

School of Information

Memo on Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Criteria

To comply with BOG Regulation 10.003, the University of South Florida (USF) has been given authority for administering Post-Tenure Faculty Review (PTR) at USF. PTR is required for all tenured faculty members at the University of South Florida in accordance with State law.

The School of Information will follow BOG Regulation 10.003 and *Procedures for Post-Tenure Review at USF* with regard to all aspects of PTR, including Timing and Eligibility, Review Requirements, Process Requirements, Outcomes, Monitoring and Reporting

With regard to PTR review criteria USF Regulation Section II(3)(b) states:

Since tenured faculty at the University of South Florida undergo annual merit evaluations post-tenure, it is expected that the post-tenure review criteria for a comprehensive 5-year review shall be based on currently approved unit-level or college-level criteria consistent with rank and assigned duties. Evaluations shall be based on rating categories of Post-Tenure Review BOG Regulation 10.003 or follow university level guidance provided in section (3)(c).

Accordingly the School of Information, with concurrence of the faculty, has developed criteria (see attached document: *School of Information Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Evaluation Matrix*) for each comprehensive 5-year PTR review based on its currently approved criteria for Tenure & Promotion (T&P) and Annual Evaluations, as specified consistent with rank and assigned duties. With regard to the use of the School of Information's T&P criteria, the PTR will not involve external review letters, but the T&P criteria will be used as a benchmark for general performance expectations.

The PTR assessment will be based on a "review packet" composed of the following materials:

- The faculty member's narrative record of accomplishments for the past five years in a university-designated template. This narrative will have a maximum limit of 12,000 characters.
- The last five years of annual performance reviews by the Director,
- The faculty member's curriculum vitae (not to exceed 5 pages single-spaced), and
- 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.

School of Information

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, & Service) by the faculty member's assignment percentage in that domain and using the sum of those figures, since that approach is most consistent with our annual evaluation system, as outlined in our governance documents.

1. **Exceeds expectations:** a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the 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.
2. **Meets expectations:** 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 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'
3. **Does not meet expectations:** 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.
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 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.

Final decisions regarding post-tenure review may be appealed under university regulations or collective bargaining agreements, as applicable to the employee.

School of Information

University of South Florida | 4202 E Fowler Avenue, CIS 1040 | Tampa, FL 33620-4301
813-974-3520 | si.usf.edu

Submitted: August 22, 2023

Approved by the Dean’s Office and Office of the Provost: August 22, 2023

School of Information Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Evaluation Matrix

RESEARCH			
<p>Evaluation ratings in the area of Research (which includes scholarship, as broadly defined in SI governance documents) generally reflect the faculty member’s research <u>productivity</u> (developmental and completed projects) and <u>impact</u>. 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). For forms of scholarship other than those designated in the SI Guidelines as “high impact,” the faculty member should provide a brief narrative describing the work, its importance/significance, and its impact. Research activity will be evaluated holistically, not just based on the number of indicators. Faculty can meet criteria for a given rating in the domain of Research with qualifying performance indicators in one or more of the rating level descriptions.</p>			
Exceeds Expectations (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (4)
<p>Evidence of exceptional progress on (e.g., data collection, data analysis, manuscript pages written) and/or completion of--on average--at least one scholarly product or “high impact” form of scholarship per year (per SI Guidelines; typically peer-reviewed article and/or substantial application for external funding, not just letter of intent) for each 20% Research Assignment.</p> <p>Evidence of exceptional research impact or professional recognition of the faculty member’s status as a leading or emerging scholar in their field (e.g., applied use of one’s</p>	<p>Evidence of significant progress on and/or completion of--on average--one scholarly product per year, at least some of which are regarded “high impact” forms of scholarship (per SI Guidelines; typically peer-reviewed article and/or substantial application for external funding, not just letter of intent), but below the rate of one product for each 20% Research Assignment.</p> <p>Evidence of significant research impact or professional recognition of the faculty member’s status as a leading or emerging scholar in their field (e.g., applied use of one’s research/scholarship in a professional practice community, scholarly</p>	<p>Little progress on any scholarly product and no completed products over the review period. Productivity is below minimum expectations within the School for most years during the review period, as assessed by standards within the SI governance.</p>	<p>Not actively engaged in research or scholarship consistent with their research assignment, for more than two years.</p>

<p>research/scholarship in a professional practice community, scholarly use of one’s research/scholarship to advance the profession or contribute to an important research topic/area, which may be measured qualitatively (e.g., scholarly recognition by peers, awards, or appointments) or quantitatively (e.g., h-index, citation counts, or productivity/impact “rankings”)</p>	<p>use of one’s research/scholarship to advance the profession or contribute to an important research topic/area, , which may be measured qualitatively (e.g., scholarly recognition by peers, awards, or appointments) or quantitatively (e.g., h-index, citation counts, or productivity/impact “rankings”)</p>		
<p>TEACHING</p> <p>The School of Information 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. Teaching activities may pertain to formal courses and to student mentoring, professional development, and advising. Teaching should generally be commensurate with faculty assignment and role (tenure-track and instructional faculty). The following rating guidelines are intended to reflect that diversity. No single indicator is necessary and may not be sufficient to warrant a given rating. Teaching activity will be evaluated holistically, not just based on the number of indicators. Faculty can meet criteria for a given rating in the domain of Teaching with qualifying performance indicators in one or more of the rating level descriptions.</p>			
<p>Exceeds Expectations (1)</p>	<p>Meets Expectations (2)</p>	<p>Does Not Meet Expectations (3)</p>	<p>Unsatisfactory (4)</p>
<p>Evidence of exceptional teaching performance and/or effectiveness for most years during the review period, considering indicators such as the following:</p> <p>Student evaluation ratings predominantly and consistently at or above the School and College averages</p> <p>Completed or nearly completed development a new course or officially “refreshed” an existing course with Innovative Education, meeting all</p>	<p>Evidence of teaching performance and/or effectiveness that meets minimum expectations within the School for most years during the review period, considering indicators such as the following:</p> <p>Student evaluation ratings predominantly and consistently at the School and College averages or slightly below with a reasonable narrative explanation from the faculty member</p> <p>Maintains existing courses, with at least minimal efforts to update or improve them</p>	<p>Evidence of below average teaching performance and/or effectiveness that fails to meet minimum expectations within the School for most years during the review period, considering indicators such as the following:</p> <p>Student evaluation ratings predominantly and consistently below the School and College</p>	<p>No clear evidence of adequate teaching performance and/or effectiveness at the level expected for the rank for more than two years.</p> <p>Ignoring deficiencies in existing courses; no efforts to improve</p> <p>Syllabi fail to follow required USF template requirements, are missing critical information</p>

<p>quality indicators</p> <p>Exceptional performance in facilitating student success, engagement, mentoring, professional development, and advising, which may include:</p> <p>Student ratings and/or narrative suggesting exceptional accessibility/responsivity to and effective communication with students</p> <p>Faculty narrative describing how they have incorporated feedback from students into substantive course revisions and articulated a plan to assess the impact of those changes</p> <p>Faculty narrative reflecting significant, positive efforts to increase student engagement</p> <p>Faculty member has gone above and beyond usual expectations to facilitate student success, including accommodating more students when course demand is particularly high</p> <p>Faculty member serves on major area paper, thesis, and/or doctoral committees within the university</p> <p>Faculty member directs undergraduate Honors Thesis</p> <p>Faculty member is actively engaged</p>	<p>Significant progress on a new course or refreshing (updating or enhancing more than 20% of content) of an existing course for one or more of the School's programs</p> <p>Above-average performance in facilitating student success, engagement, mentoring, professional development, and advising, which may include:</p> <p>Average performance in facilitating student success, engagement, mentoring, professional development, and advising, which may include:</p> <p>Student ratings and/or narrative suggesting average accessibility/responsivity to and effective communication with students</p> <p>Meets minimum expectations for attending to feedback from students, but without substantive course revisions and/or articulated plan to assess the impact of those changes</p> <p>Faculty narrative reflecting student engagement that meets minimum expectations within the School</p>	<p>averages with no reasonable narrative explanation to mitigate or contextualize them. Ignoring deficiencies in existing courses</p> <p>Below average performance in facilitating student success, engagement, mentoring, professional development, and advising, which may be reflected in:</p> <p>Student ratings and/or narrative suggesting below average accessibility/responsivity to and effective communication with students</p> <p>Failing to meet minimum expectations within the School for attending to feedback from students</p> <p>Faculty narrative reflecting below average student engagement that fails to meet minimum expectations within the School</p>	<p>Clear evidence that faculty member is inaccessible and non-responsive to students</p>
---	---	---	--

<p>with students in activities such as advising, capstones, ePortfolios, supervising and managing practicum and internships, and career planning/development and/or other forms of student engagement appropriate to the faculty member’s assignment</p> <p>Faculty member mentors students within their research “lab” and/or supervises student independent research</p> <p>Faculty member receives teaching awards/recognition</p>			
<p>SERVICE</p> <p>The School of Information recognizes (a) that university service 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, professional (c) that excellence in service can be demonstrated in different ways. The following rating guidelines are intended to reflect that diversity. Service should generally be commensurate with the proportion of faculty duties assigned in the service category (e.g., productivity expectations for faculty with a 10% service assignment will be higher than for faculty with a 5% service assignment). No single indicator is necessary and may not be sufficient to warrant a given rating. Service activity will be evaluated holistically, not just based on the number of indicators. Faculty can meet criteria for a given rating in the domain of Service with qualifying performance indicators in one or more of the rating level descriptions.</p>			
<p>Exceeds Expectations (1)</p>	<p>Meets Expectations (2)</p>	<p>Does Not Meet Expectations (3)</p>	<p>Unsatisfactory (4)</p>
<p>Evidence of exceptional service activity for most years during the review period, considering indicators such as the following (typically two or more for “Exceeds Expectations”):</p> <p>Service activity both for the university and for the profession.</p> <p>Service activity in multiple roles or on</p>	<p>Evidence of average service activity that meets minimum expectations within the School, typically comprising service activity in at least one domain—School, College, University, Profession—for most years during the review period.</p>	<p>No effective service activity or activity that is below minimum expectations within the School for most years during the review period.</p>	<p>No effective service activity at the level expected for the rank, for more than two years.</p>

<p>multiple committees, or at multiple levels—i.e., university, college, and school</p> <p>Holding office or positions of professional distinction (e.g., journal editorships) in professional service.</p> <p>Engagement in high-priority, time-intensive service activities, e.g., busy committees, special task forces</p> <p>Serving in leadership roles in university and/or professional association committees</p> <p>School-related community engagement - e.g., presentations to or consulting for community, library, government organization and/or serving as officer or board member of civic organization.</p>			
<p>OVERALL PTR RATING</p> <p>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) by the faculty member’s assignment percentage in that domain and using the sum of those figures, since that approach is most consistent with our annual evaluation system, as outlined in our governance documents.</p>			
<p>Exceeds Expectations (1)</p>	<p>Meets Expectations (2)</p>	<p>Does Not Meet Expectations (3)</p>	<p>Unsatisfactory (4)</p>
<p>A clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performance of faculty across the faculty member’s discipline and unit. Performance is appreciably greater than the</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Failure to meet expectations that reflects disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance that</p>

<p>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>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>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>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>
--	---	---	--

Submitted: August 22, 2023

Approved by the Dean's Office and Office of the Provost: August 22, 2023