Submitted: September 2023
Approved by the Dean's Office and Office of the Provost: 9/18/2023

School of Public Affairs (SPA) Criteria for Post Tenure Review

In alignment with Board of Governors' regulation 10.003, as well as state law, all tenured faculty members at the University of South Florida (USF) are subject to Post-Tenure Review (PTR) every five years. The School of Public Affairs (SPA) will follow the USF regulation 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.

With regard to PTR review criteria USF Regulation Section II(3)(b) states:

Since tenured faculty at the University of South Florida undergo annual merit evaluations post-tenure, it is expected that the post-tenure review criteria for a comprehensive 5-year review shall be based on currently approved unit-level or college-level criteria consistent with rank and assigned duties. Evaluations shall be based on rating categories of Post-Tenure Review BOG Regulation 10.003 or follow university level guidance provided in section (3)(c).

Accordingly, the School of Public Affairs has developed criteria for each comprehensive 5-year PTR review based on its' currently approved criteria for Annual Evaluations, consistent with rank and assigned duties.

PTR Review Packet:
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,

- The last five years of annual performance reviews as previously assessed by the School Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) and School Director,

- The previous five years of assigned duties for the faculty member,

- The faculty member's current curriculum vitae, and,

- 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.

PTR Rating Scale:
School of Public Affairs guidelines for post-tenure review 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 quantifiable school criteria for annual

evaluation. Post-tenure review will be based on the annual assignments of the faculty member across the five-year period under review.

Based on the PTR assessment, an OVERALL rating will be assigned using the 4-point scale specified in USF's Post-Tenure Review (PTR) regulation II(3)(c). This OVERALL rating will be determined in accordance with the faculty member's assignment percentage in each domain (i.e. Research, Teaching and Service).

Rating scale for post-tenure review:

1. **<u>Exceeds expectations</u>:** a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performances 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. **<u>Meets expectations</u>:** 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. **<u>Does not meet expectations</u>:** 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 five 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. **<u>Unsatisfactory</u>:** failure to meet expectation 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 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.

Faculty members who receive an OVERALL score of 4 will be given a non-renewal notice, and faculty members who receive an OVERALL score of 3 will be placed on a Performance Improvement Plan that will articulate benchmarks that the faculty member must achieve within

one year. Faculty members who fail to meet those benchmarks will be given a non-renewal notice.

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

PTR Review Criteria:
The following criteria for post-tenure review in the School of Public Affairs are drawn from university approved criteria for annual faculty performance evaluations:

Teaching
The School of Public Affairs 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. SPA faculty are expected to (a) abide by university guidelines with respect to the preparation of course syllabi, (b) provide students with a high quality engaged experience, (c) achieve overall student evaluation ratings that meet department and/or college averages for similar courses, (d) advise and mentor graduate students in applied research projects which may include projects undertaken as part of a class assignment, capstone, thesis, or independent study. Teaching activities may pertain to formal courses and to student mentoring, professional development, and advising. Furthermore, engaged teaching techniques (e.g. service learning, community-engaged learning projects, etc.) often require additional effort and integration with course outcomes. As the School hosts professional, terminal degree programs, opportunities to serve on graduate theses and/or dissertation committees are limited. However, faculty members are encouraged to serve as supervisors of graduate students' independent research, and to direct undergraduate research projects.

The School of Public Affairs also recognizes that faculty will participate in a wide variety of class settings, from hands-on studio projects with a few graduate students to large on-line undergraduate courses. Student evaluations of instruction do factor into the overall assessment of teaching effectiveness, especially if consistent patterns are found in the comments from students from semester to semester. There are a variety of resources available across the University to enhance teaching effectiveness and faculty are expected to avail themselves of these opportunities.

In the School of Public Affairs, teaching should generally be commensurate with faculty assignment and the following rating guidelines are intended to reflect that diversity. No single indicator is necessary and may not be sufficient to warrant a given rating. Teaching activity will be evaluated holistically, not just based on a course evaluation score. Faculty can meet PTR criteria for a given rating in the domain of Teaching with qualifying performance indicators in at least two of the rating level descriptions.

Post-tenure review of teaching will be based on the previous five years of teaching activity and assignment for each year. The post-tenure review evaluation will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period. The criteria are as follows:

Exceeds Expectations (1)

Evidence of exceptional teaching performance and/or effectiveness for most years during the review period considering indicators such as the following:

- Student evaluation ratings predominantly in range with or exceed School and/or College averages for similar courses.
- Student comments that reflect or exceed above-average effective teaching performance.
- Evidence of syllabi that exceed university guidelines and reflect high quality, impactful teaching practices through content delivery methods, assignment, and assessments designed to meet stated goals of the course.
- Evidence of successful completion in the development of new courses and/or converting existing courses within or across modalities (i.e. face-to-face, online or hybrid in line with Innovative Education quality indicators.

Evidence of exceptional performance in facilitating student success, engagement, mentoring, professional development, and advising for most years during the review period considering indicators such as the following:

- Student ratings and/or narrative suggesting exceptional accessibility/responsivity to and effective communication with students.
- 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.
- Faculty narrative reflecting significant, positive efforts to increase student engagement.
- Faculty member has gone above and beyond usual expectations to facilitate student success, including accommodating more students when course demand is particularly high.
- Faculty member directs or serves on thesis and/or doctoral committees within the university.
- Faculty member directs undergraduate Honors Thesis or independent study.
- Faculty member is actively engaged with students in activities such as advising, capstones, ePortfolios, supervising and managing practicum and internships, and career planning/development and/or other forms of student engagement appropriate to the faculty member's assignment.
- Faculty member mentors students within their research and/or supervises student independent research.
- Faculty member receives teaching award and/or recognition.
- Demonstration of high quality and impactful community engaged teaching and learning practices through course deliverables (e.g., technical reports, project summaries, products produced by the class for use by the community, etc.).
- Presentation of exemplary innovative and/or community engaged teaching techniques, strategies, and practices at a highly regarded disciplinary conference.
- Recipient of competitive external funding to support engaged teaching and learning activities (e.g., service learning, community-based project, classroom techniques/tools, etc.).

Meets Expectations (2)
Evidence of satisfactory teaching performance and/or effectiveness that meets expectations within the School for most years during the review period, considering indicators such as the following:
- Student evaluation ratings predominantly and consistently at the School and College averages or slightly below with a reasonable narrative explanation from the faculty member.
- Student comments that reflect expected satisfactory teaching performance.
- Evidence of syllabi that meet required university guidelines and reflect accepted teaching practices, assignments, and assessments relevant to the discipline which meet stated goals of the course.
- Evidence of successful refreshing of existing courses by updating or enhancing more than 25% of content across modalities (i.e. face-to-face, online or hybrid) in line with quality indicators.

Evidence of satisfactory performance in facilitating student success, engagement, mentoring, professional development, and advising for most years during the review period, considering indicators such as the following:
- Student ratings and/or narrative suggesting satisfactory accessibility/responsivity to and effective communication with students.
- Meets expectations for attending to feedback from students, but without substantive course revisions and/or an articulated plan to assess the impact of those changes.
- Faculty narrative reflecting student engagement that meets expectations within the School.
- Faculty narrative indicating use of resources through USF CITL or related university resources to maintain expected teaching effectiveness.
- Faculty narrative indicating participation in resources offered through a recognized disciplinary or national organization to maintain expected teaching effectiveness.

Does Not Meet Expectations (3)
Evidence of below average teaching performance and/or effectiveness that fails to meet minimum expectations within the School for most years during the review period, considering indicators such as the following:
- Student evaluation ratings predominantly and consistently below the School and College averages with no reasonable narrative explanation to mitigate or contextualize them.
- Student comments that reflect less than satisfactory and/or predominantly inconsistent teaching performance
- Evidence of syllabi that predominantly lack clarity and/or do not meet required university guidelines or reflect accepted teaching practices, assignments, and assessments relevant to the discipline which meet stated goals of the course.
- Evidence of refreshing existing courses by updating or enhancing less than 25% of content across modalities (i.e. face-to-face, online or hybrid) in line with quality indicators.

Evidence of below average performance in facilitating student success, engagement, mentoring, professional development, and advising for most years during the review period, considering indicators such as the following:

- Student ratings and/or narrative suggesting below average or predominantly inconsistent accessibility/responsivity to and effective communication with students.
- Predominantly inconsistent in meeting expectations for attending to feedback from students, with minimal evidence of course revisions and/or an articulated plan to assess the impact of those changes.
- Faculty narrative reflecting predominantly inconsistent student engagement that meets expectations within the School.
- Minimal evidence of participation in or use of resources to enhance teaching effectiveness.

Unsatisfactory (4)

No clear evidence of adequate teaching performance and/or effectiveness at the level expected for the rank for more than two years during the review period, considering indicators such as the following:

- Student evaluation ratings significantly below the School and College averages with no reasonable narrative explanation to mitigate or contextualize them.
- Student comments suggest unsatisfactory and/or serious concerns with teaching performance and effectiveness.
- Evidence of syllabi that fail to follow required USF template requirements and/or are missing critical information pertinent to the course assignments and assessments of learning outcomes.
- Unsatisfactory or no evidence of refreshing existing courses by updating or enhancing content across modalities (i.e. face-to-face, online or hybrid) in line with quality indicators.

No clear evidence of facilitating student success, engagement, mentoring, professional development, and advising for more than two years during the review period, considering indicators such as the following:

- Student ratings and/or narrative with clear evidence that faculty member is inaccessible and non-responsive to students and ineffective communicating with students.
- Predominantly unsatisfactory or failure to meet expectations for attending to feedback from students, with no evidence of course revisions and/or an articulated plan to assess the impact of those changes.
- Unsatisfactory or lack of faculty narrative reflecting student engagement that meets expectations within the School.
- No evidence of use of resources or effort to enhance teaching effectiveness.

Research

The School of Public Affairs recognizes its' faculty members are a highly diverse group of scholars holding degrees from a variety of disciplines. This diversity translates into the creation of research products including but not limited to books; traditional journal articles; technical reports; community engaged scholarship; presentations to community, professional, and

academic audiences; as well as submissions for local, state, and federal government and foundation grants and contracts.

The School of Public Affairs expects faculty to engage in impactful scholarly work. This includes scholarly peer review as one indicator to assess the quality and impact of scholarship, however, we also value various kinds of peer review deemed appropriate particularly with regard to the impact of community-engaged scholarship. While impactful work may take place within scholarly journals and academic presses, it may also be produced in more accessible forums including online academic journals, policy reports, technical reports, applied community action projects and grant applications. Scholarship may take the form of multiple genres and may overlap with activism and pedagogy. "High-impact" should be addressed in the faculty narrative. Furthermore, the School of Public Affairs faculty believe quality takes precedence over quantity and therefore supports excellence in the research portfolio. This should be addressed in the faculty narrative.

Because the School of Public Affairs is oriented toward professional practice and community engagement, research-based scholarship shared with or conducted in partnership with the larger non-academic community may be a significant component of the faculty member's research record. Examples of such scholarship are: community needs assessments; research reports or papers for institutes, government agencies, or community groups; evaluations of impact of public policies on local communities; documentation and analysis of innovative public affairs programs for dissemination to other communities. Community-engaged scholarship in and of itself does not substitute for a successful record of peer-reviewed research but should be given serious consideration particularly in terms of narrative demonstration through factors including but not limited to visibility, circulation, impact on policies and procedures, citations, and research quality.

The School of Public Affairs acknowledges that receiving funding for one's research from external agencies with rigorous peer review of proposals is one indicator of research excellence. However, research funding may also come from other diverse sources including local, state, private, or foundation funding. The School expects faculty to demonstrate a record of applying for and/or securing internal or external forms of funding over the PTR period.

Post-tenure review evaluation ratings in the area of Research reflect the faculty member's research and *scholarship productivity*, (both developmental and completed projects), and research *impact and professional recognition* as a scholar. 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). The faculty member should provide a succinct narrative describing the work, its importance/significance, and its impact relevant to the discipline or area of research focus. Overall research activity will be evaluated holistically, not just based on the number of indicators. Faculty can meet criteria for a given rating in the domain of Research with qualifying performance indicators in one or both of the rating level descriptions.

Post-tenure review of research will be based on the previous five years of research activity and assignment for each year. The post-tenure review evaluation will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period. The criteria are as follows:

Exceeds Expectations (1)
Evidence of exceptional scholarship and research productivity over the review period considering indicators such as the following:

- Significant progress on and/or completion of 5 or more scholarly products or "high impact" forms of scholarship for each 20% Research Assignment over the review period including:
    - Accepted or Published manuscript for a peer reviewed journal, book or edited volume, or peer reviewed chapter.
    - Lead or Co-author of manuscript under revise and resubmit with academic journal or book press.
    - Publication of a book review or review essay, encyclopedia entry, technical report, or non-peer review article relevant to one's core research area.
    - Posting of juried or invited professional blog entry or published Op-Ed article.
    - Editing of a scholarly journal or book series.
    - PI/Co-PI on funded refereed external research grant.
    - PI/Co-PI on funded refereed internal research grant.
    - PI/Co-PI on submitted high impact external or internal competitive research grant.
    - Delivery of a scholarly paper and/or presentation at refereed international, national or regional disciplinary research conference.
    - Recipient of international, national, or regional research award or honor.
    - Demonstration of high quality and impactful community engaged research and scholarship (e.g. needs assessments; research or technical reports or papers for institutes, government agencies, or community groups/organizations; evaluations of public policy impact on communities; analysis of innovative public affairs programs/practices, etc.).
    - Implementation of high quality and impactful research project (e.g., data collection, data analysis, manuscript pages written, etc.).

Evidence of exceptional research impact or professional recognition of the faculty member's status as a leading or emerging scholar in their field over the review period considering indicators such as the following:
- 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 scholarship and research productivity over the review period considering indicators such as the following:

- Significant progress on and/or completion of at least 3 scholarly products, at least some of which are regarded "high impact" forms of scholarship, for each 20% Research Assignment over the review period including:
    - Accepted or Published manuscript for a peer reviewed journal, book or edited volume, or peer reviewed chapter.
    - Lead or Co-author of manuscript under revise and resubmit with academic journal or book press.
    - Publication of a book review or review essay, encyclopedia entry, technical report, or non-peer review article relevant to one's core research area.
    - Posting of juried or invited professional blog entry, or Op-Ed article.
    - Editing of a scholarly journal or book series.
    - PI/Co-PI on funded refereed external research grant.
    - PI/Co-PI on funded refereed internal research grant.
    - PI/Co-PI on submitted high impact external or internal competitive research grant.
    - Delivery of a scholarly paper and/or presentation at refereed international, national or regional disciplinary research conference.
    - Recipient of international, national, or regional research award or honor.
    - Demonstration of high quality and impactful community engaged research and scholarship (e.g. needs assessments; research or technical reports or papers for institutes, government agencies, or community groups/organizations; evaluations of public policy impact on communities; analysis of innovative public affairs programs/practices, etc.).
    - Implementation of high quality and impactful research project (e.g., data collection, data analysis, manuscript pages written, etc.).

Evidence of significant research impact or professional recognition of the faculty member's status as a leading or emerging scholar in their field over the review period considering indicators such as the following:
- 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)
Evidence shows less than minimal or no progress on any scholarly product (refer to list of scholarly products above), in accordance with Research Assignment, and/or minimal evidence of an ongoing significant research project over the review period.
- Manuscript in progress but not submitted for review.
- Research grant application (internal or external) in progress but not submitted for review.
- Presentation in progress but not submitted to academic or community engaged outlet for review.

Unsatisfactory (4)
Lack of evidence of being actively or consistently engaged in scholarly research or community engaged scholarship projects (refer to list of scholarly products above), consistent with Research Assignment over the five-year review period.

Service

The School of Public Affairs recognizes that Service to the University, College, School, Profession, and Community are integral components of our faculty identity. Since Service Assignments may vary despite the percent of assignment, the following should be noted:

      (a) University service activities of equal importance or impact can occur at different "levels" (e.g., university, college, and school);

      (b) Service activities of equal importance or impact can occur in different domains (e.g., university, professional, community);

      (c) Excellence in service can be demonstrated in different ways (e.g., committees, leadership, boards, etc.); and,

      (d) Tenured faculty are often called upon and at times expected to engage in a variety of Service activities due to their experience as senior members of the faculty.

The following rating guidelines are intended to reflect the points outlined above. Service should generally be commensurate with the proportion of faculty duties assigned in the service category (e.g., productivity expectations for faculty with a 10% service assignment will be higher than for faculty with a 5% service assignment). No single indicator is necessary and may not be sufficient to warrant a given rating. Service activity will be evaluated holistically, not just based on the number of indicators. 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.

Post-tenure review of service will be based on the previous five years of service activity and assignment for each year. The post-tenure review evaluation will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period. For reference, the following are deemed normal types of service in various categories; however, this list is not exhaustive. The criteria are as follows:

Exceeds Expectations (1)
Evidence of exceptional service activity for most years during the review period, considering indicators such as the following (typically more than three from list below):
- Serve in a leadership role (Chair/Co-chair) on school, college, or university committee.
- Serve in a leadership role of a professional or community organization or group.
- Serve as editor or on editorial board of an academic or professional journal.
- Serve as an invited grant reviewer.
- Participation in an accreditation, other educational, or disciplinary review board.
- Significant service to profession or disciplinary activities.
- Significant service to school, college, or university activities.
- Significant service to community-based organization activities.
- Serve as an active member on school, college, or university committee.
- Serve as an active member of a professional or community organization or group.
- Serve as a manuscript reviewer for an academic journal or book press.

- Serve in other forms of significant activity relevant to university, college, school, profession, or community.

Meets Expectations (2)
Evidence of service activity that meets minimum expectations within the School for most years during the review period, considering indicators such as those listed above (typically two to three activities from the list).

Does Not Meet Expectations (3)
Evidence shows Service activity that is below minimum expectations within the School for most years during the review period, considering indicators such as those listed above (typically one activity from the list).

Unsatisfactory (4)
Lack of evidence of Service activity at the level expected for the rank within the School for most years during the review period, considering indicators such as those listed above.

<u>PTR Rating Determination:</u>
As stated previously in this document, the rating criteria used to assess performance for a 5-year PTR review period are:

1 = Exceeds Expectations
2 = Meets Expectations
3 = Does Not Meet Expectations
4 = Unsatisfactory

In accordance with the 4-point ordinal scale specified in USF's Post-Tenure Review (PTR) regulation II(3)(c), the post-tenure review for the School of Public Affairs requires one, holistic evaluation score. This will be the weighted average of the scores in teaching, research, and service.