

Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders

Submitted 9/19/2023 Approved by the Office of the Provost: 9/20/2023

Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Evaluation Matrix

According to the Board of Governors rule policy 10.003, faculty will undergo post-tenure review (PTR), every five years. This matrix will be used by the Chair to complete the department stage of PTR. The Chair will consult with an ad hoc tenured Faculty Advisory Committee on any cases that are initially assessed as anything less than meets expectations.

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). As the review criteria are written toward an approximate 40% research workload commensurate with a standard 2-2 teaching assignment, the criteria below must be adjusted proportionally for any deviations from this average. 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 in one criterion but lacking in another.

Post-Tenure Expectations: Tenured faculty are expected to achieve a record of excellent record of research compared to their peers in CSD and within their broader discipline.

Exceeds Expectations (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (4)
Faculty exceed expectations when they demonstrate a clear and significant accomplishment that is exceptional in comparison to faculty across their unit and discipline. Consistently engages in more than 2 items in the A list per year, or 2	Faculty meet expectations when they demonstrate average performance within the CSD and broader discipline. Consistently engages in 2 items in list A or at least 1 item in list A and 2 items in list B per year:	Faculty do not meet expectations when they demonstrate performance below that expected in the CSD and discipline, including no consistent items from List A per year, less than 2 items in list B per year:	Faculty demonstrate unsatisfactory performance when they are not actively engaged in research or scholarship consistent with their research

<p>items of A and at least 2 in list B:</p> <p>(a) continuous and successful efforts toward external funding for their research. A list</p> <p>(b) above-average publication rate in high impact peer reviewed outlets for CSD – A list</p> <p>(c) 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.</p> <p>(d) And combines with items in the B list</p> <p>A list items</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. final acceptance or publication of a substantive peer-reviewed journal article - first author, primary author, team leader author, significant contribution author. 2. final acceptance or publication of a substantive peer-reviewed chapter in a 	<p>(a) demonstrated efforts to attain sufficient internal and/or external funding to support their research. A list</p> <p>(b) publish research results in high impact, peer-reviewed journals, books, book chapters, and/or monographs (average of 1-2 articles per year, or equivalent in other types of publications) A list</p> <p>(c) provide evidence of significant research impact or professional 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.</p> <p>(d) Presents in national conferences and is invited to national or international conferences - B list</p>	<p>(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;</p> <p>(b) little progress on any scholarly products or few completed research products (i.e. 2-4 papers or equivalent)</p> <p>(c) lack of research impact or professional recognition</p>	<p>assignment, for more than two years of the five-year period or productivity is cumulatively below the standards for a rating of (3).</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>scholarly book - at any level of authorship</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. receipt of a major award, or fellowship that is nationally or internationally competitive, including various residential fellowships 4. Receipt of federal grant or nationally recognized private sources of funding over \$100,000 direct costs. 5. publication of a peer-reviewed scholarly monograph, edited volume, book-length critical edition, book-length translation, textbook, or other book <p>B List</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. submission of an article to a peer-reviewed journal 2. submission of a chapter for a peer-reviewed volume 3. delivery of a scholarly paper at a regional, national, or international refereed conference 4. delivery of an invited scholarly talk in an academic milieu (some talks are 			
--	--	--	--

<p>service)</p> <p>5. submission of a book proposal including narrative and chapter outlines and/or evidence that a completed book manuscript is committed to a particular publisher</p> <p>6. application for a grant or fellowship that is nationally or internationally competitive, including various residential fellowships and those from private funding sources</p> <p>7. publication of a peer-reviewed translation or creative work</p> <p>8. Serving as an invited respondent at a professional conference</p> <p>9. Submission or publication of a book review or review essay</p> <p>10. Submission or publication of a non-peer reviewed article or essay</p> <p>11. Application for or receipt of a USF internal or small regional/local grant</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>TEACHING</p> <p>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 Chair 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. CSD also acknowledges that student evaluations can be biased based on gender, race, and other categories and will take that under consideration during review. In terms of advising, evaluating student advising and mentoring must be commensurate with both workload and access to students which may be campus-specific. 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 in one criterion but lacking in another.</p> <p>Post-Tenure Expectations: Tenured faculty are expected to achieve a record of excellent teaching compared to their peers in CSD and within their broader discipline.</p>			
Exceeds Expectations (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (4)
<p>Faculty exceed expectations when they demonstrate exceptional performance as compared to the CSD and broader discipline:</p> <p>(a) teaching duties are performed effectively and support both undergraduate or graduate education; courses are innovative, transformative, engaging, or have a high impact in some facet.</p>	<p>Faculty meet expectations when they demonstrate average performance as compared to the CSD and broader discipline:</p> <p>(a) teaching duties were performed as assigned, ideally supporting both undergraduate or graduate students. Existing courses are maintained and updated, as needed.</p>	<p>Faculty do not meet expectations when:</p> <p>(a) teaching duties were only performed partially, or not as assigned.</p> <p>(b) student evaluation comments and/or ratings consistently raise clear and obvious problems, such as unresponsiveness to student</p>	<p>Faculty demonstrate unsatisfactory performance when they do not provide clear 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</p>

<p>(b) faculty makes other instructional contributions to the CSD or discipline outside the classroom, such as through general education certification, mentoring, professional development activities, community education, and so forth.</p> <p>(c) student evaluation comments and/or ratings convey a positive student experience and do not consistently raise clear or obvious problems with instruction; consistently score 4.0 or above</p> <p>(d) successful supervision and mentoring of undergraduate or graduate students, as demonstrated by the number of advisees and graduates, job placements, undergraduate research projects, theses or honors, graduate capstones and theses or dissertations, and so forth.</p>	<p>(b) student evaluation comments and/or ratings do not consistently raise clear and obvious problems with instruction. Score 3 or better in the course</p> <p>(c) evidence of supervision or mentoring of undergraduate or graduate students</p>	<p>questions, ineffective communication, disrespect to students, or failure to provide required disability accommodations.</p> <p>(c) there is limited to no supervision of graduate or undergraduate students, or comparable activities.</p>	<p>undergraduate courses, graduate courses, or graduate student advising.</p>
--	--	---	---

--	--	--	--

SERVICE/ADMINISTRATION

The Chair 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 in one criterion but lacking in another.

Post-Tenure Expectations: Tenured faculty are expected to achieve a record of excellent service compared to their peers in CSD and within their broader discipline.

Exceeds Expectations (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (4)
<p>Faculty exceed expectations when they demonstrate exceptional performance as compared to the CSD and broader discipline. They engage in at least two department/college/university service and at least two professional service activity:</p> <p>(a) continuous service within the CSD, including either leadership activity (administrative duties, committee chair, program director, or equivalent) and/or</p>	<p>Faculty meet expectations when they demonstrate average performance as compared to the CSD and broader discipline. They consistently engage in at least one department/college/university service and at least one professional service activity:</p> <p>(a) evidence of service within the CSD, college, and/or university, such as participation in activities, committees, meetings, events, and so forth.</p>	<p>Faculty do not meet expectations when:</p> <p>(a) university service activity is below expectations within the CSD for most years during the review period, such as unwillingness to serve on CSD committees;</p> <p>(b) external service to discipline or community is lacking during most years of the</p>	<p>Faculty demonstrate unsatisfactory performance when they display no effective service activity at the level expected for the rank, for more than two years.</p>

<p>regular intensive service (multiple committees, heavy workload or responsibility).</p> <p>(b) evidence of service at the college or university levels</p> <p>(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.</p>	<p>(b) evidence of professional service, through the academic discipline, community, or other outlet.</p>	<p>review period.</p>	
---	---	-----------------------	--

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	Expected level of accomplishment compared to	Performance falls below the expected range of annual	Failure to meet expectations

<p>average performance 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.</p>	<p>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'</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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 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.</p>
--	---	---	---

Drafted: 9/20/23

Approved by the Office of the Provost: 9/20/23