

Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Post-Tenure Review Guidelines and Criteria

Tenured faculty members in Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (WGSS) will follow all procedures and guidelines for post-tenure review as outlined by USF and approved by the USF BOT, including procedures for appeal. This document outlines expectations for WGSS faculty members and explains criteria for the rating scale laid out in that document.

Post-tenure review does not include involvement of the WGSS department Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC), since the FEC will have already written five years' worth of annual evaluations. However, since WGSS operates as a more egalitarian unit than the overall institution, a faculty member or department chair may request input from the WGSS FEC; it should be noted, however, that the process does not make space for a separate narrative written by the FEC.

A faculty member's post-tenure review packet shall consist of the following:

1. The faculty member's current CV
2. The faculty member's most recent five annual reviews in their entirety
3. An optional narrative record of accomplishments for the past five years, written by the faculty member, not to exceed 12,000 characters
4. If applicable, a record of any disciplinary actions involving the faculty member

OVERALL EXPECTATIONS

It is important for faculty members and the department chair to recognize that post-tenure review is not the same as annual review, tenure review, or promotion review. Faculty are not expected to re-earn tenure or promotion every five years. Tenured faculty are expected to maintain a record of ongoing productivity and excellence, but they may find different paths to those goals. The Department of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, in accordance with national and international disciplinary standards, recognizes that quality of productivity is as important as quantity.

Post-tenure review guidelines in the Department of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies will be conducted as a holistic evaluation of the post-tenure review period under review extrapolated from the criteria set forth in the department's most recent "Faculty Annual Review" guidelines, established in accordance with the department's "Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion Guidelines." The post-tenure evaluation must account for and reflect the faculty member's entire five years of workload assignments in research, teaching, service, and, when applicable, administration over the entire post-tenure period, including, where applicable, summer assignments, and sabbaticals/professional development leave.

Post-tenure reviews are to be based on:

- The past five years of annual evaluations: If a faculty member has been receiving evaluations that indicate outstanding every year, they cannot be determined to be performing less than meets expectations at post-tenure review. By the same token, if a faculty member is receiving annual evaluations indicating needs improvement and has not addressed those needed changes, they cannot be said to be exceeding expectations.
- Assigned duties: If a faculty member has taken on an unusually heavy teaching load, they cannot be judged to be deficient in research at post-tenure review, for instance (or judged deficient in teaching if they have had research releases for research). Likewise, if a faculty member takes on an unusually heavy service / administrative burden that is recognized in their assigned duties, they cannot be judged as lacking in other areas for which there is no or reduced assignment.

RATING CATEGORIES

The state-mandated categories are:

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 five 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 five years or 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 five 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.

WGSS will translate the university-mandated annual evaluation rating categories (a 5-point scale) to accommodate the state-mandated post-tenure review categories (a 4-point scale) separately for research, teaching and service. Faculty who are evaluated as having “exceeded expectations” in all three areas will receive a final overall rating of “exceeds expectation (1).” This translation is based on the WGSS department’s university-approved Tenure and Promotion document and the WGSS department-approved Faculty Annual Review Guidelines.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR RESEARCH

Tenured faculty members with a research assignment in the Department of Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies are expected to demonstrate a record of high-quality scholarship during the period under review, whether single-/co-authored or single-/co-edited.

Faculty members in WGSS have a choice to be reviewed for Tenure and Promotion under either the School of Social Sciences or the School of Humanities in the College of Arts and Sciences because of the interdisciplinary nature of WGSS. As these disciplines differ in terms of research expectations, faculty undergoing post-tenure review also may choose to be evaluated using the Schools of Social Sciences or Humanities expectations as discussed in our Tenure and Promotion document.

Evidence of productive scholarship can include effort in production or process including the preparation, submission, revision, data collection/analysis, presentation, and/or publication of work. For works in progress, such as book manuscripts or multiple-year grants, faculty members will be given significant latitude. Evidence also can include research awards and recognitions or other extraordinary research circumstances. Items to be considered include, but are not limited to, the following from the WGSS Tenure and Promotion document:

- Books, monographs, anthologies, edited collections, and textbooks
- Peer-reviewed journal articles
- Chapters in edited collections and anthologies, including introductions and conclusions
- Externally or internally funded grants as PI or Co-PI
- New and updated editions of previous work
- Community-engaged scholarship leading to substantive products
- Encyclopedia entries related to the discipline or sub-discipline(s)

- Invited or peer-reviewed conference presentations
- National or international awards, honors, fellowships, institutional appointments, etc.
- Invited work in journals or national or international contexts, including plenaries, symposia, assemblies, etc.
- Work produced in collaboration with scholars/researchers in other countries or with scholars/researchers working externally to the University of South Florida
- Reprints of previously published work, such as journal articles reprinted as book chapters
- Editorships of national or international journals or publishers
- Editorial board service for national and international journals or publishers
- Guest editing for special issues of journals
- Organizing or planning national or international conferences or conference programs for the discipline or sub-discipline(s)
- Doing program reviews and/or evaluations for national and international organizations
- Contracts, consultancies, reviews for national or international organizations

Post-tenure review of research will be based on a holistic evaluation of the faculty member's previous five years of research activities and a five-year average of the faculty member's research assignment. As the WGSS Tenure and Promotion document states, scholarly articles are usually 8000-10,000 words, and monographs are typically 90,000 – 100,000; items particularly shorter or longer than average should be noted and considered as part of the well-rounded program of research. The Department chair will be given latitude in discerning substantial differences in effort between, for example, a book manuscript and a journal article. Faculty members should discuss edited works, such as special issues or anthologies, with the FEC and/or department chair well in advance of post-tenure review to agree on equivalence(s) to other published work. At post-tenure review, only the department chair may evaluate the value of products shorter or longer than the average length of journal articles, chapters, or manuscripts; however, the chair should not deviate from the evaluation of those works which were previously assessed as part of the faculty members' annual evaluations during the post-tenure period. Such products should be noted and considered by the chair as part of the faculty member's overall research effort and should be discussed in terms of the impact and/or contribution of the work to the discipline and/or subdisciplines.

A tenured faculty member under post-tenure review can expect to be evaluated on research as follows:

1. Exceeds Expectations: A faculty member will have exceeded expectations by participating in 7 or more of the above activities, including a book manuscript (published or in process, edited or not), and/or 3 or more journal articles or book chapters, and/or 1 external grant, over the five-year period under review.

2. Meets Expectations: A faculty member will have met expectations by participating in 5-6 of the above activities, including a book manuscript (published or in process, edited or not), and/or 2 or more journal articles or book chapters, and/or 1 external grant, over the five-year period under review.
3. Does Not Meet Expectations: A faculty member does not meet expectations if the faculty member's scholarly performance results in only 1-4 of the above activities over the five-year period under review.
4. Unsatisfactory: A faculty member's research performance is unsatisfactory if they fail to engage in any of the above activities over the five-year period under review.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR TEACHING

Tenured faculty in the Department of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies are expected to fulfill all of their basic teaching obligations with integrity, to meet departmental teaching needs, and to provide rigorous and up-to-date courses to their students. Reviewing the teaching record of a tenured faculty member for post-tenure evaluation must account for the five-year average of their teaching assignment, unusually heavy teaching loads such as teaching large classes, required classes, or intensive classes, and other extraordinary circumstances of teaching.

As the WGSS Tenure and Promotion document notes, because research has established that student evaluations of teaching may be biased against women faculty and faculty of color, average E8 scores that are no more than .25 lower than college averages may be reconsidered based upon other measures of quality instruction, including but not limited to: peer evaluations, reviews of teaching portfolios, and faculty reflections.

Per the WGSS Faculty Annual Evaluation Guidelines, factors to consider when assessing a faculty member's post-tenure teaching record include, but are not limited to:

Meeting Department Needs

- Teaching courses that fulfill General Education, major or minor, and/or graduate requirements
- Teaching large-enrollment courses or in multiple modalities
- Curriculum development, new courses, course proposals, including developing proposals that will meet college and university initiatives or requirements (such as General Education)
- Stimulating interest in WGSS (recruiting majors/minors and/or graduate students; sponsoring student organizations concerned with WGSS; attending recruiting events and/or preparing material for such events, etc.)

Meeting Student Needs

- Course materials that are organized, thorough, and well-presented
- Course content that is rigorous and appropriate to the level of the course
- Support to at-risk or underrepresented students

Mentoring

- Involvement in one-on-one instruction and/or mentoring as appropriate to position (directing/serving on thesis committees, portfolio committees, directing internships, directed readings, advising, etc.)
- Supervising graduate teaching assistants
- Participation in course observation, as observer or observed
- Individual student mentoring, including career and graduate school guidance, letters of recommendation, and other emotional labor

Instructional Professional Development

- Innovative methods
- Significant course revisions
- Leading or participating in teaching workshops/seminars
- Publication or conference presentations on pedagogy

A tenured faculty member under post-tenure review can expect to be evaluated on teaching as follows:

1. Exceeds Expectations: A faculty member demonstrates excellence in 3 or more of the categories above with pedagogical activities in multiple (though not all) sub-categories and maintains a 5-year average E8 student evaluation rating that exceeds the college average over the period under review.
2. Meets Expectations: A faculty member demonstrates excellence in 2 categories above with pedagogical activities in multiple sub-categories and maintains a 5-year average E8 student evaluation rating that meets or exceeds the college average over the period under review.
3. Does Not Meet Expectations: A faculty member has fulfilled all the basic teaching obligations over the five-year period under review but may be providing courses that need more rigor, organization, or updating. There may be evidence of not meeting department or student needs, and the faculty member's 5-year average E8 student evaluation rating does not meet the college average.
4. Unsatisfactory: A faculty member has failed to engage in one or more of the basic teaching obligations over the five-year period under review.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SERVICE

Post-tenure review of service will be based on the previous five years of service activities and 5-year average service assignment. The post-tenure review will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period under review. For reference, the following are deemed typical types of service in various categories; however, this list is not exhaustive. We recognize that service commitments can vary by extent, quality, and value.

Department

- Faculty Evaluation Committee
- Committee as a Whole
- Unacknowledged administrative posts such as Graduate, Undergraduate, or Internship Director
- Standard and ad hoc committees
- Tenure/Promotion, Mid-tenure review committees
- Preparation of department external review
- Mentorship

College/University

- CAS school committees
- CAS committees
- University committees
- Faculty Senate
- Informal and ad hoc committees

Profession

- Journal manuscript review
- Book manuscript review
- External review for tenure and promotion
- Letters of recommendation
- Conference panel organizing
- Conference panel chair, discussant, or respondent
- Officer in professional organization, including divisions and interest groups

Community

- Work with public schools
- Public lecture
- Community engaged work

A tenured faculty member under post-tenure review can expect to be evaluated on service as follows:

1. Exceeds expectations: Participation on WGSS Department's Committee of a Whole, demonstrated leadership within the department, and sustained and substantive

engagement and evidence of leadership within at least two of the other 3 categories of service over the post-tenure period under review.

2. Meets expectations: Participation on WGSS Department's Committee of a Whole, significant engagement on another committee within the department, and sustained substantive engagement within at least two of the other 3 categories of service other than "Department" over the post-tenure period under review.
3. Does not meet expectations: Participation on Department's Committee of a Whole but either no sustained additional substantive departmental service or no sustained substantive engagement in any of the other categories of service over the post-tenure period under review.
4. Unsatisfactory: Failure to engage in any sustained substantive service within or outside the department over the post-tenure period under review.

(WGSS approved 9.10.23)