Submitted: September 2023
Approved by the Dean's Office and Office of the Provost: 9/18/2023

School of Public Affairs (SPA) Criteria for Post Tenure Review

In alignment with Board of Governors' regulation 10.003, as well as state law, all tenured faculty members at the University of South Florida (USF) are subject to Post-Tenure Review (PTR) every five years. The School of Public Affairs

evaluation. Post-tenure review will be based on the annual assignments of the faculty member across the five-year period under review.

Based on the PTR assessment, an OVERALL rating will be assigned using the 4-point scale specified in USF's Post-Tenure Review (PTR) regulation II(3)(c). This OVERALL rating will be determined in accordance with the faculty member's assignment percentage in each domain (i.e. Research, Teaching and Service).

Rating scale for post-tenure review:

1. **Exceeds expectations:** a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performances 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' regulations, and university regulations and policies.
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 five 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 expectation 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 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.

Faculty members who receive an OVERALL score of 4 will be given a non-renewal notice, and faculty members who receive an OVERALL score of 3 will be placed on a Performance Improvement Plan that will articulate benchmarks that the faculty member must achieve within

one year. Faculty members who fail to meet those benchmarks will be given a non-renewal notice.

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

PTR Review Criteria:
The following criteria for post-tenure review in the School of Public Affairs are drawn from university approved criteria for annual faculty performance evaluations:

<u>Teaching</u>
The School of Public Affairs 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. SPA faculty are expected to (a) abide by university guidelines with respect to the preparation of course syllabi, (b) provide students with a high quality engaged experience, (c) achieve overall student evaluation ratings that meet department and/or college averages for similar courses, (d) advise and mentor graduate students in applied research projects which may include projects undertaken as part of a class assignment, capstone, thesis, or independent study. Teaching activities may pertain to formal courses and to student mentoring, professional development, and advising. Furthermore, engaged teaching techniques (e.g. service learning, community-engaged learning projects, etc.) often require additional effort and integration with course outcomes. As the School hosts professional, terminal degree programs, opportunities to serve on graduate theses and/or dissertation committees are limited. However, faculty members are encouraged to serve as supervisors of graduate students' independent research, and to direct undergraduate research projects.

The School of Public Affairs also recognizes that faculty will participate in a wide variety of class settings, from hands-on studio projects with a few graduate students to large on-line undergraduate courses. Student evaluations of instruction do factor into the overall assessment of teaching effectiveness, especially if consistent patterns are found in the comments from students from semester to semester. There are a variety of resources available across the University to enhance teaching effectiveness and faculty are expected to avail themselves of these opportunities.

In the School of Public Affairs, teaching should generally be commensurate with faculty assignment and 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 a course evaluation score. Faculty can meet PTR criteria for a given rating in the domain of Teaching with qualifying performance indicators in at least two of the rating level descriptions.

Post-tenure review of teaching will be based on the previous five years of teaching activity and assignment for each year. The post-tenure review evaluation will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period. The criteria are as follows:

Exceeds Expectations (1)
Evidence of

Meets Expectations (2)

Evidence of satisfactory teaching performance and/or effectiveness that meets expectations within the School for most years during the review period, considering indicators such as the following:

- Student evaluation ratings predominantly and consistently at the School and College averages or slightly below with a reasonable narrative explanation from the faculty member.
- Student comments that reflect expected satisfactory teaching performance.
- Evidence of syllabi that meet required university guidelines and reflect accepted teaching practices, assignments, and assessments relevant to the discipline which meet stated goals of the course.
- Evidence of successful refreshing of existing courses by updating or enhancing more than 25% of content across modalities (i.e. face-to-face, online or hybrid) in line with quality indicators.

Evidence of below average performance in facilitating student success, engagement, mentoring, professional development, and advising for most years during the review period, considering indicators such as the following:

- Student ratings and/or narrative suggesting below average or predominantly inconsistent accessibility/responsivity to and effective communication with students.
- Predominantly inconsistent in meeting expectations for attending to feedback from students, with minimal evidence of course revisions and/or an articulated plan to assess the impact of those changes.
- Faculty narrative reflecting predominantly inconsistent student engagement that meets expectations within the School.
- Minimal evidence of participation in or use of resources to enhance teaching effectiveness.

Unsatisfactory (4)
No clear evidence of adequate teaching performance and/or effectiveness at the level expected for the rank for more than two years during the review period, considering indicators such as the following:

- Student evaluation ratings significantly below the School and College averages with no reasonable narrative explanation to mitigate or contextualize them.
- Student comments suggest unsatisfactory and/or serious concerns with teaching performance and effectiveness.
- Evidence of syllabi that fail to follow required USF template requirements and/or are missing critical information pertinent to the course assignments and assessments of learning outcomes.
- Unsatisfactory or no evidence of refreshing existing courses by updating or enhancing content across modalities (i.e. face-to-face, online or hybrid) in line with quality indicators.

No clear evidence of facilitating student success, engagement, mentoring, professional development, and advising for more than two years during the review period, considering indicators such as the following:

- Student ratings and/or narrative with clear evidence that faculty member is inaccessible and non-responsive to students and ineffective communicating with students.
- Predominantly unsatisfactory or failure to meet expectations for attending to feedback from students, with no evidence of course revisions and/or an articulated plan to assess the impact of those changes.
- Unsatisfactory or lack of faculty narrative reflecting student engagement that meets expectations within the School.
- No evidence of use of resources or effort to enhance teaching effectiveness.

Research
The School of Public Affairs recognizes its' faculty members are a highly diverse group of scholars holding degrees from a variety of disciplines. This diversity translates into the creation of research products including but not limited to books; traditional journal articles; technical reports; community engaged scholarship; presentations to community, professional, and

academic audiences; as well as submissions for local, state, and federal government and foundation grants and contracts.

The School of Public Affairs expects faculty to engage in impactful scholarly work. This includes scholarly peer review as one indicator to assess the quality and impact of scholarship, however, we also value various kinds of peer review deemed appropriate particularly with regard to the impact of community-engaged scholarship. While impactful work may take place within scholarly journals and academic presses, it may also be produced in more accessible forums including online academic journals, policy reports, technical reports, applied community action projects and grant applications. Scholarship may take the form of multiple genres and may overlap with activism and pedagogy. "High-impact" should be addressed in the faculty narrative. Furthermore, the School of Public Affairs faculty believe quality takes precedence over quantity and therefore supports excellence in the research portfolio. This should be addressed in the faculty narrative.

Because the School of Public Affairs is oriented toward professional practice and community engagement, research-based scholarship shared with or conducted in partnership with the larger non-academic community may be a significant component of the faculty member's research record. Examples of such scholarship are: community needs assessments; research reports or papers for institutes, government agencies, or community groups; evaluations of impact of public policies on local communities; documentation and analysis of innovative public affairs programs for dissemination to other communities. Community-engaged scholarship in and of itself does not substitute for a successful record of peer-reviewed research but should be given serious consideration particularly in terms of narrative demonstra0.00000912M g0 0 g⅃ 792 reW⁕ṅBT/F1 12 Tf1 0 0 1 3

- Significant progress on and/or completion of at least 3 scholarly products, at least some of which are regarded "high impact" forms of scholarship, for each 20% Research Assignment over the review period including:
    - Accepted or Published manuscript for a peer reviewed journal, book or edited volume, or peer reviewed chapter.
    - Lead or Co-author of manuscript under revise and resubmit with academic journal or book press.
    - Publication of a book review or review essay, encyclopedia entry, technical report, or non-peer review article relevant to one's core research area.
    - Posting of juried or invited professional blog entry, or Op-Ed article.
    - Editing of a scholarly journal or book series.
    - PI/Co-PI on funded refereed external research grant.
    - PI/Co-PI on funded refereed internal research grant.
    - PI/Co-PI on submitted high impact external or internal competitive research grant.
    - Delivery of a scholarly paper and/or presentation at refereed international, national or regional disciplinary research conference.
    - Recipient of international, national, or regional research award or honor.
    - Demonstration of high quality and impactful community engaged research and scholarship (e.g. needs assessments; research or technical reports or papers for institutes, government agencies, or community groups/organizations; evaluations of public policy impact on communities; analysis of innovative public affairs programs/practices, etc.).
    - Implementation of high quality and impactful research project (e.g., data collection, data analysis, manuscript pages written, etc.).

Evidence of significant research impact or

Unsatisfactory (4)
Lack of evidence of being actively or consistently engaged in scholarly research or community engaged scholarship projects (refer to list of scholarly products above), consistent with Research Assignment over the five-year review period.

Service

The School of Public Affairs recognizes that Service to the University, College, School, Profession, and Community are integral components of our faculty identity. Since Service Assignments may vary despite the percent of assignment, the following should be noted:

        (a) University service activities of equal importance or impact can occur at different "levels" (e.g., university, college, and school);

        (b) Service activities of equal importance or impact can occur in different domains (e.g., university, professional, community);

        (c) Excellence in service can be demonstrated in different ways (e.g., committees, leadership, boards, etc.); and,

        (d) Tenured faculty are often called upon and at times expected to engage in a

- Serve in other forms of significant activity relevant to university, college, school, profession, or community.

Meets Expectations (2)
Evidence of service activity that meets minimum expectations within the School for most years during the review period, considering indicators such as those listed above (typically two to three activities from the list).

Does Not Meet Expectations (3)
Evidence shows Service activity that is below minimum expectations within the School for most years during the review period, considering indicators such as those listed above (typically one activity from the list).

Unsatisfactory (4)
Lack of evidence of Service activity at the level expected for the rank within the School for most years during the review period, considering indicators such as those listed above.

<u>PTR Rating Determination:</u>
As stated previously in this document, the rating criteria used to assess performance for a 5-year PTR review period are:
       1 = Exceeds Expectations
       2 = Meets Expectations
       3 = Does Not Meet Expectations
       4 = Unsatisfactory

In accordance with the 4-point ordinal scale specified in USF's Post-Tenure Review (PTR) regulation II(3)(c), the post-tenure review for the School of Public Affairs requires one, holistic evaluation score. This will be the weighted average of the scores in teaching, research, and service.