USF - Department of Chemistry
Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Procedure and Criteria

To comply with BOG Regulation 10.003, the University of South Florida (USF) has developed Regulation 3.016, which provides authority for administering Post-Tenure Faculty Review (PTR) at USF. PTR is required for all tenured faculty members at the University of South Florida in accordance with State law.

The Department of Chemistry will follow USF Regulation 3.016 and *Procedures for Post-Tenure Review at USF* with regard to all aspects of PTR, including Timing and Eligibility, Review Requirements, Process Requirements, Outcomes, Monitoring and Reporting.

Procedure
The PTR will not involve external review letters. The PTR assessment will be based on a "review packet" composed of the following materials:

- The faculty member's narrative record of accomplishments for the past five years in a university-designated template. This narrative will have a maximum limit of 12,000 characters.
- The last five years of annual performance reviews by the department committee and chairperson
- The faculty member's curriculum vitae (not to exceed 5 pages single-spaced)
- The faculty member's disciplinary record (if any exists) in their personnel file covering the past five years to ensure compliance with state laws, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies. Only substantiated disciplinary matters will be considered for the purposes of a post-tenure review.

To evaluate the review packet, the Department of Chemistry, with concurrence of the faculty, has developed criteria for research (see page 2), teaching (page 3), and service (page 5) on the 4-point ordinal scale described below. An OVERALL rating will be calculated as a weighted total, derived by multiplying scores from each of the three evaluative domains (i.e., Research, Teaching, and Service) by the faculty member's average assignment weights in that domain and using the sum of those figures. The weighted total will be rounded to the nearest whole number (e.g. 1.4 rounds to 1; 1.5 rounds to 2). The OVERALL rating will correspond to the 4-point ordinal scale specified in USF's Post-Tenure Review (PTR) regulation II(3)(c):
1 = Exceeds Expectations
2 = Meets Expectations
3 = Does Not Meet Expectations
4 = Unsatisfactory.

Final decisions regarding post-tenure review may be appealed under university regulations or collective bargaining agreements, as applicable to the employee.

Criteria: Research

Evaluation ratings in the area of Research generally reflect the faculty member's research productivity and impact. Research/scholarly productivity should generally be commensurate with the proportion of faculty duties (e.g. percent of time in workload) assigned in the research category. The faculty member should provide a brief narrative describing research products and their importance, significance, or impact. Research activity will be evaluated holistically, not just based on the number of indicators. Faculty can meet criteria for a given rating with a qualifying performance through either a single indicator or through a combination of the two indicators.

Exceeds Expectations (1)
- Evidence of completion of --on average-- at least one scholarly product or "high impact" form of scholarship per year (typically peer-reviewed article, patents, book chapters and/or substantial application for external funding) for each 20% Research Assignment.
- Evidence of exceptional (better than average or forming an exception) research impact or professional recognition of the faculty member's status as a leading or emerging scholar in their field (e.g., applied use of one's research/scholarship in a professional practice community, scholarly use of one's research/scholarship to advance the profession or contribute to an important research topic/area), which may be measured qualitatively (e.g., scholarly recognition by peers, awards, or appointments) or quantitatively (e.g., h-index, citation counts, or productivity/impact "rankings")

Meets Expectations (2)
- Evidence of significant progress on and/or completion of --on average-- one scholarly product per year, at least some of which are regarded "high impact" forms of scholarship (typically peer-reviewed article and/or substantial application for external funding), but below the rate of one product for each 20% Research Assignment.
- Evidence of significant (demonstrated meaning or influence) research impact or professional recognition of the faculty member's status as a leading or emerging scholar in their field (e.g., applied use of one's research/scholarship in a professional practice community, scholarly use of one's research/scholarship to advance the profession or contribute to an important research topic/area, which may be measured qualitatively (e.g., scholarly recognition by peers, awards, or appointments) or quantitatively (e.g., h-index, citation counts, or productivity/impact "rankings")

Does Not Meet Expectations (3)
- Little progress on any scholarly product and no completed products over the review period. Productivity is below minimum expectations for most years during the review period.

Unsatisfactory (4)
- Not actively engaged in research or scholarship consistent with their research assignment, for more than two years.

Criteria: Teaching

The department recognizes that teaching "performance" is multidimensional, that excellence in teaching can be demonstrated in different ways, and ratings for some courses and for some types of courses (regardless of instructor) are typically higher or lower than others. Teaching activities may pertain to formal courses and to student mentoring, professional development, and advising. Teaching should generally be commensurate with faculty assignment (e.g. proportion of workload assigned to teaching). The following rating guidelines are intended to reflect that diversity. Teaching activity will be evaluated holistically, not just based on the number of indicators. <u>No single indicator is necessary and no single indicator may be sufficient to warrant a given rating. Faculty can meet criteria for a given rating in the domain of Teaching with qualifying performance indicators in one or more of the rating level descriptions</u>.

Exceeds Expectations (1)
- Student evaluation ratings predominantly and consistently at or above the School and College averages
- Completed or nearly completed development of a new course, and/or significantly overhauled and improved an existing course, and/or adapted teaching practices to increase student success
- Exceptional performance in facilitating student success, engagement, mentoring, professional development, and advising, which may include:
  o Student ratings and/or narrative suggesting exceptional accessibility/responsivity to and effective communication with students
  o Faculty narrative describing how they have incorporated feedback from students into substantive course revisions and articulated a plan to assess the impact of those changes
  o Faculty narrative reflecting significant, positive efforts to increase student engagement
  o Faculty member has gone above and beyond usual expectations to facilitate student success, including accommodating more students when course demand is particularly high
  o Faculty member serves on masters and/or doctoral thesis, and/or masters and/or doctoral committees
  o Faculty member directs one or more undergraduate students in the completion of an Honors Thesis
  o Faculty member mentors graduate students within their research lab and/or supervises student independent research
  o Faculty member mentors undergraduate students within their research lab and/or supervises student independent research
  o Faculty member mentors postdoctoral researchers and/or visiting scholars and/or other research personnel
- Faculty member receives teaching awards/recognition
- Faculty published a textbook and/or peer-reviewed article on teaching methods (e.g. scholarship of teaching and learning) or an a subject offered as an approved course at USF

Meets Expectations (2)
- Student evaluation ratings predominantly and consistently at the department averages or slightly below with a reasonable narrative explanation from the faculty member
- Maintains existing courses, with at least minimal efforts to update or improve them
- Significant progress on a new course or refreshing an existing course
- Average performance in facilitating student success, engagement, mentoring, professional development, and advising, which may include:

o Student ratings and/or narrative suggesting average accessibility/responsivity to and effective communication with students
o Meets minimum expectations for attending to feedback from students, but without substantive course revisions and/or and articulated plan to assess the impact of those changes
- Faculty narrative reflecting student engagement that meets minimum expectations

Does Not Meet Expectations (3)
- Student evaluation ratings predominantly and consistently below the department averages with no reasonable narrative explanation to mitigate or contextualize them.
- Ignoring deficiencies in existing courses
- Below average performance in facilitating student success, engagement, mentoring, professional development, and advising, which may be reflected in:
  o Student ratings and/or narrative suggesting below average accessibility/responsivity to and effective communication with students
  o Failing to meet minimum expectations within the department for attending to feedback from students or feedback from annual reviews
- Faculty narrative reflecting below average student engagement that fails to meet minimum expectations within the department

Unsatisfactory (4)
- No clear evidence of adequate teaching performance and/or effectiveness at the level expected for the rank for more than two years.
- Ignoring deficiencies in existing courses; no efforts to improve
- Syllabi fail to follow required USF template requirements or missing critical information
- Clear evidence that faculty member is inaccessible and non-responsive to students

Criteria: Service

      The department recognizes that university service activities of equal importance or impact can occur at different "levels" (e.g., university, college, and school); that service activities of equal importance or impact can occur in different domains (e.g., university professional, professional) and that excellence in service can be demonstrated in different ways. The following rating guidelines are intended to reflect that diversity. Service should generally be commensurate with the proportion of faculty duties assigned in the service category. Service activity will be evaluated holistically, not just based on the number of indicators. <u>No single indicator is necessary and may not be sufficient to warrant a given rating. Faculty can meet criteria for a given rating in the domain of Service with qualifying performance indicators in one or more of the rating level descriptions.</u>

Exceeds Expectations (1)
Evidence of exceptional service activity for most years during the review period, considering indicators such as the following (typically two or more for "Exceeds Expectations"):
- Service activity both for the university and for the profession.
- Service activity in multiple roles or on multiple committees, or at multiple levels—i.e., university, college, and school
- Holding office or positions of professional distinction (e.g., journal editorships) in professional service.
- Engagement in high-priority, time-intensive service activities
- Serving in leadership roles in university and/or professional association committees
- Serving as reviewer or panelist for granting agencies
- Serving as reviewer for scientific journals
- Profession-related community engagement - e.g., presentations to or consulting for community, library, school, government organization, or company, and/or serving as officer or board member of a civic organization, and/or science outreach
- Mentoring junior faculty members

Meets Expectations (2)
- Evidence of average service activity that meets minimum expectations within the School, typically comprising service activity in at least one domain—School, College, University, Profession—for most years during the review period.

Does Not Meet Expectations (3)
- No effective service activity or activity that is below minimum expectations within the School for most years during the review period.

Unsatisfactory (4)
- No effective service activity at the level expected for the rank, for more than two years.

Approved by Chemistry Tenure/Tenure-Track Faculty: Sept 12, 2023