Post-Tenure Faculty Review Guidelines

Department of Mental Health Law & Policy
College of Behavioral & Community Sciences
University of South Florida

Submitted: 9/25/2023. Approved by the Office of the Provost: 9/25/2023

INTRODUCTION

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, service. 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).

Faculty are identified for post-tenure review by the Provost's Office and are reviewed within departments. The procedural guidelines and evaluation criteria for the Department of Mental Health Law & Policy post-tenure review, described below, are based on USF Regulation 10.003, Post-Tenure Faculty Review. Evaluation criteria are applied to teaching, research, and service and are assessed relative to the faculty member's assigned effort and duties as well as the faculty member's history of professional conduct and academic responsibilities.

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 based on Department criteria;

(c) The faculty member's curriculum vitae (CV); and

(d) The faculty member's disciplinary record (if any) 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.

RATING CATEGORIES

(1) **Exceeds expectations**: a clear and exceptional level of accomplishment and behavior/conduct for a faculty member serving at a nationally ranked, Research One

University; sustained and satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies. For each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of "exceeds expectations," the Dean, in consultation with the department Chair, may recommend, and the Provost may determine, appropriate recognition and compensation.

(2) **Meets expectations**: a level of accomplishment that is acceptable, and even commendable, for a faculty member serving at a nationally ranked, Research One University; 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' regulations, and university regulations and policies.

(3) **Does not meet expectations**: a level of performance that is not acceptable for a faculty member serving at a nationally ranked, Research One University, but the faculty member 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 has exhibited unsatisfactory performance in any single area of assignment over multiple years or a pattern of non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies, may be deemed to not meet expectations. A faculty member who receives a score of 3 will be placed on a Performance Improvement Plan that will articulate benchmarks that the faculty member must achieve within one year. A faculty member who fails to meet those benchmarks will be given a non-renewal notice.

(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, or who demonstrates a consistent pattern of failing to perform duties assigned by the University or of sustained violations of applicable state and federal law and applicable published College, University, and Board of Governors regulations, policies, and procedures, may be deemed unsatisfactory. A faculty member who receives a score of 4 will be given a non-renewal notice and will be afforded a 12-month non-renewal period of employment.

PROCESS

The review process consists of the following steps:

(1) For each area of performance (teaching, research, service), a five-year mean percentage of effort is calculated.

(2) The Chair undertakes a holistic assessment of performance, based on the faculty member's CV and narrative record of accomplishments for the past five years relative to assigned effort, the last five years of annual performance reviews by the department Chair, and the faculty member's five-year conduct record.

(3) The Chair prepares a narrative and determines the rating category of performance (1-4, defined above) for each domain (teaching, research/scholarship, and service), based on the materials submitted and the rubric below, with expectations adjusted in accordance with percentages of assigned effort.

(4) An overall score is calculated as the mean of the three 5-year performance category scores weighted by the mean percentages of assignment for each category. The Chair may adjust scores where necessary to reflect a more accurate, holistic, five-year perspective across all categories, which may be partially obscured by the constraints on input from 4-point categorical scales. The result of this calculation is rounded to the nearest whole number to determine the final post-tenure review category.

(5) All new materials, including Chair's narrative and post-tenure review score, are added to existing materials in the Archivum Post-Tenure Review system.

POST-TENURE REVIEW SCORING RUBRIC

The faculty member's post-tenure review score for each of the three domains is assigned using the rubric below. Elements in the rubric reflect the activities that are typically seen at that category level and that are neither exhaustive nor all required for such a rating. Examples of the kind of information that may be considered both in the faculty member's narrative record and in classifying performance using the rubric are noted in the following non-exhaustive list, based on more detailed descriptions in the MHLP governance and tenure & promotion documents:

Teaching: information about efforts in curriculum development and improvement; quality of evaluations of teaching by students and/or peers; student mentoring and corresponding outcomes, including through training grants or mentoring in research grants; scholarly contributions to the science of teaching and learning.

Research: information about the nature, source, role in, and magnitude of research grants or contracts submitted and funded; internally supported research activity; peer reviewed articles, chapters, books submitted/accepted and/or other scholarly products such as technical reports; scholarly presentations; honors, awards, or other recognition.

Service: Information about participation in university, college, or department committees or other service role or activities on behalf of the university; mentoring of faculty relating to teaching and/or research or other contribution to university, college, or department goals; contributions to the profession through leadership roles in professional organizations, peer review, editorial roles, professional education; and service to the community.

	Teaching	Research/Scholarship	Service
(1) Exceeds Expectations	• Peer, observational, or student evaluations of teaching predominantly in the highest sections of rating or reporting ranges. • Extensive student mentoring activities with multiple students resulting in successful and timely completion of student projects and concrete outcomes (presentations and publications/submissions). • Administration of a moderate to large training grant reflecting extensive depth of involvement with multiple students, significant support of the Department's teaching mission through support of students, and concrete outcomes (presentations and publications/submissions) by supported students. • Evidence of significant efforts to improve content delivery, to develop curriculum, or to contribute otherwise to student success outside of typical requirements of one's course load.	• Funding or submission of one or more high impact grants, as determined by the alignment with university, college, and Department goals; funding source; size of grant; and extent of activities to be funded. • Significant activities or management of a previously funded high impact grant, as determined by the alignment with university, college, and Department goals; funding source; size of grant; and extent of activities funded. • Significant progress on, submission of or publication of multiple high impact articles or book chapters, a high impact book as determined by the quality of the outlet(s) and the influence of the publication(s) on the field, or other high impact product such as a highly influential or cited technical analysis/report. • Several high impact presentations, as evidenced by the quality of the outlet, impact of the presentation, and status of the presenter (e.g., Workshop organizer for major conference, invited address at a major conference; invited colloquium talk for a highly ranked program or highly respected institute).	• Extensive service to the Department (Note: an appropriate level of service to the Department is expected of all faculty). • Service beyond the Department in multiple activities (i.e. service to the university or college, profession, or community). • A leadership level position in the service activities (e.g., committee chair or co-chair, an editorial position, workshop organizer, organization board member). • Multiple activities for prestigious societies, organizations, or publishers.

4

	Teaching	Research/Scholarship	Service
(2) Meets Expectations	• Peer, observational, or student evaluations of teaching predominantly in the middle sections of rating or reporting ranges, less frequently in upper sections, indicating acceptable performance but with clear indications for improvement. • Student mentoring activities with at least one student resulting in successful and timely completion of student projects and progress toward concrete outcomes (presentations and publications/submissions). • Administration of a small training grant with significant support of the Department's teaching mission through support of students, and progress toward concrete outcomes (presentations and publications/submissions) by supported students. • Evidence of minimal efforts to improve content delivery if needed, to develop curriculum, or to otherwise contribute to student success outside of typical requirements of one's course load.	• Funding, or documented progress on submission of a lesser impact grant, as determined by the alignment with university, college, and Department goals; funding source; size of grant; and extent of activities to be funded. • Significant progress on, submission of or publication of articles or book chapters, a lesser impact book as determined by the quality of the outlet and the influence of the publication on the field, or other lesser impact product such as an influential or cited technical analysis/report. • One or more high impact presentation as evidenced by the quality of the outlet, impact of the presentation, and status of the presenter (e.g., Workshop organizer for a major conference, invited address at a major conference; invited colloquium talk to a highly ranked program; peer-reviewed presentation at a major conference; invited presentation in a workshop).	• Significant service to the department. • At least one service activity beyond the Department (i.e. service to the university or college, profession, or community).

	Teaching	**Research/Scholarship**	**Service**
(3) Does Not Meet Expectations	• Peer, observational, or student evaluations of teaching predominantly in middle or low sections of rating or reporting ranges. • Limited student-mentoring activities or failure to appropriately mentor students to complete projects and/or make progress toward concrete outcomes (e.g., presentations and publications/submissions). • Demonstration of insufficient effort to introduce needed improvement in content delivery, curriculum development, or to contribute otherwise to student success outside of typical requirements of the assigned teaching load.	• Lack of documentation of progress on a grant submission. • No publication or submission of a lesser impact article or book chapter, or documentation of progress on a high impact article or book as determined by the quality of the outlet and the influence of the publication on the field. • No significant presentations, as evidenced by the quality of the outlet, impact of the presentation, and status of the presenter (e.g., Workshop organizer at a major conference, invited address at a major conference; invited colloquium presentation to a highly ranked program).	• The faculty member participates in only the faculty meetings and departmental meetings with no other service being evident. • The effort reported as service is obviously not commensurate with the assigned effort in that area (i.e. someone is assigned .25 for service but only shows evidence of work that should take 1 hour a month).
(4) Unsatisfactory	• Contribution to teaching is typified by little indication overall that the teaching or mentoring provided has been satisfactory. • Failure to address challenges and correct issues identified in a performance improvement plan.	• Contribution to research is reflected by no evidence or activity in research or scholarship. • Failure to address challenges and correct issues identified in a performance improvement plan.	• Contribution to service is typified by a faculty member showing insufficient evidence of service, not even attending faculty and departmental meetings. • Failure to address challenges and correct issues identified in a performance improvement plan.