

Submitted: September 2023

Approved by the Office of the Provost: September 19, 2023

Post-Tenure Faculty Review Guidelines

School of Social Work
College of Behavioral & Community Sciences
University of South Florida

The School of Social Work is a professional degree-granting program and is committed to promoting social and economic justice, human rights, human dignity, scientific inquiry, and sustainable human and community well-being for all. The School of Social Work faculty are located on the USF Tampa and USF Sarasota-Mantee locations.

Post-tenure review(s) are required for tenured faculty five years after their initial tenure promotion according to the Board of Governors (BOG) Regulation 10.003. As a formative assessment process, post-tenure review is intended to provide continued academic professional development, enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a performance improvement plan (PIP) 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).

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 Faculty Evaluation Committee 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 of the School of Social Work will review the completed dossier and other personnel materials (see above). The Director'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 Director of the School of Social Work and by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and review of the faculty member's five-year conduct record. The performance ratings for the Director's review are to reflect a holistic assessment of overall performance. The Director shall use the process and rating scale indicated below.

Criteria for Evaluation

The following criteria for post-tenure review are drawn from the university approved criteria for annual evaluations for the School of Social Work. Each annual performance score in teaching, research, service, other, and overall 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.

The School of Social Work has approved syllabi for each course in the BSW and MSW programs to comply with accreditation requirements. Faculty teaching in these programs (face to face, online, hybrid) are expected to use the approved syllabi including assignments and rubrics. Ratings must be based on more than student evaluation scores. The teaching evaluation must take into account any relevant materials submitted by the employee including the results of peer evaluations of teaching and may not be based solely on student evaluations when this additional information has been made available to the evaluator. It is recognized that the number of completed student evaluations may not be sufficient to determine overall course instruction experience.

Examples of additional material to consider when assessing teaching effectiveness include peer evaluations/classroom observations, contributions to the educational programs of the School (e.g. new or revised courses or course materials), efforts to improve teaching, teaching supervision, teaching-related publications, teaching workshops given, awards and honors and instructional/training grants submitted and awarded, thesis/dissertation committees, course-innovation initiatives, serving as a faculty lead or faculty semester contact and other curriculum work related to the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) accreditation, certificates for teaching workshops/trainings, student mentoring/individual advising, teaching publications that are not listed as articles or scholarly work, presentations about teaching that are not listed as articles or scholarly work.

Ratings for this area are:

Ratings	PTR Score	Criteria for Consideration
Exceeds Expectations	1	Faculty member presents in the narrative evidence of mostly high numerical student ratings and an absence of patterns of criticism or complaints in the written commentary when available (small PhD courses or DIR or IND may not have student evaluations). Additional instructional activities as noted above and as evidenced through the development of teaching/learning materials and sharing it with all other instructors teaching sections and obtaining feedback of content for submission to the curriculum committee, securing teaching/training grants, the development of new course preparations, special recognition of teaching excellence via teaching awards, or through classroom observation or attendance/completion of education focused trainings. Engaging and mentoring students in research activities or related social work activities or serving as a course lead with evidence of regular engagement with adjuncts; including problem solving activities, are to be considered as well. To be rated outstanding, there must be

		unusually compelling evidence of excellence through mechanisms that are geared toward improving the curriculum, improving instruction of self, adjuncts or others, providing opportunities for students to engage in activities beyond coursework assignments that lead to professional recognition or preparation as a future scholar, as well as outstanding student evaluations.
Meets Expectations	3	Faculty member present in the narrative evidence of middling or better student ratings and minimal evidence of patterns of criticism or complaints when available. Additional instructional activities as noted above and as evidenced by demonstrated performance in development of teaching/learning materials for a single course, sharing teaching ideas with other sections of the same course, securing teaching/training grants, or special recognition of teaching excellence via teaching awards, through classroom observation, or attendance/completion of education focused trainings. Engaging and mentoring students in social work-related activities research or serving as a course lead with evidence of some engagement with adjuncts; are to be considered as well.
Does Not Meet Expectations	2	Faculty member present in the narrative evidence lower numerical student ratings with patterns of criticism or complaints in the written commentary with no recognition in the faculty narrative. Additional instructional activities as noted above and as evidenced by demonstrated of at least a satisfactory nature in development of teaching/learning materials, securing teaching/training grants, or special recognition of teaching contributions via teaching awards, or through classroom observation, or attendance/completion of education focused trainings.
Unsatisfactory	1	Faculty member present in the narrative student evaluations that reflect consistently low numbers and patterns of criticism or complaints. Additional information about teaching efforts or accomplishments are not provided.

Research:

Post-tenure review of research will be based on the previous five years of departmental evaluations and assignment for each year. The post-tenure review evaluation will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period.

Research/Scholarship refers to all forms of creative activity, both funded and unfunded, related to the creation and dissemination of new knowledge. It includes research related exploration, publication, and evaluation activities. Emphasis is placed on peer-reviewed publications and securing competitive external/internal grants/contracts. In order to categorize various areas of activity and provide a relative weighting to gauge accomplishment, the following schema shall be employed.

Level One Activities would include publication involving peer review and resulting in publication in respected media (for example, mainstream journals, respected publishers,

proceedings of prestigious organizations and scholarly books). This category would also include securing significant competitive grants and/or contracts. Teaching/training grants would be considered in the Instruction category.

Level Two Activities would include book chapters, technical reports and non-refereed publication by a credible publisher or refereed publication in other than mainstream media. Professional papers would be included in this category and if later developed to refereed publication status meeting the standards of a Level One activity could be so considered in a subsequent evaluation period. Tangible research efforts toward future level-one activities (e.g. new data collection efforts) may be reported here. Research grants/contracts of a less competitive nature or renewals not requiring major work would be considered in this category. Peer-reviewed and invited presentations shall be considered as level-two activities.

The evaluators may also take in consideration the following or other activities provided in the faculty narrative to determine their contributions to the above level activities:

- Extra required effort for international work and community-engaged scholarship.
- Local, regional, national, and international recognition of research output
- Progress which is commensurate with the faculty person's effort assigned for research, their rank, and other roles held (e.g., Program Chair)
- Effort to assist doctoral students with research projects or manuscripts
- New research collaborations within and external to USF

Ratings for this area are:

Rating	PTR Score	Criteria for Consideration
Exceed Expectations	1	Faculty member present in the narrative at least 3 level 1 or level 2 activities (at least one should be from level 1)
Meets Expectations	2	Faculty member present in the narrative at least 1 Level 1 activity or several Level 2 activities
Does Not Meet Expectations	3	Faculty member present in the narrative at least three or less level two activities. Effort toward a level one activity is not evident.
Unsatisfactory	4	Faculty member present in the narrative that progress on level one or level two activities is not evident

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.

Faculty are expected to attend all assigned School of Social Work and University Governance service committee meetings as a representative of the School of Social Work. Such bodies would

include but not necessarily be limited to, department, college and university councils or committees (standing or ad hoc) or to elective bodies such as college councils or the Faculty Senate. In addition, Faculty are expected to provide public/professional service to the profession and/or community. Such service would include, but not necessarily be limited to, service on social service planning bodies, fundraising bodies, program evaluation bodies, service on editorial/agency/organization boards, service on government appointed councils and committees, service on professional education or professional practice organizations, (for example, CSWE, NASW, or other social service related professional bodies), service to publishers/professional bodies via peer reviewer/book/abstract reviews, or work with international colleagues/universities.

Rating	PTR Score	Criteria for Consideration
Exceed Expectations	1	Faculty member present in the narrative significant documented contribution to at least one major university governance endeavor or served as a significant contributing member to several university bodies (including department committees) and be engaged in public/professional activities.
Meets Expectations	2	Faculty member present in the narrative that the faculty served as a significant contributing member to an university bodies (including department committees) or be engaged in public/professional activities.
Does Not Meet Expectations	3	Faculty member present in the narrative minimal participation in service activities and committee participation.
Unsatisfactory	4	Faculty member present in the narrative excessive absences from service activities and no evidence of effort at service assignments.

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.

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 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 will add 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 Director will include in the assessment letter the impact of COVID-19 on the School of Social Work and faculty assignments, any documented concerns regarding professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance during the period under review.

At the conclusion of the Director's review, the faculty member shall be provided the opportunity to review the packet and all documentation the Director 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's review.

The Dean of the College shall evaluate the review packet submitted by the faculty member, the Director'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 Social Work faculty and previously approved by the Director of the School of Social Work, 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 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 Social Work, 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 Social Work 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 Social Work 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 Social Work 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 Social Work faculty 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 Social Work 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 Social Work, 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.