

**SIGS Criteria for Post-Tenure Review**  
**Approved – 9-12-23**

In accordance with University and Board of Governors regulations, as well as state law, all tenured faculty members in the School of International Global Studies (SIGS) are subjected to post-tenure review every five years. The post-tenure review is an evaluation of the previous five years of employment. The review packet will be comprised of a narrative record of accomplishments over the previous five years prepared by the faculty member under review, the previous five years of annual evaluations, the faculty member's CV, and the faculty member's disciplinary record (if there is any).

SIGS guidelines for post-tenure review aim to ensure that the faculty member will be reviewed in relation to nationally recognized standards consistent with the disciplines encompassed within the School of Interdisciplinary Global Studies. These guidelines are based on SIGS' criteria for annual evaluation, adjusted to account for higher service expectations for regular tenured faculty and a five-year evaluation period. Barring exceptional circumstances, they should not yield scores that diverge significantly from the mean of the faculty member's last five annual evaluation scores as renormalized to the Board's 1-4 scale. Post-tenure review will reflect the annual Assigned Duties of the faculty member across the five-year period under review. Using the guidelines below, faculty will receive a score for their performance in teaching, research, and service. These scores will be weighted based on Assigned Duties percentages in teaching, research, and service and then averaged to arrive at an overall holistic rating.

Post-tenure reviews will be conducted by the SIGS Director in accordance with the criteria in this document. Faculty members may appeal the Director's evaluations, without prejudice, to the Faculty Executive Committee, who will use the same criteria of evaluation. The appeals process will be conducted following the process for appealing FEC Annual Evaluations specified in SIGS' Governance Document.

The following mandated rating categories will be used for post-tenure review:

1. 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.
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 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. 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.
4. 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.

The following criteria for post-tenure review of faculty in the School of Interdisciplinary Global Studies are drawn from SIGS' university-approved criteria for annual evaluations.

### **Teaching**

Post-tenure review of teaching will be predicated on the cumulation of reported teaching activities from the past five annual reviews and teaching assignments. The following accomplishments will merit the specified evaluations for a standard teaching assignment of 50%/year. For higher or lower teaching assignments, expectations will be proportionally higher or lower.

#### **Teaching activities include but are not limited to:**

- teaching undergraduate and graduate courses
- developing new courses or substantially revising courses
- writing and evaluating student comprehensive examinations
- supervising independent studies or undergraduate student research projects

- supervising or serving on committees for undergraduate honors' theses, master's theses, and dissertations
- organizing community/civic engagement, leadership, or study abroad programs; teaching/working with students engaged in such programs
- submitting grant proposals focused on instruction
- publishing scholarly articles related to education in one's field

Highly effective classroom teaching consists of teaching that effectively guides students in the acquisition of disciplinary knowledge, fosters students' critical and creative thinking skills, and helps students to develop proficiency in oral and written communication. It includes but is not limited to:

- effective course design (including the selection of relevant and appropriately current course materials)
- rigorous readings and assignments
- fair evaluation of, and instructional feedback on, student work

#### **Guidelines for “Exceed Expectations” in Teaching:**

SIGS considers “exceeds expectations” in teaching to consist of highly effective classroom teaching combined with evidence of a commitment to teaching through at least one of the following additional activities:

- Teaching enhancement and innovation
- Curriculum and program development
- Effective mentoring
- Contributing to departmental teaching needs

Faculty are not required to participate in all teaching activities identified above to exceed expectations. In particular, given the significant disparity in specialties of graduate students in SIGS as well as potential disparities in access to graduate teaching depending on campus location, expectations for the rating of “exceeds expectations” in teaching will vary accordingly. “Exceeds expectations” in teaching for faculty in subject areas with significant numbers of graduate students and access to graduate teaching will include active participation in the graduate program, including teaching graduate courses and sections, participating in the comprehensive exam process, and/or serving on thesis and/or dissertation committees. “Exceeds expectations” in teaching for faculty in subject areas with few numbers of graduate students will be focused on their active participation in the undergraduate program.

#### **Guidelines for “Meets Expectations” in Teaching:**

SIGS considers “meets expectations” in teaching to consist of reasonably effective classroom teaching with no additional teaching activities from the four additional activities listed under the guidelines for “exceeds expectations” in teaching.

**Guidelines for “Does Not Meet Expectations” in Teaching:**

SISGS considers “does not meet expectations” in teaching to consist of no apparent evidence of the criteria for a “meets expectations” in teaching rating.

**Guidelines for “Unsatisfactory” in Teaching:**

SIGS considers “unsatisfactory in teaching” to consist of no apparent evidence of the criteria for “does not meet expectations” rating and student assessments or other evidence that also point to problematic teaching.

**Assessing Teaching**

- The SIGS Director will make use of all materials provided in the file in order to evaluate teaching.
- Faculty may request peer observations of their teaching to provide additional documentation for their report. Peer observations will be done by an ad-hoc committee consisting of the director and other faculty members in the person’s area of specialty. The committee will make use of guidelines provided by USF’s institutions that support effective teaching for observing teaching. Peer observations may be useful but are not required to demonstrate that one has exceeded expectations in teaching. Peer observations must be scheduled at least two weeks before the observation occurs.
- Students’ assessments of faculty teaching will be taken into consideration, particularly insofar as they can indicate faculty members’ dedication and effort in the classroom, respect for students, accessibility to students, and ability to inspire interest in the material. However, given scholarly evidence of validity problems – especially, but not only, where response rates are low – and potential bias with student assessments, the review will be based primarily on judgments by faculty rather than students. Consideration of student assessments will be context dependent, taking into account the rigor of the class, the size and level of the class, the modality of class delivery, the representativeness of the response rate, the relevance of students’ implicit biases, and other factors that are historically associated with lower or higher student assessments. In particular, faculty whose teaching otherwise demonstrates effective course design, rigor, fairness, and respectful treatment of students will not have their evaluation lowered because of lower than average student assessments.
- The SIGS Director will use the criteria as a general guide to evaluate teaching but will also consider various circumstances as explained and documented in the faculty member’s narrative when determining the final evaluation.

## **Research**

### **Research activities include but are not limited to:**

- publishing scholarly books
- publishing articles in refereed professional journals
- publishing chapters in edited book collections
- publishing textbooks
- publishing scholarly encyclopedia entries
- publishing edited book collections
- engaging in the scholarly activity of editing professional journals
- writing and/or performing creative work that draws on research
- participating in applied or community-engaged research projects
- submitting internal and external grant proposals in support of research projects
- presenting research at conferences, symposia, colloquia, etc.

### **Guidelines for “Exceeds Expectations” in Research:**

SIGS considers “exceeds expectations” in research to consist of making a substantial contribution to the peer-reviewed scholarship in a faculty member’s area(s) of specialty. Faculty are not required to participate in all research activities identified above to exceed expectations. For the purposes of Post-Tenure Review, the quality and impact of scholarship should hold greater significance than quantitative output alone. Since faculty in SIGS span a variety of disciplines in both Humanities and Social Science fields, evaluations must also bear in mind the significant differences in research expectations across these different disciplines, especially as they account for variation in (among other things) the standard length of journal articles, norms around co-authorship, and requirements for substantial fieldwork, archival research, and/or theoretical development prior to even the earliest stages of writing. The following accomplishments will generally merit the specified evaluations for a standard research assignment of approximately 40%/year provided these factors are taken into account. For higher or lower research assignments, expectations will be proportionally higher or lower. Since junior faculty must be protected from onerous service obligations and many tenured faculty in SIGS serve in university administrative roles, the remaining tenured faculty bear a disproportionate burden of service obligations and, all else being equal, will accordingly have lower research assignments.

The criteria for this category are as follows:

1. Publication or full acceptance of publication of a scholarly book with a university press or academically-oriented commercial press relevant to the faculty member’s field

2. Publication or full acceptance of publication of an edited or co-edited book with a substantial scholarly contribution by the editor(s)
3. Publication of a revised edition of a book (with evidence of substantial revision)
4. Publication or full acceptance of publication of four to five peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, article-length review essays, or a combination thereof.
5. An equivalent combination of scholarly contributions from the following research activities:
  - receipt of a major research-focused award, grant, or fellowship that is nationally competitive
  - publication of a non-peer reviewed article or essay of substantial length
  - publication of a review essay
  - publication of a substantial encyclopedia entry
  - publication of a co-authored article or book chapter
  - receipt of an “accept with revisions” or a “revise and resubmit” review for an article or chapter manuscript from a peer-reviewed journal or an editor for a collection
  - significant progress on a book-length manuscript or edited collection, including but not limited to receipt of a book contract, the submission of a completed manuscript for review, the submission of a completed manuscript with recommended revisions, or the acceptance of a manuscript
  - completion of substantial fieldwork or archival research, or compilation of a novel dataset
  - submission of a major research-focused award, grant, or fellowship application
  - publication of a book review or commentary on an article
  - publication of a short encyclopedia entry
  - presentation of a scholarly paper or address, or participation in an academic research workshop or a roundtable at a professional conference
  - submission of an original or substantially revised article or book chapter manuscript for editorial review
  - ongoing progress on a book or edited collection involving submission of a proposal to a press and/or circulation of its smaller components, including but not limited to circulation or presentation of chapters
  - evidence of progress on fieldwork for a new project and/or work involved in re-tooling or changing to a new research focus
  - delivery of a professional report
  - receipt of a small external grant to support research (i.e. travel grant)

**Guidelines for “Meets Expectations” in Research:**

SIGS considers “meets expectations” in research to consist of evidence of 1-4 articles, book chapters, article-length review essays, a combination of these three, or the equivalent drawn from the activities described in “Exceeds Expectations.”

**Guidelines for “Does Not Meet Expectations” in Research:**

SIGS considers “does not meet expectations” in research to consist of limited evidence of engagement with the research activities described above.

### **Guidelines for “Unsatisfactory” in Research:**

SIGS considers “unsatisfactory” in research to consist of no evidence of research activity or publications over the five-year period under review.

### **Assessing Research**

- The SIGS Director will use the criteria above as a general guide to evaluating research but will also consider various circumstances as explained and documented in the faculty member’s narrative when determining the final evaluation.
- The SIGS Director will take into consideration the effort involved in successfully developing a new line of research; successfully completing research that requires unusual effort, expenditure of time, or technical skills; and/or substantial involvement in activities that include elements of teaching or service but also require a significant amount of current scholarly knowledge, such as editing a journal or making substantive decisions about a conference program.
- The post-tenure review of research will be predicated on the cumulation of reported research activities from the past five annual reviews and research assignments. It must be noted that there is considerable variety in research formats and publications, including between research in Humanities fields and in Social Sciences fields, with the result that there must be flexibility in assessing research, and the narration of the candidate is important in understanding research activity.

### **Service**

**Service activities include but are not limited to:**

#### **University Service**

- serving on and/or chairing committees in the school, college, or university
- writing proposals and documents for the school, college, or university
- reviewing proposals for university awards
- giving presentations at university events
- serving in a leadership position in the school (as associate, undergraduate, or graduate director) or serving as a director of an Institute or Center

#### **Professional Service**

- chairing or serving as a discussant for a panel at a conference
- reviewing a manuscript for a refereed journal or academic book publisher
- serving on a journal’s editorial board

- handling the administrative components of editing or co-editing a journal
- serving as a book series editor for a publisher
- reviewing paper proposals for a section of a professional conference
- organizing conferences or workshops
- serving on scholarly awards committees
- reviewing grant proposals
- reviewing tenure and promotion applications for candidates at other universities
- reviewing academic programs at other universities
- holding office in a professional association

Public/Community Service (must draw on academic background)

- offering interviews with the media
- serving as an unpaid consultant for governments/organizations
- organizing community events or giving public lectures

The following accomplishments will merit the specified evaluations for a standard service assignment of 10%/year. For higher or lower service assignments, expectations will be proportionally higher or lower.

**Guidelines for “Exceeds Expectations” in Service:**

SIGS considers “exceeds expectations” in service to consist of evidence of significant involvement in developing and/or sustaining SIGS, college, university, professional, and/or public institutions. Serving in all capacities is not necessary, especially if service in one capacity is particularly significant.

**Guidelines for “Meets Expectations” in Service**

SIGS considers “meets expectations” in service to consist of evidence of acceptable service in at least two of the three service categories listed above unless service in one category is particularly significant. In such cases, service in one category merits a “meets expectations”.

**Guidelines for “Does Not Meet Expectations” in Service:**

SIGS considers “does not meet expectations” in service to consist of providing only minimal documented service and showing declining service activities during the review period.

**Guidelines for Unsatisfactory in Service:**

SIGS considers “unsatisfactory” in service to consist of no evidence of service provided.

**Assessing Service**

- The SIGS Director will use the above criteria as a general guide to evaluate service but will consider various circumstances explained and documented in the faculty member’s narrative when determining the final evaluation.