

Department of Communication Criteria for Post Tenure Review (PTR)

Section I. Overview

In alignment with University and Board of Governors' regulations, as well as Florida state law, all tenured faculty members in the Department of Communication will undergo post-tenure review (PTR) every five years. The post-tenure review is an evaluation of the previous five years of employment. The review will be conducted based on a dossier comprised of a narrative record of accomplishments prepared by the faculty member (optional) that covers the previous five years, faculty annual evaluations for the previous five years, the faculty member's CV, and, if applicable, the faculty member's disciplinary record.

Department of Communication guidelines for PTR ensure that the faculty member will be reviewed in relation to nationally recognized standards consistent with the discipline as it exists at research universities. These guidelines are based on department criteria for annual evaluation that were previously approved by the university.

The PTR will be conducted by the department chair. It requires one holistic evaluation score. Based on the PTR assessment, an OVERALL rating will be assigned using the 4-point ordinal scale specified in USF's Post-Tenure Review (PTR) regulation II(3)(c). This OVERALL rating will be the average of the total scores (in the PTR) across the three areas of evaluation – Research, Teaching, and Service (considering annual faculty assignments/workload over the past five years).

The evaluation metrics in Section IV of this document, which correspond to Research, Teaching, and Service, are meant as guides for faculty and the department chair to ensure a continued trajectory of faculty academic progress. The trajectory and overall achievement of the faculty member over the entirety of five-year period will be central to the department chair's PTR of the faculty member.

Section II. Overall rating categories for post-tenure review shall include the following university level guidance (taken from USF Regulation created by Provost's Office):

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 5 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 5 years without evidence of a trajectory of subsequent improvement or exhibited 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 5 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.

Section III. PTR Process:

- (a) The faculty member shall complete a review packet. The packet shall consist of the previous 5 years of annual evaluations, including scores and supervisors' comments, a curriculum vitae, and a narrative (optional) that highlights accomplishments and demonstrates performance relative to assigned duties over the previous five years, using a template provided for that purpose. This narrative will have a maximum limit of 12,000 characters.
- (b) The faculty member's department chair shall evaluate the review packet and faculty member's disciplinary file covering the past 5 years and provide a written assessment (not to exceed 12,000 characters) of the level of achievement. If applicable, the chair will include in the assessment letter any concerns regarding professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance during the period under review. The chair shall also assign a performance rating consistent with the categories specified in Section IV below. These criteria are established by unit faculty and previously approved by the department chair, dean, and Provost.
- (c) The dean of the college shall evaluate the review packet submitted by the faculty member, and the chair's evaluation letter and rating. The dean may choose the guidance of a designee, including a College Post-Tenure Review Committee, to assist in this process. The dean shall add to the packet a brief narrative (not to exceed 12,000 characters) assessing the level of achievement during the period under review. If

applicable, the letter shall include any concerns regarding professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance. The letter shall also include the dean's recommended performance rating based on the criteria described in Section IV below. These criteria are established by unit faculty and previously approved by the department chair, dean, and Provost.

- (d) At the conclusion of the College dean's review, the faculty member shall be provided the opportunity to review the packet and have the option of providing narrative comments (not to exceed 6,000 characters) for consideration by the Provost.
- (e) The dean of the College shall forward the review packet and recommendation to the Provost for review.
- (f) The Provost shall evaluate the review packet and the recommendation provided by the dean of the College.
- (g) With guidance and oversight from the University President, the Provost will rate the faculty member's professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance during the review period. The Provost may accept, reject, or modify the dean's and chair's recommended rating. Each faculty member reviewed will receive one of the following performance ratings, as defined in Section II (above) and listed below:
 - a. Exceeds expectations (1)
 - b. Meets expectations (2)
 - c. Does not meet expectations (3)
 - d. Unsatisfactory (4)
- (h) The Provost shall notify the faculty member, the faculty member's department chair, and the appropriate college dean of the outcome.

Section IV. Specific criteria for post-tenure review with respect to Research, Teaching, and Service (these criteria are drawn from university approved criteria for the department's faculty annual evaluations)

A. Research

The department's bylaws recognize that research, publication, and creative activity are to be evaluated with a view toward balancing the claims of short- and long-term activity. In other words, a balance should be struck between giving credit for work done in the year under consideration and giving credit for overall career development. If a colleague has been productive for many years, for example, the faculty member's ratings should not automatically be lowered because of a seemingly unproductive year; the colleague should be given an opportunity to present evidence relevant to the overall performance. Similarly, if a colleague is heavily involved in service that also requires a good deal of current scholarly knowledge—such as editing a journal or planning a conference program—their rating should not automatically be lowered if such service temporarily slows their original output; they should be given the opportunity to explain the relevance of the service to their overall performance. And if work is produced that is beyond the highest standards for any given year, it should receive some carryover credit to subsequent years (see below).

Absolute evaluative numbers can be challenging to assign to individual items because quality must be evaluated as well as quantity. In this regard, evaluators should recognize that when a work is published, especially if referred or invited, a certain qualitative judgment has already been made by peers, one to be heeded because it probably comes from a more impartial, and perhaps more informed, jury than a local committee.

Each activity below should be weighed in view of the faculty member's rank, the length and creative ambition of the work, the order and nature of authorship (sole and/or first author carrying greater weight unless such work includes undergraduate or graduate student co-authorship), venue of placement (see department T&P guidelines for more information on venues of publication), and its contributions to the specific field(s) and sub-field(s) in which they primarily work. Contributions to the field may be demonstrated by major external prizes and awards for scholarly or creative work. The scholarly record and associated annual evaluation narrative should ideally reflect a coherent, organized, and systematic program of scholarship.

Textbooks should be judged based on how much scholarly/critical effort went into their creation and how much pedagogical value they have. Textbooks contribute to evidence of commitment to teaching, but when appropriate also can carry some weight in the rating of research.

- **Exceeds expectations (1)** includes evidence of success in any one category for each year encompassing the post-tenure review period:
 - Publication of a single-authored or co-authored book (equals publication of 5-6 single-authored or co-authored articles or book chapters in a peer-reviewed journal or edited volume (with evidence of substantial contribution, if co-authored), including in a handbook)).
 - Publication of an edited or co-edited book with a substantial scholarly contribution by the editor(s) (equals publication of 4-5 single-authored or co-authored articles or book chapters in a peer-reviewed journal or edited volume (with evidence of substantial contribution, if co-authored), including in a handbook)).
 - Receipt of a major research-focused award, grant, or fellowship that is nationally competitive (PI, co-PI, or mPI).
 - Publication of a revised edition of a book (with evidence of substantial revision), merits an evaluation of "exceeds expectations" in the year of publication when combined with any one of following:
 - Publication of a review essay with substantive length and some original contribution in assessing the state of the field
 - Submission of a single-authored or co-authored article or book chapter in a peer-reviewed journal or edited volume (with evidence of substantial contribution, if co-authored), including in a handbook
 - Publishing a book review or encyclopedia entry
 - Submission of a grant proposal
 - Service as a journal editor or associate editor

- Organizing a scholarly conference
- An independently reviewed creative work (e.g., performance, exhibition)
- A major engaged research publication for a non-academic audience (e.g., white paper)
- Publication of a single-authored or co-authored article or book chapter in a peer-reviewed journal or edited volume (with evidence of substantial contribution, if co-authored), including in a handbook, AND any one of the following:
 - Publication of a review essay with substantive length and some original contribution in assessing the state of the field
 - Submission of a single-authored or co-authored article or book chapter in a peer-reviewed journal or edited volume (with evidence of substantial contribution, if co-authored), including in a handbook
 - Substantial progress on a book manuscript (authored)
 - Publishing a book review or encyclopedia entry
 - Submission of a grant proposal
 - Service as a journal editor or associate editor
 - Organizing a scholarly conference
 - An independently reviewed creative work (e.g., performance, exhibition)
 - A major engaged research publication for a non-academic audience (e.g., white paper)

For an “exceeds expectations” rating, the overall scholarly record should reflect that the faculty member is in the process of developing or has developed a well-articulated, organized, coherent, and systematic program of scholarship during the post-tenure review period.

- **Meets expectations (2)** includes evidence of success for any one of the following for each year encompassing the post-tenure review period:
 - Publication of a single-authored or co-authored article or book chapter in a peer-reviewed journal or edited volume (with evidence of substantial contribution, if co-authored), including in a handbook.
 - Publication of a revised edition of a book (with evidence of substantial revision).
 - Publication of a review essay with substantive length and some original contribution in assessing the state of the field
 - Conference submission/presentation
 - Submission of a journal article
 - Publishing a book review or encyclopedia entry
 - Submission of a grant proposal
 - Service as a journal editor or associate editor
 - Organizing a scholarly conference
 - Substantial progress on a book manuscript (authored)
 - For community engaged scholars, smaller engaged research publications (e.g., blogs) and/or collaborative events with community partners
 - An independently reviewed creative work (e.g., performance, exhibition)

- A major engaged research publication for a non-academic audience (e.g., white paper)
- **Does not meet expectations (3)** means the chair did not find evidence of any of the items listed in the criteria for a “meets expectations” rating any one year encompassing the post-tenure review period without corresponding evidence of a trajectory of subsequent improvement.
- **Unsatisfactory (4)** research means the chair did not find evidence of any of the items listed in the criteria for a “meets expectations” rating for more than one year, or is the rating used for faculty who fail to submit materials for evaluation.

B. Teaching

The department's bylaws recognize the problematic nature of relying on student evaluations as the primary method of assessing excellence in teaching; hence, we encourage instructors to provide evidence of successful teaching that captures engagement in and commitment to undergraduate and/or graduate programs in a variety of ways.

Teaching performance will be assessed by the chair based on the five criteria listed below as applicable. The Chair will assign a rating using the following system:

- **Exceeds expectations (1)** includes evidence of success in three or more categories for each year encompassing the post-tenure review period. Alternatively, the chair may assign a rating of 1 on the basis of exceptional performance in one or two categories for each year encompassing the post-tenure review period - such as the receipt of a major teaching, mentoring, or advising award; leadership role in department, college, university-wide curriculum development; service on a number of undergraduate honors, MA thesis, or PhD dissertation committees that is unusually large in comparison with other department members and is not otherwise recognized; or another accomplishment deemed extraordinary. Evidence of such exemplary accomplishments must be included in the PTR documents submitted.
- **Meets expectations (2)** includes evidence of success in two categories for each year encompassing the post-tenure review period.
- **Does not meet expectations (3)** means the chair did not find evidence of any of the items listed in the criteria for a “meets expectations” rating for any one year encompassing the post-tenure review period without corresponding evidence of a trajectory of subsequent improvement, but peer or student evaluations are not generally problematic over the post-tenure review period.
- **Unsatisfactory (4)** teaching means the chair did not find evidence of any of the items listed in the criteria for a “meets expectations” rating for more than one year encompassing the post-tenure review period. Additionally, the chair may have found that peer or student evaluation(s) generally rate the candidate's teaching as ineffective or problematic over the post-tenure review period.

Criteria for each of these ratings are listed below; these criteria align with those listed in the department's tenure and promotion document. We recognize that the list provided is

illustrative rather than exhaustive, so we encourage faculty to describe teaching activities that are not specifically noted or adequately captured in these categories.

a) Curricular Rigor

- Course syllabi include relevant scholarship appropriate to the content and level of the course
- Course activities promote active learning, critical thinking, opportunities to enhance speaking and writing, creativity, and/or pedagogical inclusivity

b) Curricular Contribution

- Creating special topics courses
- Developing and seeking curricular approval for new courses
- Developing online classes with Innovative Education when requested by department
- Substantially updating syllabi/assignments/instructional materials
- Contributing to the department's required core undergraduate and graduate curriculum
- Participating in USF's General Education and Global Citizens project
- Participating in the assessment and revision of department degree programs
- Establishing study abroad experiences, service-learning opportunities, writing intensive experiences, community engagement opportunities, etc.
- Teaching large lecture classes and mentoring GTAs via these classes

c) Peer and/or Student Evaluations

- Peer evaluations rate the faculty member's teaching as effective
- Student evaluations meet or exceed college averages

d) Undergraduate/Graduate Student Supervision, Mentoring, and Advising

- (Co)advising MA and PhD students
- Serving on MA and PhD student advisory committees
- Supervising independent studies/directed research by graduate or undergraduate students
- Serving on/directing undergraduate honors thesis committees
- Observing/mentoring graduate student instructors
- Presenting conference papers and creative works with graduate or undergraduate students
- Publishing papers and creative works with graduate or undergraduate students
- Supervision of internships for undergraduate and grad students

e) Evidence of Commitment to Teaching

- Winning honors/awards for teaching (both intramural and extramural)
- Participating in pedagogical training sessions, workshops, or conferences
- Contributing to publications on pedagogy

C. Service

Because service is part of each faculty member's contract with the university, it is appropriately evaluated as part of any performance review. The department's T&P document indicates that tenured faculty are expected to show "substantive contributions of service to the University, profession and/or public." Tenured faculty are expected to contribute more extensively than

tenure-earning faculty to professional, university, and public service.

In evaluating service-related activities, the chair will examine all aspects of a candidate's service and will not rely on a single measure of performance. Applicants are fully responsible for providing evidence of their own service-related activities. In their service narratives, faculty members should briefly indicate level of responsibility to help the chair understand the specific service commitments. For instance, membership in an organization might entail meeting attendance and event participation; serving on a committee of that organization would entail more involvement; and chairing that committee would entail even more involvement.

Service falls into three general categories: to the university, to the profession, and to the community. University service is further broken down into service to the department, the college, and the university at large.

- **Exceeds expectations (1)** includes evidence of a consistent record of good departmental service according to assigned duties AND demonstrated evidence of service in at least two areas to contribute to the university, profession, and/or community (listed below #i - #x) for each year encompassing the post-tenure review period.

Service to the department involves activities such as (but not limited to): a) serving on, or chairing, department committees, b) organizing and/or attending faculty meetings, colloquia, performances of creative works, job interviews, student recruiting activities, and other professional events (Note: faculty are not required to attend social events).

Regarding service to the university, profession, and/or community, faculty can engage in activities such as (but not limited to):

- i. Holding leadership positions in important international, national, or regional professional organizations.
- ii. Serving as a journal editor or book series editor in their area
- iii. Serving on journal editorial boards as well as conducting ad-hoc journal peer reviews or book manuscript reviews for scholarly publishers
- iv. Serving as a book review editor for a journal
- v. Guest editing a special issue of a journal
- vi. Reviewing paper submissions for scholarly conferences
- vii. Organizing academic conferences
- viii. Serving on grant review panels
- ix. Participating actively in important university or college committees or organizations (e.g., those that meet regularly and address consequential issues)
- x. Performing community service activities such as service to public schools, community colleges, local nonprofits, public lecture series and panel discussions, contributions to TV, radio, and newsprint, and other forms of community education

Note: Since many service roles, such as committees and editorial positions, require varying levels of time and effort, faculty members need to offer a brief, yet clear assessment of the

actual work entailed in fulfilling a given role for that year, along with supporting evidence where appropriate. Public/community engagement must relate to one's academic field/expertise and cannot involve unrelated personal hobbies or interests. Tenured faculty are encouraged to highlight leadership roles they have taken in their service work.

Note: In some cases, a faculty member can be assigned an "exceeds expectations" if they perform good department service plus service in one additional area that is well beyond the standard assignment. For example, a tenured professor who spends substantial time editing a journal can be assigned an "exceeds expectations" without significant service in other areas beyond the department. Likewise, a faculty member can be assigned an "exceeds expectations" if they perform department service well beyond their standard assignment if they also demonstrate service in one other area. For example, a tenured associate professor who chairs a faculty search with a large applicant pool might be assigned an "exceeds expectations" if they also perform substantive professional but not university or community service.

- **Meets expectations (2)** includes evidence of a consistent record of good departmental service according to assigned duties and/or demonstrated evidence of service in at least one area: the university, profession, or community for each year encompassing the post-tenure review period.
- **Does not meet expectations (3)** includes inadequate performance of departmental service activities according to assigned duties for any one year encompassing the post-tenure review period without corresponding evidence of a trajectory of subsequent improvement.
- **Unsatisfactory (4)** service includes inadequate performance of departmental service activities according to assigned duties for more than one year encompassing the post-tenure review period, or for faculty who fail to submit materials for evaluation.

Section V. Notes

Note 1. Appeals: If a faculty colleague wishes to appeal the department chair's PTR, the colleague should ask to meet with the department chair, as the first step in an appeals procedure. The chair may be asked to explain the basis of the evaluation and/or the colleague may wish to present new material or to shed light on old material. If a colleague wishes further review of the chair's evaluation, the colleague should inform the department chair in writing. The Department's Executive Committee will serve as an Ad Hoc Appeals Committee. This Ad Hoc Appeals Committee, after examining relevant documents and arguments, will consult with the colleague who wants the review and with the department chair. Whatever the committee's judgment of the appeal, its recommendation is to be sent on to the college dean with the comments of the chair. The colleague who initiates the review may attach comments to any of the material in the file under consideration.

Note 2: Faculty who do not submit materials for PTR will likely be assigned an "Unsatisfactory" (4) for that period of assessment.

Note 3: The department will ensure that spouses and partners may not evaluate each other.

Note 4: The department may revise PTR criteria as needed in future years. These revisions must be approved by the Dean's Office and Provost's Office before they can go into effect.