion Criteria**

# USF Department of Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion Guidelines

September 2024

The guidelines articulated in this document do not supersede The State University System guidelines on tenure, the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the University of South Florida’s Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion, the CAS Procedures for Mid-Tenure Review and for Tenure and Promotion, or the guidelines for promotion for instructional faculty (all of which may be found on the USF Provost’s or CAS websites). The provisions in this document are compatible with those university- and college-wide guidelines and adapt them to support and reward the interdisciplinary work of Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies as articulated in *Women’s Studies Scholarship: A Statement by the National Women’s Studies Association Field Leadership Working Group*.<sup>1</sup> The goal of these guidelines is to build on USF and SUS guidelines and to clarify what our discipline values in teaching, research, and service. These guidelines should be reviewed on a regular basis by the department faculty to ensure their continued relevance and applicability.

The Department of Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies recognizes the principles of equity of assignment, resources, and opportunities of faculty across a multi-campus university.

In general, the following guidelines aim to support the NWSA Working Group’s assertion that we should “widen the scope” of “what ‘counts’ as models of research teaching and service” (*WSS* 2013, p. 9).

## Mission of the Department

The mission of the Department of Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies at the University of South Florida is feminist education, research, and practice. We promote social justice by engaging students in the discovery and production of knowledge that emerges from feminist perspectives on culture and society.

- We teach students to use the analytic skills that emerge from engaging the intersections of gender, race, ethnicity, class, sexuality, ability, and nation in order to promote responsible citizenship in a diverse transnational environment.

---

<sup>1</sup> Dill, Bonnie Thornton, Vivian M. May, et. al. NWSA, 2013. Hereafter cited in the text as *WSS* 2013.

- We expose limits in traditional higher education caused by excluding women and other marginalized groups and create knowledge that is transformative and inclusive. We aim for knowledge that will better all people's lives, not just the lives of a few.
- We connect our work as academics with the social, political, and economic world outside the university to educate our students about social inequalities that result from sexism, heterosexism and homophobia, racism, classism, ableism, and ethnocentrism. We link knowledge, research, teaching, and activism.
- We seek to empower students through a feminist critique of social, cultural, and institutional structures that enables them to think more critically about their own lives and that inspires them to work as active citizens for social change.

## **Instructional Faculty Promotion Procedures**

### **Required Materials**

Materials required to be included in the application for promotion are set by USF and CAS. The department will only consider promotion applications that are complete by the standards and deadlines set by USF and CAS.

### **Committee Formation**

For the purposes of promotion, "WGSS core faculty" will include continuing tenure-line and instructional-line faculty with appointments of 49% or greater in the Department of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies. Emeritus and affiliated faculty will only be considered "faculty" in the circumstances outlined below. Faculty on sabbatical are not required to take part in tenure and promotion reviews but are allowed (and encouraged) to do so.

Department instructional faculty promotion committees will be formed on an ad hoc basis to include all faculty at the rank of Associate or Full Professor of Instruction when considering promotion to Associate Professor of Instruction and to include all faculty at the rank of Professor of Instruction when considering promotion to Professor of Instruction, with the exception that instructional faculty on leave are encouraged but not required to serve on promotion committees. In all cases, instructional promotion committees should include at least three instructional faculty members. If there are not enough WGSS instructional faculty members of appropriate rank to form a committee, such committees will include WGSS tenured faculty members at the appropriate rank. Members of the



Affiliate Faculty may serve to constitute a viable committee, if and only if a viable committee cannot be composed of WGSS faculty. The Dean of CAS makes the decision about which Affiliate Faculty members to include in this committee, in consultation with the Department Chair; the Chair will, during this consultation, ensure that the candidate's disciplinary background is fairly represented to the Dean. The Instructional Faculty Promotion Committee will consider applications and will make recommendations to the Department Chair and College Dean; the Department Chair will make a separate recommendation to the College Dean.

One member of the committee will serve as chair of the committee for purposes of setting committee deadlines, drafting the committee evaluation, and otherwise assuring that the required USF and CAS timelines and procedures are followed.

## **Votes and Recommendations**

The instructional faculty promotion committee members will review the candidate promotion application materials prior to meeting to discuss the application materials. At that meeting a majority vote will decide whether the committee recommends the candidate for promotion or not, and this vote will be recorded in the application. The chair of the committee will draft a committee evaluation of the candidate, to be later approved by the committee and included in the file. The Chair will make a separate recommendation and will write a separate evaluation. All recommendations will be available to candidates in their files.

## **Overall Expectations**

With regard to Promotion to Associate Professor of Instruction or Associate Instructor, the department promotion process aligns with the USF Guidelines for Instructional Faculty Promotion in place at the time the promotion application, including relevant sections regarding minimal expectations and weighting of assigned duties. The relevant language at the time of approval of this governance document is as follows (emphasis added): Instructional faculty will be considered for promotion on the basis of meritorious performance in their teaching assignments. If the applicant has multiple areas of assignment, non-teaching assignments may be considered as contributing to the overall merit of the case for promotion (e.g. service or publications that address instructional concerns) but accomplishments in teaching assignments must serve as the major focus of the promotion determination.

Evidence and examples of instruction and instructional-related effort that may be part of the promotion package include but are not limited to the following: classroom teaching effectiveness; curriculum development effort, student mentoring and advising; supervision of student research/scholarship/creative activity; internship, service-learning, community-engagement, and/or fieldwork; study abroad teaching; chairing and/or serving on honors thesis committees; professional development training or leadership roles; active student organization advising; awards and recognition related to instruction; programming or other involvement with Housing & Residential Education, the Office of Multicultural Affairs, or other USF offices and departments; campus, community, and/or conference presentations; additional training or education related to pedagogy or substantive fields of teaching specialty.

With regard to Promotion to Professor of Instruction or Senior Instructor, the department promotion process aligns with the USF Guidelines for Instructional Faculty Promotion in place at the time the promotion application, including relevant sections regarding minimal expectations and weighting of assigned duties. The relevant language at the time of approval of this governance document is as follows (emphasis added): Instructional faculty will be considered for promotion on the basis of meritorious performance in their teaching assignments. In assigning ratings for candidates for Professor of Instruction or Senior Instructor, evaluating units should assess whether the individual has demonstrated continuous professional development and has achieved significant accomplishments in their teaching assignments at the Associate Professor of Instruction or Associate Instructor review, based on criteria established by the college/department/unit. Promotion to Professor of Instruction or Senior Instructor should also consider such secondary factors as service, leadership and contribution to scholarship, community engagement, or institutional success and acclaim that contribute to the instructional mission of the university.

Examples of secondary factors that may count include but are not limited to teaching honors, awards, and accolades; advanced training in instruction, course design, and pedagogy; additional or advanced training in the substantive fields in which the candidate teaches; conference and workshop presentations related to the scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL) and/or the disciplinary areas in which the candidate teaches; evidence of community-connected engagement beyond or outside of direct instructional effort; service to the discipline(s); publications, especially in the area of SOTL; receiving professional development leave, grants, or other forms of support connected to SOTL.

For promotion to Associate Professor of Instruction and to Professor of Instruction, excellent demonstrated effort and results in teaching and instructional effort is paramount, with demonstrations of strong effort and results in service and research/scholarship/creative activity if relevant and to the degree proportionate to individual candidate assignment.

The decision to apply for early promotion is not one that should be made lightly. Candidates considering applying for early promotion from Assistant Professor of Instruction or Assistant Instructor must be exceptional candidates able to demonstrate “truly outstanding” achievement across all elements of their assignments during each evaluation period (that is, ratings of excellent in every category during every evaluation period) and will be evaluated according to the standards set forth by USF and CAS for candidates to Associate Professor of Instruction or Senior Instruction.

Candidates considering applying for early promotion to Professor of Instruction or Senior Instructor must be exceptional candidates able to demonstrate “outstanding” achievement across all elements of their assignments during each evaluation period (that is, ratings of excellent in every category during every evaluation period) and will be evaluated according to the standards set forth by USF and CAS for candidates to Professor of Instruction or Senior Instruction with special emphasis placed on continuous professional development and secondary factors described above at a faster than anticipated pace or at higher levels of achievement.

## I. Teaching

Excellent effort and results in teaching are expected for all candidates for promotion.

As a department, we take great pride in our teaching and value both quality and innovation. We recognize, however, that “given the field’s overtly political approach to knowledge and power, Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies scholars often face resistance in the classroom.... For example, teaching evaluations may reflect students’ discomfort with challenges to their preexisting modes of thinking about the world around them, especially if the candidate teaches required courses” (WSS 2013, p. 9). We therefore agree with both the NWSA Working Group’s and USF’s recommendations that we should employ not just student evaluations but alternative evaluations of teaching.

To achieve excellence in teaching, the following areas are relevant:

- **Innovation and curricular currency:**
  - Candidates should demonstrate the ability to teach several different courses successfully and to different student populations (for example, to both majors and non-majors and/or to lower-level and upper-level students) in different

modalities and class sizes (as dictated by candidate assignments) within both their substantive areas and the core curriculum.

- Candidates should demonstrate course design and teaching that is in alignment with current trends in their fields.
- Candidates should demonstrate how they incorporated student and peer critiques to further their pedagogies and curricula.
- Candidates should contribute to curricular development and course redesign.
- Candidates should demonstrate relevance of courses to department, college, and university missions and strategic plans.
- **Effective teaching:**
  - Candidates should provide evidence of student learning, effective course management, and quality of instruction through a number of means that should include, inter alia, reports of student course evaluations for all relevant time periods. WGSS recognizes research/scholarship/creative activity indicating that course evaluations are often biased against women faculty, faculty of color, and faculty who challenge the ideological status quo and recognizes that online evaluation system may yield low returns; therefore, student course evaluations need not be the sole measure of teaching excellence. Providing evidence of effective teaching in addition to student evaluations is encouraged, and other relevant materials will also be considered, if submitted as part of the evaluative process, including but not limited to peer evaluations, teaching portfolios, and faculty reflections.
- **Successful mentoring and/or advising of students**
  - Candidates should demonstrate successful mentoring and/or advising of students -- e.g., advising on career and/or further graduate study, supervising internships, directing individual study, supervising Honors theses), and/or mentoring graduate student teaching assistants.

Candidates should, in consultation with the Department Chair and/or a faculty mentor(s), craft teaching narratives and compile evidence of teaching excellence that outline how they have met department expectations. We invite candidates to provide, and expect committees to consider, evidence of teaching effectiveness that may include: peer teaching observations and evaluations (noting that peer observations should comply with the CBA and with department guidelines for teaching observations); new course design; adaptation and revision of existing courses, including incorporation of new technologies or pedagogies; syllabi, assessments, and other instructional materials; evidence from courses of teaching effectiveness (including student performance on pre- and post-instruction measures);

evidence of teaching improvement and professional development activities; exemplary student work; evidence of advising and mentoring; and Honors- and MA-thesis or internship mentoring and committee membership.

While the majority of WGSS teaching evaluation will be based on classroom, mentoring or online experiences, we also affirm the value of service-learning and alternative learning formats, and recognize here the importance of alternative teaching venues: supervision and mentoring of teaching assistants; learning communities, panels, workshops, community organizations, and study-abroad. We value and recognize team-teaching and understand that in interdisciplinary teaching, collaboration may be more valuable to students, but also more challenging for faculty members. The NWSA has asserted that community engagement and activism can and should be acknowledged as both teaching and research/scholarship/creative activity.

## **II. Other Instructional Effort**

While most instructional-related work will fall into the teaching assignment, at times some effort may be allocated to other instructional effort in some situations – e.g., unusual or unique opportunities or needs, special focus for improvement of teaching, et cetera. The department considers other instructional effort assignments to be intricately connected to teaching and any such work in this area must be rated excellent for promotion purposes.

## **III. Service**

WGSS, because of our small size and our collaborative governance model, expects that service will include active and cooperative participation in department meetings and in departmental committees but sets a goal of not overburdening faculty with service requirements. We recognize the interdisciplinary nature of our department and value contributions to the larger University community, including college- and university-level committees. We recognize service to the profession, including active service to professional organizations. We recognize feminist, queer, and related work in the community as contributing to our larger departmental mission. We expect all candidates for promotion to demonstrate sustained service within the department, the university, and the profession to the degree of their assigned duties and to be rated strong in such duties.

## **IV. Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity**

While instructional faculty do not usually take on research/scholarship/creative activity as part of their assignment, in some cases specific and unique research/scholarship/creative

activity related to SOTL and/or to the substantive fields in which the candidate teaches may be warranted. When such cases exist, candidates should demonstrate a rating of strong in such assigned duties.

## VI. Effort Beyond Assigned Duties & Additional Guidance

The department recognizes that instructional faculty often do work beyond or outside of their assigned duties. Candidates may include evidence of such effort and the evaluation committee may consider it only to the extent that it is connected to or supportive of the assigned duties of the candidate.

By way of guidance for candidates: For promotion and tenure purposes, USF defines service as contributing to the university, the professional field or discipline, or the public, but requires that such service relate to the mission of the university to be considered for promotion rather than being the sort of service that individuals perform as private citizens. USF also distinguishes service from the work undertaken as part of scholarly or pedagogical community-engagement and urges candidates to “count” that work as either teaching or research/scholarship/creative activity. The department recommends that all instructional faculty work closely with the department chair to connect and include such activities under the teaching and other instructional effort categories to the degree possible.

## Tenure-Line Faculty Tenure and Promotion Procedures

### Required and Recommended Materials

- **Required:** Tenure application with annual evaluations in the university designated review system, course evaluations in the university-designated review system, mid-tenure evaluations at all levels.
- **Recommended:** Faculty narratives should concisely provide a rationale for understanding the candidate’s teaching and research trajectory and the coherence of their scholarly and pedagogical project(s); the narrative should strive to present the candidate’s work in language that would be understandable to non-specialist academics, should highlight major achievements, and should provide a context for the quality of publications and teaching endeavors. The narrative should explain any gaps, anomalies, or apparent irregularities, but should not serve as an apology. Supplementary materials should include copies of publications, letters of acceptance/contracts for publication, syllabi and other relevant teaching documentation, including peer evaluations.

## External Evaluators

Candidates will work with the Chair to develop the list of external evaluators, following CAS procedures. Candidates should strive to recommend evaluators who understand the nature of research institutions and the place of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies within such institutions. Candidates and Chairs should attempt to include evaluators from universities that could be considered USF's peers or aspirational peers.

## Committee Formation

For the purposes of tenure and promotion, "WGSS faculty" will include tenure-line faculty with appointments of 49% or greater in the Department of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies. Emeritus and affiliated faculty will only be considered "faculty" in the circumstances outlined below. Faculty on sabbatical are not required to take part in tenure and promotion reviews but are allowed (and encouraged) to do so.

WGSS will follow all procedures as outlined by the College and University. Department promotion and tenure committees will include all tenured faculty when considering tenure and promotion to the Associate Professor rank and will include all Professors when considering promotion to Professor. In all cases, such committees should include at least three faculty members; if there are not enough WGSS faculty of appropriate rank to form a committee, such committees will include members of the Affiliate Faculty sufficient to constitute a viable and legal committee. The Dean of CAS makes the decision about which Affiliate Faculty members to include in this committee, in consultation with the Department Chair; the Chair will, during this consultation, ensure that the candidate's disciplinary background is fairly represented to the Dean. Until there are more than five faculty members at any given rank, committees will consist of all faculty at a given rank. When the department exceeds five faculty in rank, this document will be revised. Mid-tenure review is similar to tenure review except that external evaluator letters are not required.

## Votes and Recommendations

The T&P committee will vote on tenure and promotion recommendations at a meeting and will write a committee evaluation of the candidate; the vote will be recorded in the candidate's applications. The Chair will make a separate recommendation and will write a separate evaluation. All recommendations will be available to candidates in their files.

Regional Chancellors will provide a formal review in promotion and tenure cases for faculty members on branch campuses prior to a College Dean completing and forwarding a recommendation to the Provost (see USF Consolidation Handbook).

## Overall Expectations

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, demonstrated excellence in teaching and research as well as a record of sustained service are expected for tenure and promotion. For promotion to Professor, demonstrated excellence in teaching and research as well as a record of substantial service and leadership are expected. Below, we articulate what “excellence” in means to the department and to our understanding of the discipline.

### I. Teaching

Excellence in teaching is expected for all candidates for tenure and/or promotion.

As a department, we take great pride in our teaching and value both quality and innovation. We recognize, however, that “given the field’s overtly political approach to knowledge and power, Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies scholars often face resistance in the classroom.... For example, teaching evaluations may reflect students’ discomfort with challenges to their preexisting modes of thinking about the world around them, especially if the candidate teaches required courses” (*WSS* 2013, p. 9). We therefore agree with both the NWSA Working Group’s and USF’s recommendations that we should employ not just student evaluations but alternative evaluations of teaching.

To achieve excellence in teaching, we expect candidates to demonstrate:

- **Innovation and curricular currency:** We expect candidates to be able to teach several different courses successfully and to different student populations (for example, to both majors and non-majors, and/or to lower-level and upper-level or graduate-level students) within both their substantive areas and the core curriculum; candidates should keep courses up-to-date and should respond to student- or peer-critiques with new materials, assignments, or teaching methods. Candidates should also contribute to curricular development and course redesign. Development or management of courses or units that contribute to the engagement of our students outside the classroom are highly desirable.
- **Effective classroom teaching:** We expect candidates to provide evidence of student learning, effective classroom management, and rigor of instruction. While we prefer that teaching evaluations meet or exceed college averages and require all candidates to submit the reports of student evaluations, Women’s,



Gender, and Sexuality Studies will weigh a diversity of measures of effective teaching. Because student evaluations of teaching are often biased against women faculty, faculty of color, and faculty who challenge the ideological status quo, and because the current use of online evaluations yields statistically irrelevant returns, student evaluations cannot be the sole measure of teaching excellence. Peer evaluations, reviews of teaching portfolios, and faculty reflections will be considered alongside student evaluations of teaching.

- **Successful mentoring and advising of students:** We expect candidates to successfully mentor and advise students. Candidates for Associate Professor and Professor should document their ability to successfully work with undergraduate and graduate students in supervising internships, directing theses, serving on graduate committees, supervising teaching assistants, and/or directing individual study. Candidates for Instructor promotion should document mentoring of undergraduate student success (e.g., advising on career and/or further graduate study; supervising internships; supervising Honors theses) and mentoring graduate student teaching assistants.

Candidates should, in consultation with the Department Chair and/or a faculty mentor, craft teaching narratives and compile evidence of teaching excellence that outlines how they have met department expectations. We invite candidates to provide, and expect committees to consider, evidence of teaching effectiveness that may include: peer teaching observations and evaluations (noting that peer observations should comply with the CBA and with department guidelines for teaching observations); new course design; adaptation and revision of existing courses, including incorporation of new technologies; syllabi, assignments, and other instructional materials; evidence from courses of teaching effectiveness (including student performance on pre- and post-instruction measures); evidence of teaching improvement activities; exemplary student work; evidence of advising and mentoring; and Honors- and MA-thesis or internship direction.

While the majority of WGSS teaching evaluation will be based on classroom, mentoring or online experiences, we also affirm the value of service-learning and alternative learning formats, and recognize here the importance of alternative teaching venues: supervision and mentoring of teaching assistants; learning communities, panels, workshops, community organizations, and study-abroad. We value and recognize team-teaching and understand that in interdisciplinary teaching, collaboration may be more valuable to students, but also more challenging for faculty members. The NWSA has asserted that

community engagement and activism can and should be acknowledged as both teaching and research.

## II. Research

Excellence in research is expected for all candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies expects that all candidates for promotion will publish scholarship in high-impact venues appropriate to their specialty. Candidates for Associate Professor will be able to demonstrate an emerging national reputation, and candidates for Professor will be able to demonstrate a national or international reputation; such reputations can be documented by invitations to present research or contribute research, by citation, by awards and grants, or by other professional recognitions. Candidates may elect to be considered by either the School of Humanities or the School of Social Sciences. As of 2014-15, successful applications for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor within the School of Humanities typically include a scholarly book (or its equivalent) plus three or four substantial scholarly articles; successful applications within the School of Social Sciences typically include 10 – 12 refereed scholarly publications.

Given the interdisciplinary nature of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, tenure and promotion committees considering WGSS candidates must recognize that candidates are likely to contribute to several "fields" as they are traditionally defined. While candidates should articulate the coherence of their work to those committees, members of the committees must also recognize that "divergent and diverse contributions should not be approached as a 'watering down' of rigor or as 'making exceptions to excellence,'" as it is a disciplinary standard that WGSS "was established, in part, to transgress institutional norms in higher education" (*WSS* 2013, pp. 9-10). We acknowledge USF's goal to maintain pre-eminent status as an institution, and expect faculty to engage in high-impact scholarly work. USF generally recognizes scholarly peer review as the best means to judge the quality and impact of scholarship and outlines in its tenure and promotion document the various kinds of peer review that are deemed appropriate; USF also recognizes, however, that the impact of community-engaged scholarship may take other forms. For WGSS, candidates are expected to publish in peer-reviewed scholarly venues, but committees should accept that high-impact scholarly records may include other forms of research in addition to peer-reviewed scholarly venues. In the discipline of WGSS, high impact work takes place within scholarly journals and academic presses. It may also originate from activism, applied research, creative efforts or pedagogy, and may take the form of policy or research reports, performances, community action projects, consulting, and field-defining statements and textbooks; high impact

scholarly work may be produced in more accessible forums, including open access online journals, blogs, op-eds or other forms of social media. For promotion to full professor, a record of positively received grant applications or successful funding (from internal or external sources) may also be considered an indicator of high-impact scholarly work. Candidates should also take seriously the value USF places on a *sustained* record of scholarship; one large project or a flurry of several projects at or near the end of a probationary period does not show that *sustained* record.

Because WGSS is itself an interdisciplinary field, and because some candidates may work more or less directly within a traditional discipline that is not familiar to all members of the department, candidates will provide evidence of the scholarly rigor of their publication venues. For traditional scholarly journals and presses, this will include impact factors and/or the publications' circulation and selectivity statistics; for nontraditional forums, candidates should provide evidence of the publications' impact and intended audience. All candidates should provide whatever evidence they can amass documenting citations, use of materials in courses at other universities, or "real-world" use of research in community change and activism.

WGSS values collaborative work. During the tenure-earning period, however, the majority of publications should be single- or first-authored. Candidates should document their individual contributions to collaboratively published research in the context of the other authors' contributions to the work. Papers and works coauthored with collaborators other than former mentors helps to establish the independence of the candidate's research program. Coauthoring papers and works with the candidate's own students provide additional evidence of an independent research program and may contribute to the candidate's record of teaching.

WGSS is a field devoted to challenging the politics of the production of knowledge itself. Candidates engaged in this activity may face a larger burden of documenting peer-recognition than those who work within the boundaries of traditional knowledge structures. As the NWSA Working Group puts it, "Critical awareness of inclusions and exclusions in knowledge production is foundational" to our field ( *WSS* 2013, p. 16). Tenure and promotion committees in WGSS must take the politics of knowledge production into account when making recommendations to the college.

### **III. Service**

WGSS, because of our small size and our collaborative governance model, expects that service will include active and cooperative participation in department meetings and in departmental committees, but sets a goal of not overburdening faculty with service

requirements. We also recognize the interdisciplinary nature of our department, and value contributions to the larger University community, including college- and university-level committees, as well as to the larger community as well. We recognize feminist work in the community as contributing to our larger departmental mission. We also value service to the profession, including MS reviews and active service to professional organizations. We expect all candidates for promotion to demonstrate sustained service within the department, the university, and the profession.

USF defines service as contributing to the University, the professional field or discipline, or the public, but requires that it relate to the mission of the University to be considered for tenure and promotion, rather than being the sort of service that individuals perform as private citizens. USF also distinguishes service from the work undertaken as part of scholarly or pedagogical community-engagement, and urges candidates to “count” that work as either teaching or research. We concur; our recognition of such activities under both Teaching and Research above represents our valuation of such activities within candidates’ dossiers.

#### **IV. Full Professor Promotion Criteria**

Candidates for promotion to full must meet or exceed the criteria for tenure and promotion in terms of teaching, research and service.

Excellence in teaching is expected for all candidates for promotion to full, and candidates are encouraged to use diverse evidence to illustrate and document their teaching. Mentoring of graduate students, in particular, is an important expectation of candidates for full.

There are numerous strategies by which candidates for full may demonstrate substantial service at USF, including but not limited to: assuming department, college, or university leadership roles; sharing expertise across multiple domains to diverse audiences; and working to improve the academic community.

Candidates applying for promotion to full in WGSS are further expected to demonstrate a record of high-quality scholarship during the period under review, whether single/co-authored or single-/co-edited:

- Books, monographs, anthologies, edited collections, and textbooks
- Journal articles
- Chapters in edited collections and anthologies, including introductions and conclusions
- Externally funded grants as PI or Co-PI

- New and updated editions of previous work
- Community-engaged scholarship leading to substantive products
- Encyclopedia entries related to the discipline or sub-discipline(s)

Candidates coming up under the School of Social Sciences typically will include 8-10 scholarly publications; candidates coming up under the School of Humanities will typically have either 8-10 scholarly articles or will have a scholarly monograph and 2-4 articles. Scholarly articles are usually 8000-10,000 words and monographs are typically 90,000 – 100,000; items particularly shorter or longer than average should be noted and considered as part of the well-rounded program of research, and should be discussed in terms of measured impact of the work. Candidates should discuss edited works with the FEC and/or Department Chair to agree on equivalence(s) to other published work.

We anticipate that candidates for Full Professor, more frequently than candidates for tenure and promotion, will engage in collaborative research reflective of their greater scholarly connections. We also anticipate that such candidates will merge their mentoring and scholarly activities by engaging in collaborative work with students and junior scholars. WGSS values such collaborative approaches to research and scholarship. We encourage candidates to discuss their contributions to projects in addition to the projects themselves in their research statements.

Finally, successful applications for promotion to full will demonstrate that candidates interacted as members of their academic communities in ways that garnered a national reputation or national or international visibility. Evidence of national/international visibility might include the following recognitions or types of work within the candidate's disciplinary field and sub-field(s):

- National or international awards, honors, fellowships, institutional appointments, etc.
- Invited work in journals or national or international contexts, including plenaries, symposia, assemblies, etc.
- Work produced in collaboration with scholars/researchers in other countries or with scholars/researchers working externally to the University of South Florida
- Reprints of previously published work, such as journal articles reprinted as book chapters
- Editorships of national or international journals or publishers
- Editorial board service for national and international journals or publishers
- Guest editing for special issues of journals

- Organizing or planning national or international conferences or conference programs for the discipline or sub-discipline(s)
- Holding office in national or international organizations
- Doing program reviews and/or evaluations for national and international organizations
- Contracts and consultancies for national or international organizations
- External reviewing of application dossiers for tenure and promotion, awards, grants, etc.

Activities listed above achieved within relevant subfields are considered indicators of national reputation. Candidates are not required to meet all of the listed criteria, and the list is not exhaustive.

The original draft of this document was approved by the WGS faculty on February 13, 2019 by a vote of 7-0. Slight revisions to tenure and promotion to full professor standards were approved by the tenured faculty on February 4, 2020 by a vote of 4-0.

Revisions to this document were approved by the WGSS faculty on September 12, 2024, by a unanimous vote.

This document was approved by the College of Arts and Sciences Dean's Office on: January 7, 2020 and by the Provost's office on June 19, 2020.

This document will be formally reviewed every five years (on years ending in 0 or 5). It may be revised at any time if a majority of full-time faculty members vote to revise it.

## **Appendix B: Post-Tenure Review Guidelines and Criteria**

# **Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies**

## **Post-Tenure Review Guidelines and Criteria Tenure-Line**

Tenured faculty members in Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (WGSS) will follow all procedures and guidelines for post-tenure review as outlined by USF and approved by the USF BOT, including procedures for appeal. This document outlines expectations for WGSS faculty members and explains criteria for the rating scale laid out in that document.

Post-tenure review does not include involvement of the WGSS department Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC), since the FEC will have already written five years' worth of annual evaluations. However, since WGSS operates as a more egalitarian unit than the overall institution, a faculty member or department chair may request input from the WGSS FEC; it should be noted, however, that the process does not make space for a separate narrative written by the FEC.

A faculty member's post-tenure review packet shall consist of the following:

1. The faculty member's current CV
2. The faculty member's most recent five annual reviews in their entirety
3. An optional narrative record of accomplishments for the past five years, written by the faculty member, not to exceed 12,000 characters
4. If applicable, a record of any disciplinary actions involving the faculty member

### **OVERALL EXPECTATIONS**

It is important for faculty members and the department chair to recognize that post-tenure review is not the same as annual review, tenure review, or promotion review. Faculty are not expected to re-earn tenure or promotion every five years. Tenured faculty are expected to maintain a record of ongoing productivity and excellence, but they may find different paths to those goals. The Department of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, in accordance with national and international disciplinary standards, recognizes that quality of productivity is as important as quantity.

Post-tenure review guidelines in the Department of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies will be conducted as a holistic evaluation of the post-tenure review period under review extrapolated from the criteria set forth in the department's most recent "Faculty Annual Review" guidelines, established in accordance with the department's "Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion Guidelines." The post-tenure evaluation must account for and reflect the faculty member's entire five years of workload assignments in research, teaching, service, and, when applicable, administration over the entire post-tenure period, including, where applicable, summer assignments, and sabbaticals/professional development leave.



Post-tenure reviews are to be based on:

- The past five years of annual evaluations: If a faculty member has been receiving evaluations that indicate outstanding every year, they cannot be determined to be performing less than meets expectations at post-tenure review. By the same token, if a faculty member is receiving annual evaluations indicating needs improvement and has not addressed those needed changes, they cannot be said to be exceeding expectations.
- Assigned duties: If a faculty member has taken on an unusually heavy teaching load, they cannot be judged to be deficient in research at post-tenure review, for instance (or judged deficient in teaching if they have had research releases for research). Likewise, if a faculty member takes on an unusually heavy service / administrative burden that is recognized in their assigned duties, they cannot be judged as lacking in other areas for which there is no or reduced assignment.

## RATING CATEGORIES

The state-mandated categories are:

1. 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 top-tier 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.
2. 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 a top-tier research institution; evidence of at least a satisfactory performance rating in each annual evaluation during the previous five 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.
3. 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 five years or unsatisfactory performance in any single area of assignment over multiple years or pattern of non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies may be deemed to not meet expectations.
4. 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. A

faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation during two or more of the previous five 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.

WGSS will translate the university-mandated annual evaluation rating categories (a 5-point scale) to accommodate the state-mandated post-tenure review categories (a 4-point scale) separately for research, teaching and service. Faculty who are evaluated as having “exceeded expectations” in all three areas will receive a final overall rating of “exceeds expectation (1).” This translation is based on the WGSS department’s university-approved Tenure and Promotion document and the WGSS department-approved Faculty Annual Review Guidelines.

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR RESEARCH**

Tenured faculty members with a research assignment in the Department of Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies are expected to demonstrate a record of high-quality scholarship during the period under review, whether single-/co-authored or single-/co-edited.

Faculty members in WGSS have a choice to be reviewed for Tenure and Promotion under either the School of Social Sciences or the School of Humanities in the College of Arts and Sciences because of the interdisciplinary nature of WGSS. As these disciplines differ in terms of research expectations, faculty undergoing post-tenure review also may choose to be evaluated using the Schools of Social Sciences or Humanities expectations as discussed in our Tenure and Promotion document.

Evidence of productive scholarship can include effort in production or process including the preparation, submission, revision, data collection/analysis, presentation, and/or publication of work. For works in progress, such as book manuscripts or multiple-year grants, faculty members will be given significant latitude. Evidence also can include research awards and recognitions or other extraordinary research circumstances. Items to be considered include, but are not limited to, the following from the WGSS Tenure and Promotion document:

- Books, monographs, anthologies, edited collections, and textbooks
- Peer-reviewed journal articles
- Chapters in edited collections and anthologies, including introductions and conclusions
- Externally or internally funded grants as PI or Co-PI
- New and updated editions of previous work
- Community-engaged scholarship leading to substantive products
- Encyclopedia entries related to the discipline or sub-discipline(s)
- Invited or peer-reviewed conference presentations
- National or international awards, honors, fellowships, institutional appointments, etc.

- Invited work in journals or national or international contexts, including plenaries, symposia, assemblies, etc.
- Work produced in collaboration with scholars/researchers in other countries or with scholars/researchers working externally to the University of South Florida
- Reprints of previously published work, such as journal articles reprinted as book chapters
- Editorships of national or international journals or publishers
- Editorial board service for national and international journals or publishers
- Guest editing for special issues of journals
- Organizing or planning national or international conferences or conference programs for the discipline or sub-discipline(s)
- Doing program reviews and/or evaluations for national and international organizations
- Contracts, consultancies, reviews for national or international organizations

Post-tenure review of research will be based on a holistic evaluation of the faculty member's previous five years of research activities and a five-year average of the faculty member's research assignment. As the WGSS Tenure and Promotion document states, scholarly articles are usually 8000-10,000 words, and monographs are typically 90,000 – 100,000; items particularly shorter or longer than average should be noted and considered as part of the well-rounded program of research. The Department chair will be given latitude in discerning substantial differences in effort between, for example, a book manuscript and a journal article. Faculty members should discuss edited works, such as special issues or anthologies, with the FEC and/or department chair well in advance of post-tenure review to agree on equivalence(s) to other published work. At post-tenure review, only the department chair may evaluate the value of products shorter or longer than the average length of journal articles, chapters, or manuscripts; however, the chair should not deviate from the evaluation of those works which were previously assessed as part of the faculty members' annual evaluations during the post-tenure period. Such products should be noted and considered by the chair as part of the faculty member's overall research effort and should be discussed in terms of the impact and/or contribution of the work to the discipline and/or subdisciplines.

A tenured faculty member under post-tenure review can expect to be evaluated on research as follows:

1. Exceeds Expectations: A faculty member will have exceeded expectations by participating in 7 or more of the above activities, including a book manuscript (published or in process, edited or not), and/or 3 or more journal articles or book chapters, and/or 1 external grant, over the five-year period under review.
2. Meets Expectations: A faculty member will have met expectations by participating in 5-6 of the above activities, including a book manuscript (published or in process, edited or not), and/or 2 or more journal articles or book chapters, and/or 1 external grant, over the five-year period under review.

3. Does Not Meet Expectations: A faculty member does not meet expectations if the faculty member's scholarly performance results in only 1-4 of the above activities over the five-year period under review.
4. Unsatisfactory: A faculty member's research performance is unsatisfactory if they fail to engage in any of the above activities over the five-year period under review.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR TEACHING

Tenured faculty in the Department of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies are expected to fulfill all of their basic teaching obligations with integrity, to meet departmental teaching needs, and to provide rigorous and up-to-date courses to their students. Reviewing the teaching record of a tenured faculty member for post-tenure evaluation must account for the five-year average of their teaching assignment, unusually heavy teaching loads such as teaching large classes, required classes, or intensive classes, and other extraordinary circumstances of teaching.

As the WGSS Tenure and Promotion document notes, because research has established that student evaluations of teaching may be biased against women faculty and faculty of color, average E8 scores that are no more than .25 lower than college averages may be reconsidered based upon other measures of quality instruction, including but not limited to: peer evaluations, reviews of teaching portfolios, and faculty reflections.

Per the WGSS Faculty Annual Evaluation Guidelines, factors to consider when assessing a faculty member's post-tenure teaching record include, but are not limited to:

### Meeting Department Needs

- Teaching courses that fulfill General Education, major or minor, and/or graduate requirements
- Teaching large-enrollment courses or in multiple modalities
- Curriculum development, new courses, course proposals, including developing proposals that will meet college and university initiatives or requirements (such as General Education)
- Stimulating interest in WGSS (recruiting majors/minors and/or graduate students; sponsoring student organizations concerned with WGSS; attending recruiting events and/or preparing material for such events, etc.)

### Meeting Student Needs

- Course materials that are organized, thorough, and well-presented
- Course content that is rigorous and appropriate to the level of the course
- Support to at-risk or underrepresented students

### Mentoring

- Involvement in one-on-one instruction and/or mentoring as appropriate to position (directing/serving on thesis committees, portfolio committees, directing internships, directed readings, advising, etc.)
- Supervising graduate teaching assistants
- Participation in course observation, as observer or observed
- Individual student mentoring, including career and graduate school guidance, letters of recommendation, and other emotional labor

### Instructional Professional Development

- Innovative methods
- Significant course revisions
- Leading or participating in teaching workshops/seminars
- Publication or conference presentations on pedagogy

A tenured faculty member under post-tenure review can expect to be evaluated on teaching as follows:

1. Exceeds Expectations: A faculty member demonstrates excellence in 3 or more of the categories above with pedagogical activities in multiple (though not all) sub-categories and maintains a 5-year average E8 student evaluation rating that exceeds the college average over the period under review.
2. Meets Expectations: A faculty member demonstrates excellence in 2 categories above with pedagogical activities in multiple sub-categories and maintains a 5-year average E8 student evaluation rating that meets or exceeds the college average over the period under review.
3. Does Not Meet Expectations: A faculty member has fulfilled all the basic teaching obligations over the five-year period under review but may be providing courses that need more rigor, organization, or updating. There may be evidence of not meeting department or student needs, and the faculty member's 5-year average E8 student evaluation rating does not meet the college average.
4. Unsatisfactory: A faculty member has failed to engage in one or more of the basic teaching obligations over the five-year period under review.

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SERVICE**

Post-tenure review of service will be based on the previous five years of service activities and 5-year average service assignment. The post-tenure review will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period under review. For reference, the following are deemed typical types of service in various categories; however, this list is not exhaustive. We recognize that service commitments can vary by extent, quality, and value.

### Department

- Faculty Evaluation Committee
- Committee as a Whole
- Unacknowledged administrative posts such as Graduate, Undergraduate, or Internship Director
- Standard and ad hoc committees
- Tenure/Promotion, Mid-tenure review committees
- Preparation of department external review
- Mentorship

### College/University

- CAS school committees
- CAS committees
- University committees
- Faculty Senate
- Informal and ad hoc committees

### Profession

- Journal manuscript review
- Book manuscript review
- External review for tenure and promotion
- Letters of recommendation
- Conference panel organizing
- Conference panel chair, discussant, or respondent
- Officer in professional organization, including divisions and interest groups

### Community

- Work with public schools
- Public lecture
- Community engaged work

A tenured faculty member under post-tenure review can expect to be evaluated on service as follows:

1. Exceeds expectations: Participation on WGSS Department's Committee of a Whole, demonstrated leadership within the department, and sustained and substantive engagement and evidence of leadership within at least two of the other 3 categories of service over the post-tenure period under review.
2. Meets expectations: Participation on WGSS Department's Committee of a Whole, significant engagement on another committee within the department, and sustained

substantive engagement within at least two of the other 3 categories of service other than “Department” over the post-tenure period under review.

3. Does not meet expectations: Participation on Department’s Committee of a Whole but either no sustained additional substantive departmental service or no sustained substantive engagement in any of the other categories of service over the post-tenure period under review.
4. Unsatisfactory: Failure to engage in any sustained substantive service within or outside the department over the post-tenure period under review.

(WGSS approved 9.10.23)

**Appendix C: Annual Review Guidelines**



## Faculty Annual Review

Each year, faculty members will meet with the Department Chair to determine their goals for the year and to agree on their percentages for workload and effort assignments. Faculty will also upload their annual reports into the university-designated review system for evaluation; faculty may provide supplemental materials to the Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Annual reports should include narratives describing teaching, research, and service; access to student teaching evaluations; and copies of publications. Annual report packets may also include other evidence of teaching effectiveness, innovation, and improvement as well as copies of scholarly work in progress. Tenure-line faculty who want to have work in progress count toward their annual research productivity should plan to submit that work.

Evaluations will be based on material included in the annual report materials and will be entered into the university-designated review system. Faculty will be reviewed, typically, on their teaching, research, and service; in some cases, faculty may have other responsibilities that should be evaluated (such as administration), but these will be stated in their annual workload and effort statements. Evaluation packets supporting the annual report may include (but are not limited to):

- Teaching Evidence
  - Material prepared for courses, including syllabi, reading lists, online presentations, etc.;
  - Reports on class observations, when appropriate;
  - Student evaluations;
  - Documents showing the development of new courses and/or the adoption of new teaching methods, technologies, or techniques;
  - Evidence of ongoing teaching improvement, including (but not limited to) teaching workshops and seminars;
  - Lists of graduate student committees (specifying whether MA or PhD, whether director or member), lists of undergraduate Honors Thesis committees (specifying director or member); and any directed research, readings, or internships;
  - Other evidence demonstrating teaching in non-traditional formats or situations.
- Research Evidence
  - Research, creative, and scholarly publications that appear during the year;
  - Letters of acceptance for publications that are forthcoming;
  - Manuscripts of long-term, ongoing projects or manuscripts that have been submitted;
  - Grants and contracts accepted and awarded;

- Grants and contracts solicited and/or submitted, whether in process or unfunded;
- Papers, symposia, posters, presentations, or performances at professional meetings/colloquia, including invited addresses;
- Digital or internet-based research, including online exhibits, professional blog-postings, publication in online journals and professional magazines;
- Professional publications like book reviews, short encyclopedia entries, or professional responses;
- Other work representing scholarly effort, including reports, op-ed articles, and documents related to community engagement.
- Service Evidence
  - Listings of any professional service and/or department-related community service organizations on which the faculty member has served;
  - Any evidence from those organizations indicating the level of service;
  - A list of committees on which the faculty member has served;
  - Documents from those committees that represent extraordinary service effort.

The Chair is responsible for review of the faculty by a deadline set by the College of Arts and Sciences and/or Academic Affairs. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will write a separate evaluation that will also be uploaded into the university-designated review system. Faculty members who find any part of their evaluations unacceptable should contact both the Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee, and ask for a reevaluation. Faculty members may provide additional materials to supplement the reevaluation. Faculty members who find any part of their re-evaluations still unacceptable, should follow procedures outlined in the CBA. “Regional Chancellors or their designee will provide formal written input prior to a College Dean or Vice President completing the performance appraisal” for faculty on the St. Petersburg or Sarasota/Manatee campuses.

### **Annual Review Expectations and Standards**

**Teaching.** Faculty members are expected to fulfill all of their teaching obligations with integrity, to meet departmental teaching needs, and to provide rigorous and up-to-date courses to their students. Those courses should be well organized with clear learning outcomes and ample opportunities for students to demonstrate that they have met those learning outcomes.

Evaluations of teaching should include a recognition of workload and consider all of the evidence presented by the faculty member and should not rely solely on teaching evaluations (unless the faculty member does not offer other evidence). Student evaluations may be used to demonstrate achievement in any or all of the categories below, but other

evidence may be as or more pertinent. Factors to consider when assessing a faculty member's teaching include, but are not limited to:

- Meeting department needs, including
  - Teaching courses that fulfill General Education, major or minor, and/or graduate requirements
  - Teaching large-enrollment courses or in multiple modalities
  - Curriculum development, new courses, course proposals, including developing proposals that will meet college and university initiatives or requirements (such as General Education)
  - Stimulating interest in WGSS (recruiting majors/minors and/or graduate students; sponsoring student organizations concerned with WGSS; attending recruiting events and/or preparing material for such events, etc.)
- Meeting student needs, including:
  - Course materials are organized, thorough, and well-presented
  - Course content is rigorous and appropriate to the level of the course
  - Providing support to at-risk or underrepresented students
- Mentoring
  - Involvement in one-on-one instruction and/or mentoring as appropriate to position (directing/serving on thesis committees, portfolio committees, directing internships, directed readings, advising, etc.)
  - Supervising graduate teaching assistants
  - Participation in course observation, as observer or observed
  - Individual student mentoring, including career and graduate school guidance, letters of recommendation, and other emotional labor
- Instructional Professional Development, including:
  - Innovative methods
  - Significant course revisions
  - Leading or participating in teaching workshops/seminars
  - Publication or conference presentation on pedagogy

Evaluations should consider teaching awards and recognitions, unusually heavy teaching loads, and other extraordinary circumstances of teaching.

Criteria:

*Outstanding (5):* A faculty member demonstrates excellence in two or more categories above with pedagogical activities in multiple (though not all) sub-categories.

*Strong (4):* A faculty member demonstrates excellence in one category above and will have pedagogical activities in multiple sub-categories.

*Satisfactory (3):* A faculty member has fulfilled all of their teaching obligations with integrity, met departmental teaching needs, and provided rigorous and up-to-date courses to their students. Those courses are well organized with clear learning outcomes and ample opportunities for students to demonstrate that they have met those learning outcomes.

*Needs Improvement (2):* A faculty member has fulfilled all basic teaching obligations, but may be providing courses that need more rigor, organization, or updating. There may be evidence of not meeting department or student needs in some minor ways.

*Poor (1):* A faculty member has not fulfilled one or more basic teaching obligations.

**Research.** Faculty members with a research assignment are expected to contribute to the discovery of new knowledge, the development of new educational techniques, and/or to take part in creative activities. The WGSS Tenure and Promotion Guidelines outline the level of research productivity that is expected for promotion to Associate Professor and to Professor and the different ways that a faculty member can achieve excellence when being considered for promotion. Annual evaluation standards for quantity of productivity should match those standards, broken down to an annual basis. Evaluation standards for quality are explained in the WGSS Tenure and Promotion document and will guide annual evaluations. Impact in WGSS does not have to be demonstrated by the impact-factor of a publication venue, but should be validated by evidence if the venue is not peer-reviewed and rated by outside sources.

Since WGSS is often a book- or monograph-based discipline, faculty members will be given significant latitude toward working on long-term projects. To substantiate the record of publication in years when one's primary research output is otherwise undocumented (i.e., when there is no contract, correspondence with a press, or other external evidence), the faculty member should submit the parts of the MS completed in that year and/or a description of the work undertaken in that year (e.g., travel to an archive, interviews of research subjects, working with authors as an editor of a collection, etc.). Productivity on a

larger but unpublished MS in each year should exceed, in quantity, the amount expected in published materials, given that publication requires additional steps (working with editors, revisions, copy-editing, etc.).

Grant-work in WGSS may face specific complexities, given that few grants are available for individual researchers working on purely WGSS projects, and that those that are tend to be less lucrative. Faculty members working on grants as part of a larger team should be understood to be working on long-term projects, and should substantiate their work on those projects following the same process as those working on books or monographs.

Finally, when productivity is measured quantitatively, adjustments must be made for percentage of appointment. In semesters when a faculty member has administrative appointments or unusually heavy teaching or service commitments, research productivity measures should be prorated to match the assignment.

Evaluations should take into account research awards and recognitions or other extraordinary research circumstances.

Criteria:

*Outstanding (5):* A faculty member has maintained a level of research equal to promotion guidelines broken down to an annual basis *or* has produced research that merits special consideration for quality or impact.

*Strong (4):* A faculty member has maintained a level of research that equals half (or more) of the promotion guidelines on an annual basis or research that merits special consideration for quality or impact.

*Satisfactory (3):* A faculty member has evidence of ongoing research of high quality (as defined in our tenure and promotion document) and demonstrates involvement in presenting or attempting to publish that work.

*Needs Improvement (2):* A faculty member has some evidence of ongoing research but does not demonstrate involvement in presenting or attempting to publish that work.

*Poor (1):* A faculty member does not provide evidence of ongoing research.

**Service.** Faculty members are expected to provide service to the department and, if appropriate, to the college, university, profession, and community as explained in the tenure and promotion guidelines. Service expectations should be in line with the assignment of

faculty workloads. Faculty members in tenured and tenure-earning positions are expected to include service to the profession and university or college; faculty members in teaching positions may include professional, university, or college service.

Evaluation of service should include consideration of the extent of a faculty member's service commitments; the quality of their work on committees (if this can be judged); and the value of the service to the department, college, university or profession.

Criteria:

*Outstanding (5):* A faculty member has exceeded expectations for service in at least two categories: extent, quality, and/or value.

*Strong (4):* A faculty member has exceeded expectations for service *either* in extent, quality, or value.

*Satisfactory (3):* A faculty member has done service to the department as a member of the committee as a whole, will have attended faculty meetings regularly, and will have participated in departmental activities. Tenured faculty members will have performed some college- or university-level service; tenured and tenure-earning faculty members will have done some professional service.

*Needs Improvement (2):* A faculty member will have done service to the department and will have attended faculty meetings regularly. They may not have performed service at all levels appropriate to their workload and/or job description.

*Poor (1):* A faculty member will not have met even minimal service obligations.

This document was approved unanimously by the faculty of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies in November 2022.