Post-Tenure Faculty Review Guidelines

School of Aging Studies
College of Behavioral & Community Sciences
University of South Florida

Submitted 09/28/23
Approved by the Office of the Provost 09/29/23

Introduction

Post-tenure review is required of all tenured faculty members at the University of South Florida in accordance with State law. The purpose of this review is to ensure continued high standards of quality and sustained productivity among tenured faculty consistent with the mission of the university and with assigned duties in research, teaching, service. In addition, post-tenure review is intended to recognize and honor exceptional achievement. As a formative assessment process, post-tenure review is also intended to provide continued academic professional development, enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a performance improvement plan and return to expected levels of productivity, and, when necessary, identify patterns of performance that are unacceptable or inconsistent with the professional standards of employment in the Florida State University System (SUS).

Faculty are identified for post-tenure review by the Provost's Office and are reviewed within departments. The procedural guidelines and evaluation criteria for the School of Aging Studies post-tenure review are described below. Evaluation criteria are applied to teaching, research, and service and are assessed relative to the faculty member's assigned effort and duties as well as the faculty members history of professional conduct and academic responsibilities.

Rating categories for post-tenure review shall include the following university level guidance:

> **(1) Exceeds expectations**: a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performance of faculty across the department. Must have a sustained and satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law, Board of Governor's regulations, and university regulations and policies.
>
> **(2) Meets expectations:** expected level of accomplishment compared to faculty across the candidate's department. Must have a sustained and satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law, Board of Governor's regulations, and university regulations and policies.
>
> **(3) Does not meet expectations**: performance falls below the expected range of annual variation on performance compared to faculty across the candidate's department but is capable of improvement. Must have evidence of effort in at least two assigned areas and satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and

compliance with state law, Board of Governor's regulations, and university regulations and policies.

(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 past five years of review 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 Governor's regulations, policies, and procedures.

Process

Faculty selected for post-tenure review shall complete a review packet. Post-tenure review shall examine only the faculty member's "review packet," The packet shall consist of the previous five years of annual evaluations, including scores and Director's and Chair of Faculty Evaluation Committee's comments, a curriculum vitae and a narrative provided by the faculty member that highlights accomplishments and demonstrates performance relative to assigned duties over the previous five years, using a university template.

As percent effort in each review area may vary as a career evolves, faculty are encouraged to discuss variations in assigned effort in their narrative, including the impact of COVID-19 if applicable. It is recommended that the narrative not exceed five double spaced pages and should also include any corrections or responses to comments posted by the annual Faculty Evaluation Committee during the five-year review period.

Prior to completing this narrative, the faculty member shall be given access to their personnel file and other records related to professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance that may be used in this review process by other evaluators. The faculty member will have the opportunity to address any prior issues in their personnel package in their narrative and prior to the initial and following levels of evaluation.

The Director, and the elected Chair of the School's Faculty Evaluation Committee, undertake holistic assessments of performance, based on the faculty member's CV and narrative record of accomplishments for the past five years, the last five years of annual performance reviews by the School's Director and elected Chair of the School's Faculty Evaluation Committee, and the faculty member's five-year conduct record.

The faculty member will have the opportunity to review the SAS Director's and Faculty Evaluation Committee Chair's narrative and respond (similar to the process in the annual evaluation) prior to submission in Archivum to the Dean's Office. This response to the narrative should be completed within one week of receiving the Director's and Faculty Evaluation Committee Chair's review.

Criteria for Evaluation

The following criteria for post-tenure review are drawn from the approved criteria for annual evaluations for the School of Aging Studies. Each annual performance score in teaching shall be weighted by the percent effort assigned.

Teaching:
Post-tenure review of teaching will be based on the previous five years of teaching assignments for each year. The post-tenure review evaluation will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period.

Indicators of Excellence:

Preferred Indicators of excellence	**Means of evaluation**
Student Evaluation of Undergraduate Instruction	Average student evaluation rating of 4.0 or above
Student Evaluation of Graduate Instruction	Average student evaluation rating of 4.0 or above
Successful mentorship of graduating PhD students	Chairing completed dissertation committee
Successful contribution to graduating PhD student mentorship	Serving on a completed dissertation committee
Mentorship of PhD students	Serving as dissertation committee chair or primary mentor for a current PhD student
Contribution to mentorship of PhD students	Serving as a member of a dissertation committee for a PhD student
Contribution to research mentorship of PhD students	Being second or senior author on a paper first authored by a PhD student
Significant contribution to research mentorship of PhD students	Being second or senior author on three or more papers first authored by a PhD student
Exceptional contribution to mentorship of PhD students	Mentor for a PhD student funded by an F31 or another competitive dissertation grant
Successful mentorship of postdoctoral fellows	Primary mentor of a postdoctoral fellow
Successful mentorship of undergraduates	Chaired completed Senior Honors Thesis or has at least one undergraduate student who

	has coauthored a published article or conference presentation.
Significant mentorship of undergraduates	Has at least one undergraduate student involved in their program of research, or has written at least 10 reference letters for undergraduate students in the past year
National/international impact on aging studies instruction	At least one publication or conference on instruction, USF or national awards for teaching or mentorship, or service on national committees focused on aging studies instruction
Contribution to curriculum development	Service on curriculum revision committee, produces draft curriculum revision documents, new development or substantial revision of face-to-face course, or new development or substantial revision of web-based courses
Noncredit aging studies instruction	Training grants, CE workshops or presentations, or planning committees for CE workshops

Ratings for this area are based on an average annually over the last five years:

Ratings	PTR Score	Criteria for Consideration
Exceeds Expectations	1	Faculty member should meet at least six of the above preferred indicators of excellence.
Meets Expectations	2	Faculty member should meet at least four of the above preferred indicators of excellence.
Does Not Meet Expectations	3	Faculty member only met on average annually three of the above preferred indicators of excellence.
Unsatisfactory	4	Faculty member only met on average annually one of the preferred indicators of excellence.

Research

The following criteria for post-tenure review are drawn from the approved criteria for annual evaluations for the School of Aging Studies. Each annual performance score in research shall be weighted by the percent effort assigned.

Indicators of Excellence

Required Indicators of excellence	**Means of evaluation**
Appropriate quality, quantity and contribution to publications	The faculty member should have at least two first, second to a student, or senior authored publications, or at least four coauthored publications, in journals Indexed in the Web of Science.
Meaningful effort toward research productivity	Has an IRB-approved research project underway or has submitted at least one manuscript for publication.
Pursuit of extramural funding	Any one of the following: Current funding as a PI, Co-PI or MPI, or Co-Investigator. Grant or contract application as a PI, Co-PI or MPI, or Co-I Strong scores on submitted proposals Efforts at resubmission of unfunded proposals
Research addresses one or more programs of research	Multiple papers on related topics Papers build on previous publications and findings Papers show increased methodological and/or theoretical sophistication over time Candidates must make the case in their annual evaluation statement that a major part of their work is programmatic. Members of the faculty review committee will rate the faculty member as meeting or not meeting this standard.

Preferred Indicators of excellence	**Means of evaluation**
Significant scientific impact	High (300 or more per year) or increasing (at least 10% above previous year) numbers of Google Scholar Citations. Faculty members wanting to demonstrate attaining this indicator should have a Google Scholar page.
Attaining extramural funding from prominent source	PI, CO-PI, MPI, Site PI, or Co-I of funding from NIH or comparable agency.
Making significant contributions to extramural funding from prominent source.	At least 10 percent effort on funded projects from NIH or comparable agency
Making substantial contributions to extramural funding from prominent source	At least 25 percent effort on funded projects from NIH or comparable agency
Significant quality, quantity and contribution to publications	The faculty member has at least two first, second to a student, or senior authored publications in the first or second quartile, or at least four coauthored publications in the first or second quartile of the Web of Science quartile rankings within a journal category.
Exceptional quality, quantity and contribution to publications	The faculty member has at least four first, second to a student, or senior authored publications in the first or second quartile, or at least six coauthored publications in the first or second quartile of the Web of Science quartile rankings within a journal category.
Research Awards	Received an award for research accomplishments from USF or a professional society

Ratings for this area are based on five-year average annually and effort of 35% in research (efforts that are more or less will be weighted accordingly):

Ratings	PTR Score	Criteria for Consideration
Exceeds Expectations	1	Faculty member should meet on average annually all four of the above required indicators of excellence, and at least two of the preferred indicators of excellence. .
Meets Expectations	2	Faculty member should meet on average annually two of the above required indicators of excellence, and at least two of the preferred indicators of excellence.
Does Not Meet Expectations	3	Faculty member only met on average annually two of the above required indicators of excellence and no preferred indicators of excellence.
Unsatisfactory	4	Faculty member only met on average annually one of the required indicators of excellence.

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.

Indicators of excellence	**Means of evaluation**
Service to the School	Membership on at least one SAS Committee, including the Faculty Evaluation Committee
Service to the College or University	Service on at least one College or University Committee, or engaging in faculty governance such as membership on Faculty Council or Faculty Senate
Service to the profession	Reviewing for at least one scholarly journal or grant review, or serving as External Reviewer for at least one candidate for Tenure and Promotion or Awards
Exceptional service to the School, College, or University	Chairing a SAS, College, or University Committee
Strong service to the profession	Serving on committees for professional or scientific societies, or external reviewer for a candidate for tenure or promotion at another university, or on an Editorial Board

Exceptional service to the profession	Service on multiple committees for professional or scientific societies, or providing multiple external reviews for candidate for tenure or promotion at another university, or two or more Editorial Boards
Service to the community	At least one community lecture or volunteer activity annually
Strong service to the community	Service on a community board relevant to field
Exceptional service to the community	Chairing a community board, or receiving an award for service

Rating	PTR Score	Criteria for Consideration
Exceed Expectations	1	Faculty member meets at least five of the above indicators of excellence.
Meets Expectations	2	Faculty member meets four of the above indicators of excellence.
Does Not Meet Expectations	3	Faculty member meets on average annually only two of the above indicators of excellence.
Unsatisfactory	4	Faculty on member meets on average annually only one of the above indicators of excellence

Based on the PTR assessment of both the Director of the School of Aging Studies and the Chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, 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 the two scores (Director's and Chair's) of each of the three evaluative domains (i.e., Research, Teaching, 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.

Overall five-year performance rating:	**PTR Score**	**Label**
	1	"Exceeds expectations"
	2	"Meets expectations"
	3	"Does not meet expectations"
	4	"Unsatisfactory

These scores, when appropriate, can be adjusted upward or downward, by the Director and the Chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, when assessing these scores holistically and in the light of the faculty member's five-year narrative, curriculum vitae, and five-year conduct record (see the definitions of the performance rating categories above).

The Director and the Chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee will jointly write a letter, recommended not to exceed five double spaced pages, assessing the level of overall achievement using the scoring system noted above. If applicable, the letter will include the impact of COVID-19, faculty assignments, any documented concerns regarding professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance during the period under review.

At the conclusion of the Director's and Chair's review, the faculty member shall be provided the opportunity to review the packet and all documentation used to determine ratings and have the option of providing a response to the narrative comments (recommended not to exceed two double spaced pages) for consideration by the Dean. This narrative should be completed within two weeks of receiving the Director and Chair review.

The Dean of the College shall evaluate the review packet submitted by the faculty member, the Director's and Chair's evaluation letter and rating(s). The Dean shall add to the packet a brief narrative assessing the level of achievement during the period under review. If applicable, the letter shall include any concerns regarding professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance. The letter shall also include the Dean's recommended performance rating based upon the categories described above using the criteria established by the School of Aging Studies faculty and previously approved by the Director of the School of Aging Studies, Dean, and Provost.

At the conclusion of the College Dean's review, the faculty member shall be provided the opportunity to review the packet and have the option of providing a responding narrative to these comments (recommended not to exceed two double spaced pages) for consideration by the Provost. This narrative should be completed within two weeks of receiving the Dean's review.

The Dean shall forward the total review packet, including any response(s) from the faculty during the prior reviews, and their recommendations to the Provost for review.

With guidance and oversight from the University President, the Provost will rate the faculty member's professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance during the review period. The Provost shall evaluate the review packet and the recommendations provided by the Dean of the college. The Provost may accept, reject, or modify the Dean's and Director's and Chair's recommended ratings. Each faculty member reviewed will receive one of the following performance ratings, as defined above: (1) Exceed expectation, (2) Meets expectations, (3) Does not meet expectations, or (4) Unsatisfactory for their overall performance.

The Provost shall notify the faculty member, the faculty member's Director, and the appropriate college Dean of the outcome within a reasonable time.

Post Review Information and Process for Recognition

For each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of “exceeds expectations,” the college Dean, in consultation with the Director of the School of Aging Studies, shall recommend to the Provost suitable recognition and compensation in accordance with the faculty member’s performance and university regulations and policies. The Provost shall make the final determination regarding recognition and/or compensation.

For each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of “meet expectations,” the college Dean, in consultation with the faculty member’s Director, shall recommend to the Provost suitable recognition in accordance with the faculty member’s performance and university regulations and policies. The Provost shall make the final determination regarding recognition and/or compensation.

For each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of “does not meet expectations,” the Dean, in consultation with the faculty member and the faculty member’s Director shall propose a performance improvement plan (PIP) to the Provost. The plan shall include a deadline for the faculty member to achieve the requirement of the PIP. The deadline may not extend more than 12 months past the date that the faculty member receives and signs the improvement plan. The PIP shall indicate how specific deficiencies in the faculty member’s performance (as measured against stated departmental or college criteria) shall be remedied.

It is the faculty member’s obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted. Although each PIP is tailored to individual circumstances; it is expected to define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies; outline activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes; identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan; set timelines for achieving goals and outcomes; and indicate the criteria for assessment in annual review of progress in the plan.

The faculty member and the Director of the School of Aging Studies will meet regularly (quarterly at a minimum) to review the faculty member’s progress toward remedying deficiencies. The faculty member will provide at the end of each semester a progress report to the Director of the School of Aging Studies and to the Dean. Modifications to the plan are permissible in consultation with the Director and shall be recorded. This will be forwarded to the Dean and Provost and noted in the faculty member’s personnel file.

Further evaluation of the faculty member’s performance (e.g., annual reviews) may draw upon the faculty member’s progress in achieving the goals set forth in the PIP.

Each faculty member who fails to meet the requirement of a PIP by the established deadline as determined by the Provost, in consultation with the Dean and Director, shall receive a notice of termination from the Provost. The faculty member will be afforded a 12-month non-renewal period of their tenured appointment.

Each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of “unsatisfactory,” for their overall performance, shall receive a notice of termination from the Provost. The faculty member will be afforded a 12-month non-renewal period of their tenured appointment.

Final decision regarding post-tenure review may be appealed under university regulations or collective bargaining agreements.

Exceptions to the Post-Tenure Review Process

Tenured faculty who provided written notice to Director of the School of Aging Studies of their intent to leave the University of South Florida at the end of the academic year or those who are resigning with a delayed date in the subsequent academic year may not be required to participate in the post-tenure review process. Tenured faculty in the process of a comprehensive promotion review may also not be required to participate in the post-tenure process. Tenured faculty in administrative roles are to be evaluated annually as outlined in the appropriate governance guidelines and therefore not subject to post-tenure review until five years post their administrative separation.

Procedure for Requesting a Post-Tenure Review Delay

Requests to delay an upcoming post tenure review should be submitted to the Director of the School of Aging Studies in advance to ensure timely departmental processing of the request. Requests must be in writing and specify the compelling reason(s) for the request to delay the review.

Requests must include a written justification from the Director of the School of Aging Studies and be submitted to the Dean of the College. The Dean may or may not support the request but must attach a brief letter indicating reasons for non-support. This letter shall be copied to the Director and faculty member as well.

Requests are then submitted to the Provost for review and decision regarding the delay. Once the request is reviewed, a written communication will be sent from the Provost’s Office to the faculty member, the Director of the School of Aging Studies, and the Dean’s Office indicating whether the request has been approved. This decision letter should be kept in the faculty member’s personnel file. A new timeline for post-tenure review for the faculty member should be established and noted in the personnel file as well.

If the request is approved, the faculty member’s academic unit must then determine when the next review will be scheduled and complete any established actions to formalize this new date, with the Provost’s letter of approval attached, to finalize the change to the Post-Tenure Review date.