

Post-Tenure Faculty Review Guidelines
Department of Criminology
College of Behavioral & Community Sciences
University of South Florida

INTRODUCTION¹

Post-tenure review is required of all tenured faculty members at the University of South Florida in accordance with State law and FL BOG Regulation 10.003. 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, and other. 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).

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 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 applicable 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

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

academic responsibilities and compliance with applicable 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. A faculty member who has received an overall weak or unsatisfactory annual evaluation during one of the five previous five years without evidence of a trajectory of subsequent improvement or exhibited a weak or unsatisfactory performance in any single area of assignment over multiple years or pattern of non-compliance with applicable 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 a weak or unsatisfactory annual evaluations during two or more of the previous five years or a weak 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) Exceeds expectations, (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 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. A 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 GUIDELINES²

The Chair's post-tenure performance rating and narrative shall constitute a holistic and formative assessment of the candidate's curriculum vitae, narrative record of accomplishments for the past five years, the last five years of annual performance reviews by the department chair, and review of the faculty member's five-year conduct record. The Chair shall employ the departmental goals and evaluation criteria in the areas of teaching, research, and service as described below.

RESEARCH

The Department of Criminology is a doctoral-granting program at a research-extensive R1 university. Therefore, scholarship in the form of empirical and theoretical research is a vital activity for each faculty member. The Department strives to excel in its research mission by publishing in high-quality peer-reviewed journals, obtaining state, federal and private funding, and disseminating research through various scholastic outlets. By excelling in these endeavors, the Department attains prestige among its peers within the university and across the discipline. This effort, in turn, attracts outstanding students and new faculty; it also facilitates higher impact research and scholarship.

The post-tenure performance review shall assess how well a faculty member has contributed to attaining the Department's research goals across the five-year period under review. While the post-tenure performance review is not the same as annual review or tenure and promotion, all are tied to the same goals and therefore share some of the same evaluative criteria and benchmarks.

Department Goals for Research

- *Increase the visibility of the department through research,*
- *Publish research in high-quality peer-reviewed outlets,*
- *Obtain resources for conducting research (i.e., grants, partnerships),*
- *Disseminate research at conferences, colloquia, symposiums, or other public venues,*
- *Evaluate and inform evidence-based policies of public and private organizations.*

There are many ways to help the department attain its goals. The standard expectation for tenured and tenure-track faculty is two peer-reviewed publications per year and other research activities, such as presenting at conferences, writing book chapters, and submitting agency reports. Publishing in high-quality journals or receiving a federal grant are examples of work that exceeds the Department's expectations because they increase the program's visibility.

The amount of effort assigned to each faculty member is varied based on consultation with the Department Chair. A standard annual research assignment is approximately 35% toward research with the expectation to publish at least two articles per year and contribute through other research productivity. Faculty with less than a 35% five-year average assignment should adjust expectations in their ability to help the department reach its goals. For example, a faculty member with a 20% five-year average research assignment would only be expected to contribute one peer-reviewed article per year on average and fewer other research activities.

² This material is unique to the Department of Criminology

To evaluate a faculty member's contribution to the Department's research goals, the department Chair shall use the following. First, this evaluation is limited to work done in the previous five calendar years. Research output includes peer-reviewed publications, external funding, internal funding, research presentations, monographs, book chapters, and books that include research, and evaluative technical reports. It is up to faculty members under review to make a case for their rating, citing various factors to justify their proposed post-tenure performance review.

The following rubric applies to a faculty member with a 35% or more five-year average assignment in research. Faculty members with less than 35% five-year average assignment should be expected to have fewer factors that elevate them to a higher rating and those with greater than a 35% five-year average assignment should be expected to have more factors that elevate them to a higher rating. The Chair is at liberty to adjust a performance score upward or downward based upon relevant activities presented in the candidate's narrative and justified in the Chair's narrative --- this applies to performance scores in all areas of assessment: teaching, research, and service.

Unsatisfactory 4	Does not Meet Expectations 3		Meets Expectations 2	Exceeds Expectations 1
One or more paper presentations but nothing more.	At least one but less than six peer-reviewed articles published or their equivalencies (see below for article equivalencies).		At least six but less than fifteen peer-reviewed articles published or their equivalencies. Of these articles, half must be published in top-tier/high impact journals. Also, of these articles, the candidate must be the sole, first, or senior author on at least half.	At least fifteen peer-reviewed articles published in peer-reviewed journals. Of these articles, half must be published in top-tier/high impact journals. Also, of these articles, the candidate must be the sole, first, or senior author on at least half.
Factors that elevate the evaluation*				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer-reviewed publications • Book chapter • Monograph in mid-tier press • Internal grant • Presentation at an academic conference • Write an evaluation report for a local agency • Works in progress (article under submission to a high-impact journal) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High-impact journal publication (not first author) • Federal or foundation grant application (not funded) • Invited presentation at another university or organization • Book chapter in top-tier press • Monograph in a mainstream press • Write an evaluation report for a state or local agency 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtaining a federal or foundation grant • Invited presentation at a prestigious institution • A monograph is a top-tier press • Lead-authored publication in a high-impact journal • Write an evaluation report for a prestigious agency (e.g., NIJ, Presidential Commission)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a major data collection effort 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include students as authors on a paper 	
--	--	--

*These factors are not a checklist; instead, they should be used by the faculty member to make their case for impact and be used by the Chair to appraise the case. The list of factors is not exhaustive.

There is some need to address general expectations concerning *article equivalents*. Throughout these equivalencies, an “article” refers to a lesser tier/lower impact journal article. An edited book of reprints is equivalent to an article; an edited book of original work is equivalent to 1.5 articles; a scholarly book or monograph is equivalent to 4 articles; a final grant report is equivalent to an article; a grant proposal is equivalent to an article; an accepted federal/state grant is equivalent to 2 articles; book chapters are the equivalent of 0.75 articles. Book reviews and encyclopedia entries are given minor credit, but do not in and of themselves indicate evidence of scholarly publication. Applications for promotion or tenure should consist primarily of peer-reviewed publications, with a preference for peer-reviewed publications that are sole or lead/senior authored and published in high-rank or high-impact outlets.

TEACHING

Teaching is the other essential activity that faculty engage in for the Department. Teaching comprises in-class instruction and mentoring students through various activities, including, but not limited to, serving on thesis and dissertation committees, honors thesis committees, lab activities, directing independent studies, or publishing with students. As in research, there are many ways that faculty may help the department reach its teaching goals. The rubric below provides factors that the department Chair may use to assess how well the faculty member has helped the department achieve its teaching goals.

The amount of effort assigned to each faculty member is varied based on consultation with the Department Chair. A standard annual teaching assignment is approximately 55% toward research with the expectation to publish at least two articles per year and contribute through other research productivity. Faculty with less than a 55% five-year average assignment should have their expectations adjusted accordingly regarding their ability to help the department reach its goals.

The post-tenure performance review shall assess how well a faculty member has contributed to attaining the Department's teaching goals across the five-year period under review. While the post-tenure performance review is not the same as annual review or tenure and promotion, all are tied to the same goals and therefore share some of the same evaluative criteria and benchmarks.

Department Goals for Teaching

- Uphold the mission and values of the College and University.
- Create a classroom and learning environment that promotes inclusivity, equity, and belonging.
- Encourage the real-world application of knowledge and community-engaged learning.
- Develop mentorship relationships with students.
- Promote critical thinking and problem-solving strategies.

Unsatisfactory 4	Does not Meet Expectations 3		Meets Expectations 2	Exceeds Expectations 1
Five-year average student evaluation of teaching below 3.5 but no students directed/supervised.	Five-year average student evaluation of teaching above 3.5 and at least one student directed/supervised per year on average.		Five-year average student evaluation of teaching above 4.0 and at least two students directed/supervised per year on average.	Five-year average student evaluation of teaching above 4.5 and at least 5five students directed/supervised per year on average.
Factors that elevate the evaluation*				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching evaluations that show evidence of valued instruction • Mentoring students outside of the classroom • Creating new course content 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New preparations • Modifications to an existing course in content or course delivery • Working with graduate students • Teaching complex material (e.g., quantitative analysis or graduate methods) • Improvement in teaching evaluations • Variety of courses assigned • Incorporate innovative teaching pedagogy • Published textbook or teaching monograph 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive modifications to existing courses • Major professor for doctoral student • Shows major improvement in teaching evaluations from the previous year • Received a teaching or mentorship award 	

*These factors are not a checklist; instead, they should be used by the faculty member to make their case for impact and used by the department Chair to appraise the case. The list of factors is not exhaustive. The Chair should consider the candidate’s teaching workload assignment and access to graduate students (i.e., instructors do not work with graduate students).

SERVICE

The Department’s goals regarding Service are that faculty contribute time, energy, and expertise to the department, college, university, community, and profession. Service will vary depending upon each faculty member's skills, talents, and interests and the general and specific needs of the various contexts in which their service is requested. Consideration should go beyond a simple enumeration of service activities to include an evaluation of the extent and quality of the services rendered. When necessary, faculty should provide more detail on the extent and quality of their service activities in the narrative portion of their post-tenure performance report. Credit for Service is limited only to those activities in which the individual faculty members become involved because of their status as members of the university faculty or profession. Service that is financially compensated outside of one’s employment

should not be counted. The standard workload assigned to service is approximately 10%; the rubric below is based upon such a service workload.

Unsatisfactory 4	Does not Meet Expectations 3		Meets Expectations 2	Exceed Expectations 1
Less than two Departmental, University, Professional, or Public service contributions per year	Less than four Departmental, University, Professional, or Public service contributions per year with at least one at the Departmental or University level and another at the Professional or Public level.		More than four Departmental, University, Professional, or Public service contributions per year with at least one at the Departmental or University level and at least two at the Professional or Public level.	More than five Departmental, University, Professional, or Public service contributions per year with at least one at each level. At least one of these must be a very significant contribution (i.e., Committee Chair, Administrative role, Editor of professional journal, Officer in professional organization, etc.).
Factors that elevate the evaluation*				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Served on assigned committees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engaged in community-related activities related to the profession Review articles for journals Service to the discipline (e.g., serve as program chairs) Provide expertise on issues to local media Guest editor for journal special issue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive Service to a regional or national organization (e.g., division chair) Provide expertise on issues to state, federal, and international media. Longform discussions regarding expertise (podcasts or involved media interviews) Journal editor or associate editor Receive service award 		

*These factors are not a checklist; instead, they should be used by the faculty member to make their case for impact and used by the department Chair to appraise the case. The list of factors is not exhaustive. The factors should be considered regarding the faculty member's service workload assignment.

Overall Post-Tenure Performance Review Score and Narrative:

The chair's post-tenure performance review narrative and scores shall be a holistic assessment based upon the candidate's ability to help the department meet its goals in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

Once the chair has assessed the candidate's 5-year performance and productivity and assigned post-tenure performance scores in the areas of teaching, research, and service, these scores shall be weighted by the 5-year average faculty workloads in these areas to produce the candidate's overall post-tenure performance score. The Chair's narrative shall justify this final or overall post-tenure performance score as well as any upward or downward adjustments made..

Submitted: September 2023

APPROVED By the Office of the Provost: 09/15/2023