

Post-Tenure Faculty Review

Post-tenure review is required of all tenured faculty at the University of Florida in compliance with Board of Governors (BOG) Regulation 10.003. Post-tenure review is intended to: recognize and honor exceptional achievement; affirm continued academic professional development; enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance standards to refocus academic and professional efforts through a performance improvement plan and return to expected levels of performance; and identify faculty members whose pattern of performance is unsatisfactory and to take appropriate employment action. Matters such as political opinion, expressive viewpoint, and ideological beliefs are not appropriate matters for evaluation and shall not be considered in post-tenure review.

(1) Timing and Eligibility

- (a) Each tenured faculty member shall have a comprehensive post-tenure review of the preceding five years of performance in the fifth year following the last promotion or the last comprehensive review, whichever is later. For faculty hired with tenure, the hire date shall constitute the start of their post-tenure review clock.
- (b) Tenured faculty in administrative roles (chairs, directors or higher with faculty supervisory role or 0.5 or greater administrative full-time equivalent, FTE) shall be reviewed annually by their supervisors. These faculty shall undergo post-tenure review in the fifth year after their administrative assignment drops below 0.5 FTE.
- (c) A semester in which a faculty member is on leave of absence or on reduced FTE compensated leave shall not be considered a part of the post tenure review period unless the primary purpose of the leave is to conduct research or there is an agreement to the contrary in writing between the faculty member and the provost prior to the commencement of the leave. Faculty members on reduced FTE from their tenured 1.0 FTE appointment shall earn time toward the post tenure review on a pro-rated basis. Except as noted above, a faculty member on unpaid leave for 20 or more business days during a semester shall not have that semester counted toward the post tenure review period, unless mutually agreed otherwise by the faculty member and the provost.
- (d) At its discretion, the University may grant exceptions to the timing of the comprehensive post-tenure review for extenuating, unforeseen circumstances. Such exceptions must be requested by the faculty member in writing to their chair and the request must provide an explanation of the extenuating, unforeseen circumstances. The chair and applicable dean will review the request and indicate whether they support the request before sending it to the provost for consideration. The provost has the final authority on granting exceptions.

(2) Review Requirements

Tenured faculty are expected to perform satisfactorily at teaching; research, scholarship, or creative work; service; and other assigned responsibilities (e.g., patient care, extension, administration, and the like). Positive sustained contributions are expected in all assigned areas. Percent effort in these assignments may vary as a career evolves. A decrease in effort and thus expectation in one category should be balanced with an increase in another category.

(a) The comprehensive post-tenure review shall include consideration of the following as stated in BOG Regulation 10.003:

1. The level of accomplishment and productivity relative to the faculty member's assigned duties in research, teaching, service, and other assignments including extension and clinical assignments.
2. The faculty member's history of professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities to the university and its students.
3. The faculty member's non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.
4. Unapproved absences from teaching assigned courses.
5. Substantiated student complaints.
6. Other relevant measures of faculty conduct as appropriate.

(b) Each faculty member reviewed will receive a performance rating. Rating categories for post-tenure review shall include the following university level standards:

1. Exceeds expectations: a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performance of faculty across the faculty member's unit and area of expertise.
2. Meets expectations: expected level of accomplishment compared to faculty across the faculty member's unit and area of expertise. Sustained record commensurate with the academic standards of a top-tier research institution. While not dispositive of a meets expectations rating, the following performance assessments will be considered evidence of such a rating: evidence of a satisfactory performance rating in each annual evaluation during the last 5 years and satisfactory or greater assessment of 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. The absence of an overall satisfactory annual evaluation or a satisfactory performance assessment in a single area of assignment does not preclude a "meets expectations" rating if it is determined

through the post-tenure review process that the faculty member's work history is inconsistent with their performance evaluations.

3. Does not meet expectations: performance falls below the normal range of 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 or an unsatisfactory performance assessment in any single area of assignment over multiple years or has demonstrated a pattern of non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies is evidence of a failure to meet performance expectations. The absence of an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation or an unsatisfactory performance assessment in a single area of assignment does not preclude a "does not meet expectations" rating if it is determined through the post-tenure review process that the faculty member's work history is inconsistent with their performance evaluations.

4. Unsatisfactory: failure to meet expectations that reflect disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable 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 an unsatisfactory performance assessment in any two areas of assignment over three of the last five years of the review period, or has demonstrated a pattern of failing to perform duties assigned by the University or has sustained violations of applicable state and federal law and applicable published college, university, and Board of Governors regulations, policies, and procedures are evidence of unsatisfactory performance. The absence of an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation or an unsatisfactory performance assessment in a single area of assignment does not preclude an "unsatisfactory" rating, if it is determined through the post-tenure review process that the faculty member's work history is inconsistent with their performance evaluations.

(c) University standards and further specifications within each rating category are found in the University Criteria for Post-tenure Review. Each college and department shall have discipline-specific criteria that clearly describe performance expectations for tenured faculty relative to each rating standard. These unit-specific criteria shall:

(1) take into consideration the unit's mission; (2) be adaptable to various assigned duties; and (3) be detailed enough that a reasonable faculty member should not be uncertain or confused about what level of performance or accomplishment is sufficient in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, service, and other assignments to earn each performance rating.

(3) Process Requirements

The following process shall be followed for completion of the post-tenure review.

(a) The faculty member shall provide a current curriculum vitae and may opt to provide a narrative of up to one page per area of assignment highlighting accomplishments and demonstrating performance relative to assigned duties over the previous five years. The faculty member may provide additional detail and clarification of their research, teaching, service or other contributions. These documents will be provided to the appropriate department chair.

(b) The faculty member's department chair shall review the materials provided by the faculty member, along with the last five years of annual evaluations, information on sponsored research (if applicable), and the faculty member's disciplinary record in their personnel file. Collectively, these documents constitute the Post-Tenure Review Packet.

(c) The faculty member's department chair shall add a written assessment of the level of achievement and will include in the assessment letter, if applicable, any concerns regarding professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance during the period under review. The chair shall not assign a performance rating.

(d) The dean may choose to convene a college post-tenure review committee to assist in the assessment of Post-Tenure Review Packets. The college post-tenure review committee shall be advisory to the dean. Any such committee shall be composed of tenured faculty members in the college appointed by the dean who may consult with the faculty regarding such appointments.

(e) If a dean utilizes a college post-tenure review committee, the chair shall forward the PTR packet (minus the disciplinary record) and their letter of assessment to the appropriate college post-tenure review committee. If a college post-tenure review committee is not convened the chair shall forward the information to the dean.

(f) If convened, the college post-tenure review committee will serve in a consultative role, reviewing the Post-Tenure Review Packets and report on the strengths and weaknesses of the records. The committee shall not recommend a rating. The purpose of this assessment is to provide the dean with insight regarding whether the faculty member has made contributions during the review period consistent with those expected of a tenured faculty member; provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development, when needed; and recognize faculty members who continue to exceed expectations.

(g) The dean of the college shall review the Post-Tenure Review Packet, the

chair letter and the input of the college post-tenure review committee, if such a committee was convened.

(h) The dean of the college shall add a brief letter assessing the faculty member's level of achievement during the period under review. 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 university standards and the applicable college and unit criteria.

(i) The dean will provide the letter and all materials from the PTR packet to the faculty member for review. The faculty member shall have five (5) days from receipt of the dean's letter to submit an optional written response that shall be added to the Post- Tenure Review Packet before the packet moves to provost review.

(j) The dean of the college shall forward the Packet to the provost for review.

(k) The provost shall review the Packet.

(l) With guidance and oversight from the university president, the provost will assess the faculty member's professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance during the review period. The provost may accept, reject, or modify the dean's recommended rating. Each faculty member reviewed will receive one of the following performance ratings from the provost:

1. Exceeds expectations
2. Meets expectations
3. Does not meet expectations
4. Unsatisfactory

(m) The provost shall notify the faculty member, the faculty member's department chair, and the appropriate college dean of the outcome. If an outcome is inconsistent with a faculty member's annual evaluations, the provost will explain, in detail, the discrepancy to the faculty member in writing and will meet with the chair and/or dean responsible for the inconsistent outcome. The chair and/or dean will then meet with the faculty member to explain the rating.

(4) Outcomes

The following steps will occur after the provost assigns final performance ratings:

(a) For each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of "exceeds expectations" or "meets expectations," the appropriate college dean, in consultation with the faculty member's department chair, shall recommend to the provost appropriate recognition and/or compensation in accordance with the

faculty member's performance and university regulations and policies. The provost, with guidance and oversight from the university president, shall make the final determination regarding recognition and/or compensation.

(b) 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 department chair, shall propose a performance improvement plan to the provost. The provost may finalize the performance improvement plan as is or make such modifications that the provost considers appropriate and finalize the plan as modified. The provost may consult with the appropriate dean, department chair, and/or faculty member before finalizing any improvement plan.

1. The plan must include a deadline for the faculty member to achieve the requirements of the performance improvement plan. The deadline may not extend more than 12 months past the date the faculty member receives the plan.

- a. The performance improvement plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against university standards and college and unit criteria) will 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 performance improvement plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan must: list specific deficiencies to be addressed; define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies; outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes; identify institutional resources available to support the plan; set timelines for achieving goals and outcomes; and indicate the criteria for assessment in regular reviews of progress.

- b. The faculty member and department head will meet regularly to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies. The faculty member will provide an end of semester progress report to the department chair and to the dean. Further evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the regular faculty performance evaluation process (e.g., annual reviews) may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals set forth in the performance improvement plan.

2. Each faculty member who fails to meet the requirements of a performance improvement plan by the established deadline as determined by the provost in consultation with the dean and department chair shall receive a notice of termination from the provost.

- (c) Each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of “unsatisfactory” shall receive a notice of termination from the provost.
- (d) Final decisions regarding post-tenure review may be appealed under university regulations or collective bargaining agreements, as applicable to the employee and such grievance process will be processed consistent with the law.