

Post-tenure Review

Department of Integrative Biology, University of South Florida

From the USF Post-tenure review regulation: *Post-tenure review is required of all tenured faculty members at the University of South Florida in accordance with State law. The purpose of this review is to ensure continued high standards of quality and sustained productivity among tenured faculty consistent with the mission of the university and with assigned duties in research, teaching, and service. In addition, post-tenure review is intended to recognize and honor exceptional achievement. As a formative assessment process, post-tenure review is also intended to provide continued academic professional development, enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a performance improvement plan and return to expected levels of productivity, and, when necessary, identify patterns of performance that are unacceptable or inconsistent with professional standards or employment in the Florida State University System (SUS).*

Post-tenure review outcomes will reflect faculty members' assignments. Post-tenure review assessments are holistic; therefore, evaluation covers each area of assignment including all aspects of faculty workload in research, teaching, and service. Each area is scored on a four-point scale: 1 = exceeds expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = does not meet expectations; 4 = unsatisfactory. The final overall rating, on the same four-point scale, is an average of the ratings in each area (research, teaching, service), weighted by the percentage assignment in each area.

The department chair will evaluate the review packet and faculty member's disciplinary file (if applicable) covering the past five 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 an overall performance rating using the four-point scale as defined in the USF post-tenure review regulation as follows:

Exceeds expectations (rating = 1): *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.*

Meets expectations (rating = 2): *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*

38 *conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law, Board*
39 *of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.*

40 ***Does not meet expectations (rating = 3):*** *performance falls below the expected range of*
41 *annual variation in performance compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline*
42 *and unit but is capable of improvement. A faculty member who has received an overall*
43 *unsatisfactory annual evaluation during one of the previous 5 years without evidence of a*
44 *trajectory of subsequent improvement or exhibited unsatisfactory performance in any single*
45 *area of assignment over multiple years or pattern of non-compliance with state law, Board of*
46 *Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies may be deemed to not meet*
47 *expectations.*

48 ***Unsatisfactory (rating = 4):*** *failure to meet expectations that reflects disregard or failure to*
49 *follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance*
50 *that involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in university regulations and policies. A*
51 *faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation during two or*
52 *more of the previous 5 years or unsatisfactory performance in two or more areas of*
53 *assignment over three of the last five years of the review period may be deemed*
54 *unsatisfactory. Demonstrates a consistent pattern of failing to perform duties assigned by the*
55 *University or sustained violations of applicable state and federal law and applicable*
56 *published College, University, and Board of Governors regulations, policies, and*
57 *procedures.*

58

59 According to the USF Post-tenure review regulation, the review process will examine only the
60 faculty member's "review packet," comprising the following materials:

- 61 1. (a) *The faculty member's narrative record of accomplishments for the past five years in a*
62 *university-designated template*,*
- 63 2. (b) *The last five years of annual performance reviews by the department chair (or*
64 *individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation, such as program director,*
65 *dean, or designated supervisor; hereafter referred to as department chair),*
- 66 3. (c) *The faculty member's curriculum vitae, and*
- 67 4. (d) *The faculty member's disciplinary record (if any exists) in their personnel file covering*
68 *the past five years to ensure compliance with state laws, Board of Governors' regulations,*
69 *and university regulations and policies. Only substantiated disciplinary matters will be*
70 *considered for the purposes of a post-tenure review.*

71 * The faculty narrative of their accomplishments in research, teaching, and service is not to
72 exceed 12,000 characters in length.

73 The department chair may request that the faculty advisory committee or associate chair evaluate
74 the review packet and make a recommendation to the department chair if the overall rating is
75 approaching 1 (Exceeds expectations), 3 (Does not meet expectations) or 4 (Unsatisfactory).

76 Course releases, sabbatical leave, and other forms of approved leave will not penalize the faculty
77 member in the calculation of their ratings.

78

79 **Research** rating on the four-point scale is based on research achievements over the five years
80 under review as follows:

81

82 **Exceeds expectations (rating = 1):** The faculty member has achieved:

83 At least **10** peer-reviewed journal publications in indexed* journals or peer-reviewed
84 chapters in a book from a reputable publisher

85 **or**

86 A scholarly book with original synthesis and contribution to theory from a reputable
87 scholarly publisher **and five** peer-reviewed journal publications or peer-reviewed
88 chapters in a book from a reputable publisher

89 **or**

90 **Five** peer-reviewed journal publications or peer-reviewed book chapters in a volume
91 from a reputable publisher **and 10** of any of the following items from at least **four**
92 categories: book chapter (peer-reviewed or non-peer-reviewed), book review, conference
93 presentation, edited volume, funding (new or continued, each year counted separately),
94 invited seminar, journal publication (peer-reviewed or non-peer-reviewed), patent,
95 reference book, handbook, field guide, research award, software, technical report,
96 textbook, textbook chapter.

97 Other research achievements will be counted and substantive achievements may count
98 more than once, in either case only after consultation and written agreement with the
99 department chair.

100 *Journals that are citation-indexed, e.g., by Scopus, SCI/Web of Science, etc.

101

102 **Meets expectations (rating = 2):** The faculty member has achieved:

103 At least **seven** peer-reviewed journal publications in indexed* journals or peer-reviewed
104 chapters in a book from a reputable publisher

105 **or**

106 A scholarly book with original synthesis and contribution to theory from a reputable
107 scholarly publisher **and two** peer-reviewed journal publications or peer-reviewed
108 chapters in a book from a reputable publisher

109 **or**

110 **Five** peer-reviewed journal publications or peer-reviewed book chapters in a volume
111 from a reputable publisher **and four** of any of the following items from at least **three**
112 categories: book chapter (peer-reviewed or non-peer-reviewed), book review, conference
113 presentation, edited volume, funding (new or continued, each year counted separately),
114 invited seminar, journal publication (peer-reviewed or non-peer-reviewed), patent,
115 reference book, handbook, field guide, research award, software, technical report,
116 textbook, textbook chapter.

117 Other research achievements will be counted and substantive achievements may count
118 more than once, in either case only after consultation and written agreement with the
119 department chair.

120 *Journals that are citation-indexed, e.g., by Scopus, SCI/Web of Science, etc.

121

122 **Does not meet expectations (rating = 3):** The faculty member has achieved:

123 Fewer than **seven** peer-reviewed journal publications in indexed journals or peer-
124 reviewed chapters in a book from a reputable publisher

125 **and**

126 No scholarly book with original synthesis and contribution to theory **and** fewer than **two**
127 journal peer-reviewed publications or peer-reviewed chapters in a book from a reputable
128 publisher

129 **and**

130 Fewer than **five** peer-reviewed journal publications or peer-reviewed chapters in a book
131 from a reputable publisher and fewer than **four** of any of the following, or fewer than
132 **three** categories: book chapter (peer-reviewed or non-peer-reviewed), book review,
133 conference presentation, edited volume, funding (new or continued), invited seminar,
134 journal publication (peer-reviewed or non-peer-reviewed), patent, reference book,
135 handbook, field guide, research award, software, technical report, textbook, textbook
136 chapter.

137 Other research achievements will be counted and substantive achievements may count
138 more than once, in either case only after consultation and written agreement with the
139 department chair.

140

141

142 **Unsatisfactory (rating = 4):** The faculty member has achieved **none** of the following:

143 Peer-review publication, scholarly book, book chapter, book review, conference
144 presentation, edited volume, funding, invited seminar, journal publication, patent,
145 reference book, handbook, field guide, research award, software, technical report,
146 textbook, textbook chapter.

147

148 **Teaching** rating on the four-point scale will be based on the following categories of activities
149 undertaken during Fall and Spring semesters of the five-year period under review:

150 1. Teaching formal undergraduate and graduate classes and laboratories, with favorable peer
151 and/or student evaluations. Student evaluations will be considered in light of factors that have
152 been demonstrated to have negative impacts that are independent of teaching skills and
153 course content (e.g., class size, instructor race, ethnicity, gender identity or sexual identity).

154 2. Leading workshops or conferences on best teaching practices or receiving a certification
155 for attending such workshops (at USF or outside USF).

156 3. Developing a new class, or substantially improving an existing class to match best
157 practices for learning outcomes.

158 4. Sustaining teaching approaches and content updates that are consistent with best
159 pedagogical practices.

160 5. Supervising research by post-docs, graduate and undergraduate students, and service on
161 thesis and dissertation committees.

162 6. Supervising teaching assistants.

163 7. Teaching-related awards.

164 8. Teaching large enrollment classes, multiple distinct courses or labs, or developing study-
165 abroad courses.

166

167 **Exceeds expectations (rating = 1):** The faculty member has achieved **five** of the categories
168 of teaching activities listed above in each year under review.

169

170 **Meets expectations (rating = 2):** The faculty member has achieved at least **two** of the
171 categories of teaching activities listed above in each year under review.

172

173 **Does not meet expectations (rating = 3):** The faculty member has achieved **one** of the
174 categories of teaching activities listed above in each year under review.

175

176 **Unsatisfactory (rating = 4):** The faculty member has achieved an average of fewer than one
177 of the categories of teaching activities listed above over the five years under review.

178

179 **Service** rating on the four-point scale is based on activities including but not limited to the
180 following four categories:

181 1. Activities in department, college, and university-level committees.

182 2. Service to the students, including mentorship of clubs, letters of recommendation.

183 3. Service to the scientific and professional community, including but not limited to
184 manuscript and proposal peer-review, journal editorships, leadership in professional
185 organizations, organization of symposia/meetings.

186 4. Service to the community at large, including but not limited to outreach activities such as
187 workshops for K-12 teachers, judging science fairs, and presentations to community
188 members.

189

190 **Exceeds expectations (rating = 1):** The faculty member has achieved at least **three**
191 categories of activities from the list above in each year of the five years under review.

192

193 **Meets expectations (rating = 2):** The faculty member has achieved at least **two** categories of
194 activities from the list above in each year of the five years under review.

195

196 **Does not meet expectations (rating = 3):** The faculty member has achieved **one** category of
197 activities from the list above in each year of the five years under review.

198

199 **Unsatisfactory (rating = 4):** The faculty member has achieved an average of fewer than one
200 of the categories of activities from the list above over the five years under review.