

## DEPARTMENT OF WORLD LANGUAGES CRITERIA FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW

Submitted: September 1, 2023

Approved by the Dean's Office and Office of the Provost: September 11, 2023

In alignment with University and Board of Governors' regulation 10.003, as well as Florida state law, all tenured faculty members in the Department of World Languages will undergo post-tenure review every five years. The post-tenure review is an evaluation of the previous five years of employment. The review will be conducted based on a dossier comprised of a narrative record of accomplishments prepared by the faculty member that covers the previous five years, departmental annual performance reviews for the previous five years, the faculty member's CV, and, if applicable, the faculty member's disciplinary record.

### FACULTY TASKS: CV & NARRATIVE

CV: The original guideless included a five-page CV intended to highlight the last five years. There is no limit to the size of the PDF that can be uploaded to Archivum, however, so faculty who wish to offer a longer CV are allowed to do so. Those entering longer CVs should consider the possibility that at some point in the process, a reader may only focus on the first five pages and should design the file accordingly.

Narrative: The Archivum limit is 12,000 characters including spaces. A faculty member is free to enter anywhere from 1 to 12,000 characters. Though the narrative is not required, those under review are highly encouraged to participate in this part of the process.

### DEPARTMENT GUIDELINES

Department of World Languages 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 department criteria for annual evaluation that were previously approved by the university.

The post-tenure review requires one holistic evaluation score. This score will be the weighted average of the scores in teaching, research, and service for the previous five years according to the faculty member's percentage assignments in those three categories averaged over the five-year period. Where there is a discrepancy in the scores given by the Salary, Tenure and Promotion committee and the department Chair, the average of the two will be used.

### **Rating categories for post-tenure review shall include the following:**

Exceeds expectations: 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. (1)

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 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. (2)

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 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. (3)

Unsatisfactory: 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. (4)

**The following criteria for post-tenure review are drawn from the university approved criteria for annual evaluations for the Department of World Languages.**

## **TEACHING**

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

### **Materials for Annual Evaluation:**

- A syllabus for each course: All syllabi must conform to the guidelines as articulated on the USF website (as of this writing [System Policy 11-008](https://www.usf.edu/innovative-education/citl/syllabus.aspx) <https://www.usf.edu/innovative-education/citl/syllabus.aspx> )

- Student evaluations (accessed online by evaluators): The STP committee and the Chair recognize the limitations of student evaluations and ratings in the assessment of successful teaching (e.g., participation level, implicit biases related to gender and racial identities, subject matter, level of course, difficulty of course material, anticipated grades) and use appropriate care in determining their effect on the rating. Faculty are encouraged to promote student participation in this process.
- A Teaching Narrative: To be written in prose or bullet-point form (250-500 words). The narrative allows the faculty member to supplement the information provided in the course syllabi. All relevant information should be included. The committee considers all relevant activity including items not listed in the examples below.

Examples of other information to include:

- thesis and dissertation activity
- new course development, course redesign (whether in process or submitted to Curriculog)
- new or proposed attributions such as Gen Ed and Global Citizens Project
- evidence of community-engaged teaching
- directing Honors Theses
- teaching awards
- supervision of lower-level language courses
- maintenance and updating of shared Canvas shells and course syllabi
- a leadership role in teaching within the department or section
- adoption or development of innovative teaching methods
- contributing to departmental needs in teaching (e.g., Gen Ed or FOT classes)
- evidence of dealing with special needs of students (e.g., altering curriculum for accessibility)
- mentoring (e.g., undergraduate research mentoring, supervising interns)
- participating in USF undergraduate research and/or Honors college activities
- publishing with students in venues not included in research assessment
- helping students present at regional or national conferences

## GUIDELINES FOR RATINGS

### Exceeds expectations: (1)

The faculty member presents a dossier containing:

- syllabi that not only meet university guidelines but reflect courses that challenge students intellectually, stimulate their interest, and develop their skills through assessments designed to meet the stated goals of the course
- a well-conceived Teaching Narrative that lists a variety of items from the above list or other relevant instructional activities
- mostly high numerical student ratings and an absence of patterns of criticism or complaints in the written commentary

Meets Expectations (2)

The faculty member presents a dossier containing:

- syllabi that not only meet university guidelines but reflect courses that challenge students intellectually, stimulate their interest, and develop their skills through assessments designed to meet the stated goals of the course
- a well-conceived Teaching Narrative that lists items from the above list or other relevant instructional activities
- middling or better student ratings and minimal evidence of patterns of criticism or complaints

Does not meet expectations (3):

The faculty member presents a dossier containing:

- syllabi with major lapses in both syllabus and course design
- a Teaching Narrative that does not describe satisfactory teaching effort
- lower numerical student ratings with patterns of criticism or complaints in the written commentary

Unsatisfactory (4):

The faculty member presents a dossier containing:

- syllabi lacking important required elements
- unacceptable lapses of quality in the design of courses
- a Teaching Narrative that does not describe teaching effort or a lack of Teaching Narrative
- student evaluations that reflect consistently low numbers and patterns of criticism or complaints

## RESEARCH

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

There are two lists below that will aid in determining the relative weight of research activities. List A contains the kind of high-level accomplishments associated with the granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to Full Professor, and receipt of the departmental annual rating of 5. List B contains a wide range of items that constitute scholarly activity. The numbered items at the top of list B are given more weight than the non-numbered items further down the list. Below the two lists are the guidelines that the evaluators will use for

determining each rating. The evaluators will also take into account activities not found on the lists when warranted. All items can occur multiple times.

#### LIST A

1. final acceptance or publication of a substantive peer-reviewed journal article
2. final acceptance or publication of a substantive peer-reviewed chapter in a scholarly book
3. receipt of a major award, grant, or fellowship that is nationally or internationally competitive, including various residential fellowships and those from private sources of funding
4. publication of a peer-reviewed scholarly monograph, edited volume, book-length critical edition, book-length translation, textbook, or other book

**PUBLICATION CREDIT:** Faculty members have two choices for when to claim credit for a publication, the year of final acceptance or the year in which it first appears. If a publication appears first online and then in print, or vice-versa, it only counts once. Each scholarly monograph will merit Outstanding for three years, while other books will merit Outstanding for two years. For books, the faculty member needs to indicate in which year the two- or three-year clock for credit will begin. Such decisions should be clearly articulated in the Research Narrative. In the absence of clear instructions, the decision will default to the year of first appearance.

#### LIST B (numbered)

1. submission of an article to a peer-reviewed journal
2. submission of a chapter for a peer-reviewed volume
3. delivery of a scholarly paper at a regional, national, or international refereed conference
4. delivery of an invited scholarly talk in an academic milieu (some talks are service)
5. submission of a book proposal including narrative and chapter outlines and/or evidence that a completed book manuscript is committed to a particular publisher
6. application for a grant or fellowship that is nationally or internationally competitive, including various residential fellowships and those from private funding sources
7. publication of a peer-reviewed translation or creative work

#### List B (non-numbered)

- a. serving as an invited respondent at a professional conference
- b. submission or publication of a book review or review essay
- c. submission of a translation or a creative work for publication in a peer-reviewed venue
- d. posting of juried or invited professional blog or website entry
- e. submission or publication of a non-peer reviewed article or essay
- f. submission or publication of an encyclopedia or sourcebook entry
- g. application for or receipt of a USF internal or small regional/local grant
- h. submission or publication of a translation of a peer-reviewed essay/article
- i. submission or publication of a literary translation (short piece)
- j. scholarly work in Digital Humanities (DOI required)
- k. sharing, with STP Committee, of one or more fully drafted book chapters

## GUIDELINES FOR RATINGS

### Exceeds Expectations (1)

- Monograph disciplines 1 item from list A plus 3 items from list B  
Non-monograph disciplines 2 items from list A plus 2 items from list B

### Meets Expectations (2)

- Monograph disciplines 3 items from list B of which 1 item must be from list B (1-7)  
Non-monograph disciplines 1 item from list A plus 2 items from list B (1-7)

### Does not meet expectations (3)

- All disciplines 2 items from list B, of which 1 item must be from list B (1-7)

### Unsatisfactory (4)

- All disciplines 2 or fewer items from anywhere in list B

## SERVICE

Post-tenure review of service will be based on the previous five years of evaluations and assignment for each year. The post-tenure review evaluation will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period.

There are three lists below. List A contains high-level service items that require significant time and effort and are not compensated by course releases or salary increase. List B is a combination of departmental, university, and professional service items, of which the numbered items at the top of the list will carry more weight. List C contains items related to community/public service and engagement. All items can be used multiple times. The evaluators will determine the weight of a given activity based on the details provided.

### List A

- a. membership on the STP committee
- b. Section Head
- c. membership on a college-level committee, council, task force (significant effort such as Gen Ed, SHUM Grad curriculum, Faculty council, SHUM T&P)
- d. membership on a university-level committee, council, or task force (significant effort)
- e. membership in the USF Faculty Senate
- f. major professional service (e.g., journal or book series editor, academic association office holder, main conference organizer) [if this is the only item from A, there must also be at least 1 item from B (1-4)]

### List B (numbered)

1. membership on department committees (e.g., Executive Committee, Diversity)
2. non-committee service to the department (e.g., colloquium organization)
3. membership on a college-level committee (lower effort)
4. membership on a university committee (lower effort)

List B (non-numbered)

- a. thesis/dissertation committee membership outside one's section/defense Chair
- b. recruitment efforts (department, section, program, university)
- c. formal faculty mentoring
- d. student club advisor
- e. reviewing for USF grants and external fellowship competitions
- f. membership on editorial boards
- g. conference organization work, panel Chair
- h. active non-leadership role in a professional scholarly organization (local, regional, national, international)
- i. peer-review of an article or book (a book counts twice)
- j. reviewing for external grants
- k. prize committees for scholarly associations

List C

- a. public lecture/presentation (to be distinguished from invited academic lecture)
- b. significant service to public schools
- c. significant service to community groups
- d. significant service to cultural groups
- e. significant service on art councils
- f. significant service to community colleges
- g. local/regional panel discussions
- h. unpaid translation for community members/groups

GUIDELINES FOR RATINGS

Exceeds Expectations (1)

1 item from list A plus 3 items from list B or C

or

5 items from list B or C of which 1 must be from B (1-4)

Meets Expectations (2)

4 items from list B or C of which at least 1 must be B (1-4)

Does not meet Expectations (3)

3 or 4 items from list B or C

Unsatisfactory (4)

2 items or fewer