Submitted: September 2023
Approved by the Dean's Office and Office of the Provost: 9/15/2023

DEPARTMENT OF MOLECULAR BIOSCIENCES POST-TENURE REVIEW GUIDELINES

A. Purpose and Intent (verbatim from Academic Affairs USF Regulation):

"Pursuant to Florida Board of Governors (BOG) Regulation 10.003 Post-Tenure Faculty Review (PTR), this regulation provides authority for administration of Post-Tenure Faculty Review at the University of South Florida.

Post-tenure review is required of all tenured faculty members at USF 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)."

B. Timing and Eligibility (verbatim from Academic Affairs USF Regulation):

"Each tenured faculty member shall have a comprehensive post-tenure review of 5 years of performance in the fifth year following the last promotion or the last comprehensive review, whichever is later. For faculty hired with tenure, the hire date shall constitute the date of the last promotion. Faculty who have given written notice that they are leaving the university at the end of or during the academic year, including those retiring or resigning with a delayed date in the subsequent academic year, are excluded from the post-tenure review process. Also excluded are faculty in the process of a comprehensive promotion review during the current academic year. Exceptions to the post-tenure review clock may be considered, such as medical exigencies or parental situations covered by FMLA or ADA legislation or other extenuating circumstances approved by the University. A tenured faculty member under such circumstances may request an extension of his/her 5-year clock. The request must be made in writing and must be approved by the chair of the department, Dean, and the institution's designated senior academic officer overseeing the candidate's unit. Ordinarily, extensions of more than two years beyond the 5-year clock will not be permitted.

(a) The following timing will be followed for post-tenure review:

1. In the first year following the effective date of this regulation, 20% of tenured faculty will be evaluated, in addition to faculty in the fifth year as explained above.
2. In each of the second, third, fourth, and fifth years following the effective date of this regulation, 20% of tenured faculty who have not received a comprehensive review will be evaluated in addition to faculty who are in the fifth year as explained above.
3. Beginning with the sixth year, following the effective date of this regulation, the process outlined above shall be followed. (i.e., review in the fifth year following the last promotion or the last comprehensive review, whichever is later).

(b) Tenured faculty in administrative roles (chairs, directors or higher) shall be reviewed annually by their supervisors. Upon returning to a 1.0 FTE faculty role, these faculty shall undergo post-tenure review in the fifth year following a return to a full-time faculty appointment."

C. Evaluative Documents and Process Requirements (Refer to Post-Tenure Faculty Review Regulation, per Academic Affairs):

A "faculty-prepared packet" comprised of the following four materials will constitute the review components.

1. Faculty Narrative of accomplishments from the past five years, which highlights accomplishments and demonstrates performance relative to assigned duties. This narrative has a maximum limit of 12,000 characters.
2. Faculty's last five years of annual performance reviews (scores and comments) by the Chair.
3. Faculty's Curriculum Vitae or NIH Biosketch (not to exceed five pages, single-spaced).
4. Faculty members' disciplinary record (if any) over the past five years, to determine whether there is any evidence of non-compliance with state laws, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies. Only substantiated disciplinary matters will be considered for the purpose of a post-tenure review.

The MBS Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) will review the "faculty-prepared packet" and provide a summary narrative. The Department Chair will consider the FAC narrative in their evaluation 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 based on documented evidence. The Chair will also assign a performance rating consistent with the categories described below.

The College Dean will then evaluate the review packet submitted by the faculty member and the Chair's evaluation letter and rating. The Dean will provide a narrative (according to these departmental criteria) and assign a performance rating consistent with the categories described below.

Following Dean's review, the faculty member will have the opportunity to review the entire packet and have the option of providing a comment narrative (not to exceed 6,000 characters) for consideration by the Provost. The review packet will then be forwarded by the Dean to the Provost.

With guidance/oversight by the University President, the Provost will rate the faculty member's professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance during the review period according to these department criteria. The Provost may accept, reject, or modify the Dean's and Chair's recommended rating (see **Outcomes** section for appeals). Each faculty member will receive one of the following performance ratings below:

1. Exceeds expectations.
2. Meets expectations.
3. Does not meet expectations.
4. Unsatisfactory

D. Assessment of Quality of Efforts in Teaching, Research, and Service:

The criteria will accommodate faculty with different assignments (i.e., those with a 40% research assignment will have higher research expectations than those with a 20% research assignment) and those at different stages of their careers.

D.1a. Teaching

The *Faculty Member* may be involved in teaching undergraduate classes, graduate classes, laboratory classes, teaching lab supervision, laboratory supervision/training of students at any level (including post-docs), and/or curriculum development. Evaluation of the *Faculty Member's* effort in this category will be commensurate with the teaching assignment of the *Faculty Member.*

With respect to both classroom teaching and laboratory research supervision: *Highly effective* teaching refers to teaching which guides students in the acquisition of knowledge, in the fostering of critical and creative thinking skills, and in the development of communication skills. Laboratory research supervision also involves the fostering of appropriate research skills.

Evaluation of classroom teaching quality may include consideration to the following factors: (a) student course evaluations (noting the percent of students providing evaluations, class size, summary of comments, and faculty response), (b) peer faculty teaching evaluations and faculty response if conducted, and (c) plans for correction for classes with low student and peer evaluations. With respect to faculty with higher teaching load, efforts to update curricula and/or engaging in development of new curricula may also be considered.

Evaluation of laboratory research supervision quality may include consideration to the following factors: (a) mentoring of graduate students and post-doctoral scholars, (b) assessment of mentoring quality (e.g., assessment of progress of graduate students toward their degree such as qualifying exam, successful thesis or dissertation defense, publications and presentations) and progress of post-doctoral scholars toward career goals (e.g., publications and presentations), (c) service on thesis and dissertation committees such as those involving non-thesis MS, thesis MS, and PhD students, which includes grading of written qualifying examinations, and/or (d) mentoring of undergraduate students.

Overall evaluation of teaching will be based on any of the following categories of activity during the past five years [1], depending upon the faculty's assignment:
(1) Peer and/or student evaluations (relative to average departmental/college ratings and/or generally positive comments). Student evaluations will be considered with respect to factors that have been demonstrated to have negative impacts that are independent of teaching skills and course content (i.e., class size, etc.). In reference to factors (gender, age, race, etc.) affecting student teaching assessments (https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2022/10/31/ratings-and-bias-against-women-over-time), the PTR Reviewers must be cognizant of such issues. The PTR Reviewers will consider these and other relevant issues in the evaluations.
(2) Laboratory research supervision of students (and post-doctoral fellows). This category may also include teaching undergraduate students in course-based undergraduate research experiences (CUREs).
(3) Developing a new class or substantially improving an existing class with updates to the curriculum and/or content delivery to match best practices for learning outcomes.
(4) Evidence of sustained use and content updates consistent with best pedagogical practices.

[1] Teaching related awards can also be considered in the annual assessment of teaching.

(5) Supervising lecture teaching assistants and lab teaching assistants.

Criteria for Ratings:

Score of 1 (exceeds expectation) - yearly efforts over the assessment period show evidence of *highly effective* classroom teaching (i.e., equal or above departmental teaching evaluations), and/or *highly effective* laboratory research supervision, and/or *highly effective* engagement in another teaching activity.

Score of 2 (meets expectation) - yearly efforts over the assessment period show evidence of *satisfactory* classroom teaching (teaching evaluations in some courses may be below department average but with evidence of improvements), and/or evidence of effective laboratory research supervision e.g., students progressing in a timely manner, generation of external outputs (publications, abstracts, presentations), and/or evidence of another teaching activity.

Score of 3 (does not meet expectations) - whilst teaching occurred annually, the teaching evaluations reflect well below average teaching evaluations along with a lack of remediation efforts and an absence of any other activities, or limited evidence of laboratory research supervision e.g., students not progressing, no external outputs (publications, abstracts, presentations), or limited evidence of another teaching activity.

Score of 4 (unsatisfactory) - yearly efforts over the assessment period show **consistently poor teaching evaluations, or no evidence of laboratory research supervision, or no evidence of another teaching activity.** This category also indicates **serious issues with fulfilling teaching responsibilities (lack of attendance, lack of communication with students, lack of grade submission).**

D.1b Other Instructional Effort

Leadership duties (i.e., associate chair, graduate director, undergraduate director, research director, etc.) are assessed in this category. Evidence of these contributions must be provided in the *Faculty Member's* narrative in terms of the nature, extent, outcomes, and impact of their effort.

Criteria for Ratings:

Score of 1 (exceeds expectations) - this rating during the assessment period involves performing required duties pertaining to the position annually. This score also reflects overall **generally positive comments** from the departmental level.

Score of 2 (meets expectations) - this rating during the assessment period involves performing required duties pertaining to the position annually. Only **minor concerns** are noted at the departmental level.

Score of 3 (does not meet expectations) - this rating during the assessment period involves commitment to the required duties pertaining to the position but with **major concerns** at the departmental level.

Score of 4 (unsatisfactory) - this rating during the assessment period reflects **lack of demonstrable commitment** to required duties annually and **major concerns** from the departmental level.

D.2 Research

Evaluation of research and scholarship efforts of *Faculty Members* will be based on activities described in the following three categories including, but not limited to [2]:

(1) Proposals, Grants, and Fellowships:
   a. PI, Co-PI, Subcontract
   b. Role in proposal writing and research undertaken.
   c. Allocation of the grant funds to the faculty member
   d. Multi-year, national, regional, or internal grants
   e. Status: awarded, under revision, scored/unscored
   f. Other research-related awards

(2) Presentations:
   a. Invited seminars and talks
   b. Poster presentations
   c. Role of the faculty member (i.e., presenter, collaborator, a mentor, etc.)

(3) Publications:
   a. Status: Published, Accepted, under Revision, Submitted (date and journal to be provided)
   b. Quartiles and impact factor
      i. In reference to Journal impact factors (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4967953/), the PTR Reviewers must be cognizant of such issues. The PTR Reviewers will consider these issues in the evaluations.
   c. Authorship Position and Contributions
   d. Other creative works (i.e., patents)

Exceeds expectations in research (equivalent criterion score of 1) consists of making a substantial contribution to peer-reviewed scholarship in the faculty member's research area of expertise. *Faculty Members* are expected to have sufficient funds to support their own research program enabling support of graduate students in their own laboratories. The PTR Reviewers will be cognizant to the diversity of grant funding amounts (grant amounts required to support one's research fully; based on research area), diversity of number of publications (multiple small publications versus one large publication and types of publications), and the diversity in the time required to publish (publication possible within a short span of time compared to longer time period to complete the required work) based on the faculty member's area of research. In this regard, it is required of the faculty member to provide sufficient detail within the research narrative (e.g., grant expenditures, quality/impact of publications, contributions to collaborative studies, etc.) that will help the PTR Reviewers to assess each individual case fairly.

Please note flexibility in criteria [3].

Criteria for Ratings:

Score of 1 (exceeds expectations) - yearly efforts over the assessment period demonstrate achievement in **all of the above three** categories described above including a PI-led grant to support the

[2] Other indicators of esteem for research may include consultancy roles, membership of (and role in) national and international consortia, election to esteemed bodies, active grant and manuscript reviewing, active editorial board membership.

[3] Consideration will be given to number of grants submitted as PI, papers submitted/under revision, etc. The number of grant submissions will be assessed together with quality of scores/reviews. Efforts to publish (manuscripts submitted, under review, under revision, etc.) will also be considered, in the absence of published manuscripts for the past five years.

faculty's research program along with a corresponding author manuscript and a scientific conference presentation (can be either a student or a faculty presentation).

Score of 2 (meets expectations) - yearly efforts over the assessment period demonstrate achievement in **two** of the above categories of products described above including submission of ≥ 1 large multi-year grant(s) along with publishing a paper or a presentation (can be either a student or a faculty presentation).

Score of 3 (does not meet expectations) - yearly efforts over the assessment period demonstrate minimal achievement in **two** categories of products described above including ONLY a submission of a grant proposal with ONLY efforts in manuscript preparation without product(s) over the collective period.

Score of 4 (unsatisfactory) - yearly efforts over the assessment period demonstrate **no** evidence of research efforts in any of the above categories. This category also indicates **serious issues with fulfilling research responsibilities.**

D.3 Service

A *Tenured Faculty Member* is expected to *serve* in the operation of a *Faculty Member's* university and professional communities (i.e., through multiple engagements). *Faculty Members* serving as regular members on prestigious grant review panels (i.e., NIH study section panels, including *ad hoc* membership) or leadership roles that are associated with a substantial time commitment are recognized and hence, not penalized for nominal service on internal committees.

Evaluation of service duties of *Faculty Members* will be based on activities described in the following three categories including, but not limited to:

a) Service to the university. This category includes but is not limited to departmental committees, college committees, school committees, and university committees. The role of the faculty member on these committees will be considered (i.e., chair versus member roles). Mentorship of junior faculty in/outside of MBS will also be recognized. This category also includes faculty engagement in departmental discussions.
b) Service to the *Faculty Members*' scientific and professional community. This category includes but is not limited to review of grant proposals (i.e., membership in proposal panels), editorial activities, peer-review of manuscripts and/or textbook chapters, leadership activities in international professional organizations, and organization of conferences/symposia.
c) Service to the community. This category includes but is not limited to community outreach activities (judging science fairs and presentation to community members) and partnerships.
d) Service to students. This category includes but is not limited to mentorship of clubs, letters of recommendations, or providing career counseling outside of typical instructional responsibility.

Criteria for Ratings:

Score of 1 (exceeds expectations) - the assessment period includes annual **contributions** to activities from **at least two of the above** (out of the **above four**) categories which must include *engagement to both* the University and Professional Community.
Score of 2 (meets expectations) - the assessment period includes annual activities from **two** of the **above four** categories described above, of which one includes engagement to either the University or Professional Community (*Faculty Member did not participate in both* University and Professional service).
Score of 3 (does not meet expectations) - the assessment period includes annual activities from only **one** of the categories described above.
Score of 4 (unsatisfactory) - the assessment period includes annual activities from only **one or none** of the categories described above. The **service, if any, was compromised by lack of participation and/or attendance**.

E. Outcomes (verbatim from Academic Affairs USF Regulation):

"The PTR Outcomes will reflect Faculty Members' assignments. Therefore, the final overall rating, on the same scale, will be weighted based on the percentage assignment and evaluation in each area.

- For each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of "**exceeds expectations**," the appropriate college Dean, in consultation with the faculty member's department chair, shall recommend to the Provost, suitable recognition and compensation in accordance with the faculty member's performance and university regulations and policies. The Provost shall make the final determination regarding recognition and/or compensation.

- For each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of "**meets expectations**," the appropriate college Dean, in consultation with the faculty member's department chair, shall recommend to the Provost suitable recognition in accordance with the faculty member's performance and university regulations and policies. The Provost shall make the final determination regarding recognition.

- For each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of "**does not meet expectations**," the Dean, in consultation with the faculty member and the faculty member's department chair, shall propose a **performance improvement plan (PIP)** to the Provost. The plan must include a deadline for the faculty member to achieve the requirements of the PIP. The deadline may not extend more than 12 months past the date the faculty member receives the improvement plan.
    1. The PIP shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated departmental or college/school criteria developed under the provision of this procedure) will be remedied. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to

implement the plan adopted. Although each PIP is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan must list specific deficiencies to be addressed; define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies; outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes; identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan; set timelines for achieving goals and outcomes; and indicate the criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan.

2. The faculty member and department chair will meet regularly (quarterly at a minimum) to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies. The faculty member will provide at the end of each semester a progress report to the department chair and to the Dean. Further evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the regular faculty performance evaluation process (e.g., annual reviews) may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals set forth in the PIP.
3. Each faculty member who fails to meet the requirements of a PIP by the established deadline as determined by the Provost, in consultation with the Dean and department chair shall receive a notice of termination from the Provost. The faculty member will be afforded a 12-month non-renewal period of their tenured appointment.

- Each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of "**unsatisfactory**" shall receive a notice of termination from the Provost. The faculty member will be afforded a 12-month non-renewal period.

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