

School of Geosciences

Approved by CAS Dean’s Office and Office of the Provost 9/6/2023

Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Evaluation Matrix—Developed for BOG Regulation 10.003

This matrix will be used by the SGS Director, in collaboration with the Associate Chairs, to complete the department stage of PTR. The Director will consult with the Faculty Advisory Committee on any cases that are initially assessed as anything less than meets expectations. This document was developed by the SGS Director, without the direct input of the SGS Faculty.

RESEARCH

Evaluation ratings in the area of Research (which includes scholarship) generally reflect the faculty member’s research productivity and impact. Research/scholarly productivity should generally be commensurate with the proportion of faculty duties assigned in the research category (e.g., productivity expectations for faculty with a 40% research assignment will be higher than for faculty with a 20% research assignment). As the review criteria are written toward an approximate 40% research workload commensurate with a standard 2-1 teaching assignment, the criteria below must be adjusted proportionally for any deviations from this average. Partial scores (e.g. 2.5 or 3.5) are allowable for borderline cases within each scoring category. Additionally, there is flexibility within each scoring category to compensate for a faculty member exceeding in one criterion but lacking in another.

Post-Tenure Expectations: Tenured faculty are expected to achieve a record of excellent record of research compared to their peers in SGS and within their broader discipline.

Exceeds Expectations (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (4)
<p>Faculty exceed expectations when they demonstrate a clear and significant accomplishment that is exceptional in comparison to faculty across their unit and discipline:</p> <p>(a) continuous and successful efforts toward external funding for their research.</p>	<p>Faculty meet expectations when they demonstrate average performance within the SGS and broader discipline:</p> <p>(a) demonstrated efforts to attain sufficient internal and/or external funding to support their research.</p>	<p>Faculty do not meet expectations when they demonstrate performance below that expected in the SGS and discipline, including:</p> <p>(a) no efforts to obtain internal or external funding for research during the five-year</p>	<p>Faculty demonstrate unsatisfactory performance when they are not actively engaged in research or scholarship consistent with their research assignment, for more than two years of the</p>

<p>(b) above-average publication rate in high impact outlets (e.g. average of 2.5 or more high impact papers per year)</p> <p>(c) other research impacts that support their position as a leading scholar in their discipline, as determined from completed annual reviews and the candidate's narrative.</p>	<p>(b) publish research results in high impact, peer-reviewed journals, books, book chapters, and/or monographs (average of 1-2 articles per year, or equivalent in other types of publications)</p> <p>(c) provide evidence of significant research impact or professional as a leading or emerging scholar in their field, as determined appropriate for discipline from completed annual reviews and the candidate's narrative. Candidates may submit evidence of academic or applied impacts in quantitative (e.g. impact factors, citation metrics) or qualitative terms (e.g. awards, honors, scholarly recognition by peers, appointments), as best suited to their discipline.</p>	<p>period, especially when funding is needed to complete research in the discipline;</p> <p>(b) little progress on any scholarly products or few completed research products (i.e. 2-4 papers or equivalent)</p> <p>(c) lack of research impact or professional recognition</p>	<p>five-year period or productivity is cumulatively below the standards for a rating of (3).</p>
---	--	---	--

TEACHING

Teaching activities may pertain to formal courses and to student mentoring, professional development, and advising. Teaching activity will be evaluated holistically, not just based on student evaluations. The School of Geosciences recognizes (a) that teaching “performance” is multidimensional, (b) that excellence in teaching can be demonstrated in different ways, and (c) ratings for some courses and for some types of courses (regardless of instructor) are typically higher or lower than others. The SGS also acknowledges that student evaluations can be biased based on gender, race, and other categories and will take that under consideration during review. In terms of advising, evaluating student advising and mentoring must be commensurate with both workload and access to students which may be campus-specific. Partial scores (e.g. 2.5 or 3.5) are allowable for borderline cases within each scoring category. Additionally, there is flexibility within each scoring category to compensate for a faculty member exceeding in one criterion but lacking in another.

Post-Tenure Expectations: Tenured faculty are expected to achieve a record of excellent teaching compared to their peers in SGS and within their broader discipline.

Exceeds Expectations (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (4)
<p>Faculty exceed expectations when they demonstrate exceptional performance as compared to the SGS and broader discipline:</p> <p>(a) teaching duties are performed effectively and support both undergraduate and graduate education; courses are innovative, transformative, engaging, or have a high impact in some facet.</p> <p>(b) faculty makes other instructional contributions to the SGS or</p>	<p>Faculty meet expectations when they demonstrate average performance as compared to the SGS and broader discipline:</p> <p>(a) teaching duties were performed as assigned, ideally supporting both undergraduate and graduate students. Existing courses are maintained and updated, as needed.</p> <p>(b) student evaluation comments and/or ratings do not consistently raise clear and obvious problems</p>	<p>Faculty do not meet expectations when:</p> <p>(a) teaching duties were only performed partially, or not as assigned.</p> <p>(b) student evaluation comments and/or ratings consistently raise clear and obvious problems, such as unresponsiveness to student questions, ineffective communication, disrespect to students, or failure to provide</p>	<p>Faculty demonstrate unsatisfactory performance when they do not provide clear evidence of adequate teaching performance and/or effectiveness at the level expected for the rank for more than two years; or failure to complete assigned teaching duties in undergraduate courses, graduate courses, or graduate student</p>

<p>discipline outside the classroom, such as through general education certification, mentoring, professional development activities, community education, and so forth.</p> <p>(c) student evaluation comments and/or ratings convey a positive student experience and do not consistently raise clear or obvious problems with instruction;</p> <p>(d) successful supervision and mentoring of undergraduate or graduate students, as demonstrated by number of advisees and graduates, job placements, and so forth.</p>	<p>with instruction.</p> <p>(c) evidence of supervision or mentoring of undergraduate or graduate students</p>	<p>required disability accommodations.</p> <p>(c) there is limited to no supervision of graduate and undergraduate students, or comparable activities.</p>	<p>advising.</p>
---	--	--	------------------

SERVICE/ADMINISTRATION

The School of Geosciences recognizes (a) that university service (and administration, where applicable) activities of equal importance or impact can occur at different “levels” (e.g., university, college, and school); (b) that service activities of equal importance or impact can occur in different domains (e.g., university, professional), (c) that excellence in service can be demonstrated in different ways, and (d) that service expectations fluctuate with workload, leave, and rank . The following rating guidelines will be interpreted with respect these factors. Partial scores (e.g. 2.5 or 3.5) are allowable for borderline cases within each scoring category. Additionally, there is flexibility within each scoring category to compensate for a faculty member exceeding in one criterion but lacking in another.

Post-Tenure Expectations: Tenured faculty are expected to achieve a record of excellent service compared to their peers in SGS and within their broader discipline.

Exceeds Expectations (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (4)
<p>Faculty exceed expectations when they demonstrate exceptional performance as compared to the SGS and broader discipline:</p> <p>(a) continuous service within the SGS, including either leadership activity (administrative duties, committee chair, program director, or equivalent) and/or regular intensive service (multiple committees, heavy workload or responsibility).</p> <p>(b) evidence of service at the college or university levels</p>	<p>Faculty meet expectations when they demonstrate average performance as compared to the SGS and broader discipline:</p> <p>(a) evidence of service within the SGS, college, and/or university, such as participation in activities, committees, meetings, events, and so forth.</p> <p>(b) evidence of professional service, through the academic discipline, community, or other outlet.</p>	<p>Faculty do not meet expectations when:</p> <p>(a) university service activity is below expectations within the SGS for most years during the review period, such as unwillingness to serve on SGS committees;</p> <p>(b) external service to discipline or community is lacking during most years of the review period.</p>	<p>Faculty demonstrate unsatisfactory performance when they display no effective service activity at the level expected for the rank, for more than two years.</p>

<p>(c) evidence of leadership and service within the academic discipline or community, such as holding offices, positions, or other leadership roles; participation in special task forces or boards; serving as an editor; significant engagement with the community; and so forth.</p>			
--	--	--	--

OVERALL PTR RATING

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 a weighted total, derived by multiplying scores from each of the three evaluative domains (i.e., Research, Teaching, and and Service/Administration) by the faculty member's assignment percentage in that domain and using the sum of those figures; the overall rating will be reported as the nearest whole number.

Exceeds Expectations (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (4)
<p>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.</p>	<p>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'</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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</p>

			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.
--	--	--	--