Department of Child and Family Studies
College of Behavioral and Community Sciences
Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Faculty Review Guidelines

Submitted: September 2023
Approved by the Office of the Provost: 09/20/2023

INTRODUCTION[1]

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, and service. In addition, post-tenure review is intended to recognize and honor exceptional achievements. 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).

Post-tenure review shall examine only the faculty member's "review packet," comprised of the following materials: (a) the faculty member's narrative record of accomplishments for the past five years in a university-designated template, (b) the last five years of annual performance reviews by the department chair (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation), (c) the faculty member's curriculum vitae, and (d)the faculty member's disciplinary record (if any exists) in their personnel file covering the past five years.

Tenured faculty are expected to perform satisfactorily in the areas of teaching, research service and other assigned responsibilities (e.g., administration.). Positive sustained contributions are expected in all assigned areas. Percent effort in these areas may vary as a career evolves. A decrease in effort, and thus expectations, in one category should be balanced with a concomitant increase in one or more of the other categories. A comprehensive post-tenure review shall include consideration of (1) the level of accomplishment and productivity relative to the faculty member's assigned effort and duties in research, teaching, service, and other assignments, and (2) the faculty member's history of professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities to the university and its students.

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. Performance is

[1] This material comes from the University of Florida Post-Tenure Faculty Review Regulation no 10.003)

appreciably greater than the average faculty member at the candidate's present rank in the discipline 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 Governor's regulations, and university regulations and policies.

2. **Meets expectations**: expected level of accomplishment compared to faculty across the candidate's department. 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 Governor's 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 candidate's department but is capable of improvement. A faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation during one of the five 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 Governor's 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 overall unsatisfactory annual evaluations 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. The packet shall consist of the previous five years of annual evaluations, including scores and supervisor's comments, a curriculum vitae, and a narrative that highlights accomplishments and demonstrates performance relative to assigned duties over the previous five years, using a template provided for that purpose. This narrative shall have a maximum limit of 12,000 characters.

The department chair shall evaluate the review packet and the faculty member's disciplinary file covering the past five years and provide a written assessment (not to exceed 12,000 characters) of the level of achievement. If applicable, the chair will include in the assessment letter any concerns regarding professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance during the period under review. The chair shall also assign a performance rating consistent with the categories specified above.

The dean of the college shall evaluate the review packet submitted by the faculty member, the chair's evaluation letter, and rating. The dean shall add to the packet a brief narrative (not to exceed 12,000 characters) 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 department faculty and previously approved by the department chair, 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 narrative comments (not to exceed 6,000 characters) for consideration by the Provost.

The dean shall forward the review packet and recommendations to the Provost for review.

The Provost shall evaluate the review packet and the recommendation provided by the dean of the college.

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 may accept, reject, or modify the dean'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.

The Provost shall notify the faculty member, the faculty member's department chair, and the appropriate college dean of the outcome.

For each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of "exceeds expectations," the college dean, in consultation with the department chair, 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 department chair, 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.

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 department chair, 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 of the faculty member receives 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 is 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 department chair 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 department chair and to the dean. 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 department chair, 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,” 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.

DEPARTMENTAL POST-TENURE GUIDELINES[2]

The guidelines and evaluation criteria for the Department of Child and Family Studies (CFS) 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.

The review consists of the following materials:

(a) The faculty member's narrative record of accomplishments for the past five years in the university-designated template,

(b) The last five years of annual performance reviews by the department chair and the ratings received in each area of assigned duties that follow the approved CFS Evaluation Guidelines and detailed criteria for assigned ratings of outstanding (5), strong (4), satisfactory (3), weak (2), and unsatisfactory (1) in Teaching, Research, and Service,

(c) The faculty member's curriculum vitae, and

(d) 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.

The process shall proceed according to the following steps: (1) The Chair will review of all materials and provide a rating of the faculty members performance in teaching, research, and service using the Post Tenure Review Evaluation Matrix; (2) The chair will calculate an overall PTR Rating by multiplying scores from 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 (using the rating that is the nearest whole number); and (3) The chair will provide a narrative that provides a summary of the faculty member's overall post-tenure performance.

[2] This material is unique to the Department of Child and Family Studies

Department of Child and Family Studies

Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Evaluation Matrix

This matrix will be used by the CFS Department Chair, to complete the department stage of PTR.

RESEARCH

Evaluation ratings in the area of Research (which includes scholarship) generally reflect the faculty member's research productivity and impact. 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). Partial scores (e.g., 2.5 or 3.5) are allowable for borderline cases within each scoring category. Research will be evaluated holistically, not just based on external funding or number of publications. Additionally, there is flexibility within each scoring category to compensate for a faculty member exceeding one criterion but lacking in another.

Post-Tenure Expectations: Tenured faculty are expected to achieve a record of excellent record of research compared to the standards of their broader discipline.

Exceeds Expectations (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (4)
Faculty exceed expectations when their performance reflects clear and significant accomplishments that are exceptional in their discipline through a combination of: (a) continuous and successful efforts in external funding for their research. (b) continuous and successful dissemination efforts as reflected through the number	Faculty meet expectations when they demonstrate average performance within the broader discipline with accomplishments that are acceptable through a combination of: (a) demonstrated efforts to attain sufficient internal and/or external funding to support their research. (b) publishing research results in peer-reviewed journals, books,	Faculty do not meet expectations when they demonstrate performance below that expected in the discipline, including: (a) no efforts to obtain internal or external funding for research during the five-year period, especially when funding is needed to complete research in the discipline.	Faculty demonstrate unsatisfactory performance when they are not actively engaged in research or scholarship consistent with their research assignment, for more than two years of the five-year period or productivity is cumulatively below the standards for a rating of (3).

of publications, publications that are notable for their impact, and/or the prestige of the journal outlet. (c) highly visible scholarly dissemination of research through publication of books and/or book chapters, national and international conference presentations, invited addresses, invited testimony, or other events. (d) continuous and successful efforts to form or to participate in intra- and inter- disciplinary research partnerships with scholars from other USF departments and other universities. (e) other research impacts that support their position as a leading scholar in their discipline, as determined from completed annual reviews and the candidate's narrative.	book chapters, and/or monographs (c) providing scholarly presentations through state and national conference presentations and other events. (d) providing evidence of significant research impact as a leading or emerging scholar in their field, as determined appropriate for discipline from completed annual reviews and the candidate's narrative. Candidates may submit evidence of academic or applied impacts in quantitative (e.g., impact factors, citation metrics) or qualitative terms (e.g., awards, honors, scholarly recognition by peers, appointments), as best suited to their discipline.	(b) little progress on any scholarly products or few completed research products (c) lack of research impact or professional recognition	

TEACHING

Teaching activities may pertain to formal courses and to student mentoring, professional development, and advising. Teaching activity will be evaluated holistically, not just based on student evaluations. The Department of Child and Family Studies 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. The Department also acknowledges that student evaluations can be biased based on gender, race, and other categories and will take that into consideration during review. In terms of advising, evaluating student advising and mentoring must be commensurate with assigned faculty duties and role in an academic program. Partial scores (e.g., 2.5 or 3.5) are allowable for borderline cases within each scoring category. Additionally, there is flexibility within each scoring category to compensate for a faculty member exceeding one criterion but lacking in another.

Post-Tenure Expectations: Tenured faculty are expected to achieve a record of excellent teaching compared to the standards of their broader discipline.

Exceeds Expectations (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (4)
Faculty exceed expectations when they demonstrate exceptional performance in their discipline through a combination of: (a) teaching duties are performed effectively and support undergraduate or graduate education; courses are innovative, transformative, engaging, or have a high impact in some facet. (b) faculty makes other instructional contributions to the academic program or	Faculty meet expectations when they demonstrate acceptable performance within their broader discipline through a combination of: (a) teaching duties were performed as assigned. Existing courses are maintained and updated, as needed. (b) student evaluation comments and/or ratings do not consistently raise clear and obvious problems with instruction.	Faculty do not meet expectations when demonstrate performance below that expected in the discipline, including: (a) teaching duties were only performed partially, or not as assigned. (b) student evaluation comments and/or ratings consistently raise clear and obvious problems, such as unresponsiveness to student questions, ineffective	Faculty demonstrate unsatisfactory performance when they do not provide evidence of adequate teaching performance and/or effectiveness at the level expected for the rank for more than two years; or failure to complete assigned teaching duties in undergraduate courses, graduate courses, or graduate student advising.

discipline by activities such as applying for training grants, general education certification, mentoring, professional development activities, community education, field supervision, program coordination, and so forth. (c) student evaluation comments and/or ratings convey a positive student experience and do not consistently raise clear or obvious problems with instruction; (d) successful supervision and mentoring of undergraduate or graduate students, as demonstrated by number of advisees and graduates, job placements, and student achievements (e.g., student presentations, publications, grant proposals, awards).	(c) evidence of supervision or mentoring of undergraduate or graduate students	communication, disrespect to students, or failure to provide required disability accommodations. (c) there is limited to no supervision of graduate or undergraduate students, or comparable activities.	

SERVICE/ADMINISTRATION

The Department of Child and Family Studies recognizes (a) that university service (and administration, where applicable) activities of equal importance or impact can occur at different "levels" (e.g., university, college, and school); (b) that service activities of equal importance or impact can occur in different domains (e.g., university, professional), (c) that excellence in service can be demonstrated in different ways, and (d) that service expectations fluctuate with workload, leave, and rank . The following rating guidelines will be interpreted with respect to these factors. Partial scores (e.g., 2.5 or 3.5) are allowable for borderline cases within each scoring category. Additionally, there is flexibility within each scoring category to compensate for a faculty member exceeding one criterion but lacking in another.

Post-Tenure Expectations: Tenured faculty are expected to achieve a record of excellent service compared to the standards of their broader discipline.

Exceeds Expectations (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (4)
Faculty exceed expectations when their performance reflects clear and significant accomplishments demonstrate exceptional performance through a combination of: (a) continuous service within the CFS, including either leadership activity (administrative duties, committee chair, program director, or equivalent) and/or regular intensive service (e.g., multiple committees, heavy workload or responsibility). (b) evidence of service at the	Faculty meet expectations when they demonstrate acceptable performance through a combination of: (a) evidence of service within the CFS, college, and/or university, such as participation in activities, committees, meetings, events, and so forth. (b) evidence of professional service, through the academic discipline, community, or other outlet.	Faculty do not meet expectations when: (a) there is little university service activity within the SGS for most years during the review period, such as unwillingness to serve on CFS committees. (b) external service to discipline or community is lacking during most years of the review period.	Faculty demonstrate unsatisfactory performance when they display no effective service activity at the level expected for the rank, for more than two years.

college or university levels (c) evidence of leadership and service within the academic discipline or community, such as holding offices, positions, or other leadership roles; participation in special task forces or boards; serving as an editor; significant engagement with the community; and so forth.			

OVERALL PTR RATING

Based on the PTR assessment, 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 scores from 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.

Exceeds Expectations (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (4)
A clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performance of faculty across the faculty member's discipline. 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.	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 satisfactory performance rating across annual evaluations 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.	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 5 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.	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. 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.