

University Criteria for Post-Tenure Review

Tenured faculty at the University of Florida are expected to demonstrate sustained distinction through professional achievements primarily in teaching and research, the criteria for which shall be applied proportionally based on the assigned effort of the faculty member over the five-year period of the review. Tenured faculty are also expected to demonstrate high levels of professionalism and a commitment to academic responsibility. During the post-tenure review process, the University will review the level of accomplishment, productivity and professionalism over the previous five years.

The following rating methodology describes the university-wide general expectations across disciplines for evaluation of post-tenure performance for implementation of Board of Governors' regulation 10.003 and University of Florida Regulation 7.010(8). Faculty are not required to achieve all outcomes described for each category, nor is any single outcome definitive in achieving that rating, unless otherwise noted. Due to the breadth of activities across the institution, the outcomes below are not exhaustive and departmental/discipline specific parallel examples of the achievement behaviors called out below are expected. Any documented efforts of activities in publishing in high quality outlets, participation in or organization of national and international research and educational forums, service to the university, service to the faculty member's profession, and quality teaching or pedagogical activities including advising, mentoring and outreach will be taken into consideration.

1. Research Criteria:

A faculty member who **exceeds expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following during the PTR Evaluation Period:

- Productivity in research or other scholarship or creative works of quantity and quality commensurate with the top quintile of performers in the faculty member's discipline at AAU institutions
- Where applicable, grant awards /external financial support commensurate with excellent performance
- Evidence of a high level of professional impact, including regular participation in invited/peer-reviewed presentations /exhibits/commissions/ performances at key meetings, conferences, and venues within one's field, seminar presentations at major research universities/ state and federal agencies, professional awards, and citations to (critically acclaimed reviews of) one's scholarly work
- Leading and serving on national advisory committees for research foundations, federal funding agencies or other authoritative bodies
- Receipt of awards or recognition for excellence related to research and/or creative works

A faculty member who **meets expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following during the PTR Evaluation Period:

- Productivity in research or other scholarship or creative works of quantity and quality commensurate with typical productivity of faculty in the faculty member's discipline at AAU institutions
- Where applicable, grant awards / external funding commensurate with other faculty in the discipline
- Evidence of professional impact, including adequate participation in invited/peer-reviewed presentations exhibits/commissions/ performances at key meetings, conferences, venues within one's field, seminar presentations at major research universities/ state and federal agencies, professional awards, and citations to/critically acclaimed reviews of one's scholarly work, normed to the faculty member's specific discipline

A faculty member who **does not meet expectations** exhibits the following performance characteristics during the PTR Evaluation Period:

- Productivity in research or other scholarship and creative works of quantity and quality observably below typical productivity of faculty at AAU institutions
- Where applicable, grant awards / external funding below average performance in the discipline
- Inconsistent evidence of professional impact, including irregular participation in invited/peer-reviewed presentations exhibits/commissions/ performances at key meetings, conferences, venues within one's field, seminar presentations at major research universities / state and federal agencies

A faculty member who is **unsatisfactory** exhibits the following performance characteristics during the PTR Evaluation Period:

- Substantial and chronic deficiencies or failure to meet expectations in research / scholarship / creative works with minimal to no efforts to follow previous advice or other efforts make corrections
- Deficiencies in the quantity and quality of research or other scholarship and creative works that are substantially below typical productivity of faculty at AAU institutions
- Where applicable, lack of grant awards to support research in the discipline
- Absence of professional impact, as measured by regular participation in invited presentations at key meetings and conferences within one's field, seminar presentations at major research universities, professional awards, and citations to one's scholarly work

Departmental research criteria clarifications consistent with the foregoing university level research are provided to each department.

2. Teaching Criteria:

A faculty member who **exceeds expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of a sustained and successful commitment to excellence in teaching, mentoring, and other instructional activities during the PTR Evaluation Period, including the following:

- Student teaching evaluations consistently exceed all of the following of the following, contextualized and adjusted, as appropriate, in cases of courses that have historically lower evaluation score averages across teaching faculty:
 - Department means
 - College means
 - GatorEvals instructor average scores of 3.7
- Peer assessments consistently indicate excellence in teaching
- Development of new curricular elements
- Demonstrating pedagogical or curricular innovation enhancing student learning
- Contribution to educational scholarship
- Awards for excellence in teaching / mentoring
- Teaching certificates and significant commitment to pedagogical professional development
- Leadership in regional, national or international educational societies and boards of the candidate's field
- Contribution to funding educational programs through external sources (ex. grants, foundation, or industry support)
- Advisor or member of a significant number of dissertation, masters or undergraduate thesis committees

A faculty member who **meets expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of a sustained and successful commitment to high-quality teaching, mentoring, and other instructional activities during the PTR Evaluation Period, including the following:

- Student teaching evaluations consistently exceeding the lower of the following, contextualized and adjusted, as appropriate, in cases of courses that have historically lower evaluation score averages across teaching faculty:
 - The normal range of variation in performance compared to faculty across the faculty member's department and college; and
 - GatorEvals instructor average scores of 3.7
- Teaches in assigned courses as per department expectations/needs

- Effective mentorship of students/trainees (e.g., office hours, meetings and evaluations completed regularly, establishing individualized development plans (IDPs), opportunities to present and publish work)
- Advisor or member of average number of dissertation, masters or undergraduate thesis committees for a tenured faculty in the unit

A faculty member who **does not meet expectations** exhibits the following performance characteristics during the PTR Evaluation Period:

- Both of the following, contextualized and adjusted, as appropriate, in cases of courses that have historically lower evaluation score averages across teaching faculty:
 - A consistent pattern of student teaching evaluations below the department average in any course with a greater than 10% average response rate; or
 - GatorEvals instructor scores repeatedly equal or less than 3.7 in any course with a greater than 10% response rate
- In cases in which student responses fall below the 10% minimum requirements and limit the number of student score averages to be considered, also exhibit:
 - Record of student evaluations response rates consistently below the department average
 - Absence of any peer assessments of teaching or peer assessments of teaching which fail to describe adequate teaching
- Record of poor mentorship of students/trainees (e.g., failure to hold regular meetings, office hours, and evaluations, establish IDPs, or provide opportunities to present and publish work)
- Evidence of Inconsistent acceptance of assignments to meet the teaching needs of the department/unit

A faculty member who is **unsatisfactory** exhibits the following performance characteristics during the PTR Evaluation Period:

- Evidence of disregard, failure or minimal efforts to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction
- Both of the following, contextualized and adjusted, as appropriate, in cases of courses that have historically lower evaluation score averages across teaching faculty:
 - A consistent pattern of student teaching evaluations below the department average in any course with a greater than 10% average response rate; or
 - GatorEvals instructor scores equal or less than 3.5 in any course with a greater than 10% response rate

- In cases in which student responses fall below the 10% minimum requirements and limit the number of student score averages to be considered, also exhibit:
 - Record of student evaluations response rates consistently below the department average
 - Absence of any peer assessments of teaching or peer assessments of teaching which fail to describe adequate teaching
- Evidence of repeated failure to meet expected performance in teaching as evidenced by missed lectures, late grade submissions, or student complaints related to teaching
- Evidence of minimal attempts to mentor or advise or poor mentoring/advising of undergraduate, graduate or professional students

3. Service Criteria:

A faculty member who **exceeds expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following during the PTR Evaluation Period:

- Leadership roles or national/international impact on external professional organizations, other organizations relevant to the faculty member's area of expertise which contribute to the mission of the university, federal agencies/foundations or conferences.
- Outstanding service or leadership within the university, including in college or university faculty shared governance.
- Editorial role(s) for prestigious peer-reviewed journals and academic presses
- Significant contribution as faculty advisor of campus student organizations
- Judging or jurying prestigious exhibitions
- Contribution to funding service-related programs through external sources (ex:grants, foundation, or industry support)
- Awards or recognition for excellence related to service

A faculty member who **meets expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following during the PTR Evaluation Period:

- Significant service contributions aligned with the needs of the unit, college, university, profession, and other constituencies, as appropriate for the faculty member's discipline
- Engaged participation in college and departmental committees and faculty governance, as assigned

- Participation in committees, as jurors / critics, grant reviews, or other types of service for external professional organizations, other organizations relevant to the faculty member's area of expertise which contribute to the mission of the university, foundations or governmental agencies
- Editorial or peer review role(s) as applicable for the discipline

A faculty member who **does not meet expectations** exhibits the following performance characteristics during the PTR Evaluation Period:

- Evidence of poor attendance or engagement in assigned service duties (e.g. failure to attend >50% of meetings) or faculty shared governance
- Evidence of minimal to no involvement in external professional organizations or disciplinary peer review
- A faculty member who is **unsatisfactory** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the during the PTR Evaluation Period:
- Evidence of disregard, failure or minimal efforts to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction.
- Evidence of minimal efforts or failure to participate in assigned service duties.
- No documentation of involvement or attempts to become engaged in external professional organizations or peer-review within the discipline

4. Clinical Criteria:

A faculty member who **exceeds expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following during the PTR Evaluation Period:

- Clinical productivity, as measured by RVU's or other appropriate measures, consistently exceeds unit targets
- Leadership roles or national/international impact on clinical organizations, federal agencies/foundations or conferences
- Holding a leadership role in nationally funded collaborative network
- Invited professorships at other academic institutions
- Demonstrating clinical innovation (e.g., game-changing healthcare, creating a nationally/internationally emulated program, etc.)
- Innovation in practice methods, development of new programs and leadership in safety and quality initiatives
- Awards or recognition for excellence related to clinical performance
- Regular patient referral from national or international area

A faculty member who **meets expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following during the PTR Evaluation Period:

- Clinical productivity, as measured by RVU's or other appropriate measures, consistently meets unit targets
- Significant clinical contributions aligned with the needs of the unit, college, university, profession, and other constituencies, as appropriate for the faculty member's discipline
- Engaged participation in safety and quality initiatives
- Routine and highly regarded clinical presentations that inform the local or regional practice community
- Patient satisfaction scores that fall within the normal range of variation in performance compared to faculty across the faculty member's department and college and evidence of a sustained and successful commitment to high-quality patient care
- Patient referrals from a regional, national or international area
- Satisfactory communication with clients and colleagues

A faculty member who **does not meet expectations** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the PTR Evaluation Period:

- Clinical productivity, as measured by RVU's or other appropriate measures, consistently does not meet unit targets
- Clinical program of insufficient quality relative to the mission and community needs
- Patient satisfaction scores that routinely fall below the normal range of variation in performance compared to faculty across the faculty member's department and college
- Lack of evidence of a sustained and successful commitment to high-quality patient care
- Failure to report for clinical shifts or respond to phone calls during emergency duty
- Evidence of poor communication with clients or colleagues
- Multiple adverse event reports directly related to care provided by the practitioner

A faculty member who is **unsatisfactory** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the PTR Evaluation Period:

- Clinical productivity, as measured by RVU's or other appropriate measures, consistently falls substantially below unit targets
- Disregard, failure or minimal efforts to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction
- Minimal efforts or failure to participate in assigned clinical duties
- Evidence of unsatisfactory quality of practice including either lack of competence or effort in patient care/diagnostic service

5. Extension Criteria:

A faculty member who **exceeds expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following over the PTR Evaluation Period:

- Leadership roles or national/international impact on extension organizations, federal agencies/foundations or conferences
- Extension program recognized at national level
- EDIS publications of quality and quantity on par with the top quintile of performers in the faculty member's discipline
- Grant awards or external financial support commensurate with excellent extension performance
- Awards or recognition for excellence related to extension programming

A faculty member who **meets expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following over the PTR Evaluation Period:

- Develops and carries out an extension program relevant to mission of the college and needs of county faculty and/or clientele
- Measurable goals for and documents outcomes and impacts of extension programs
- Documents scholarship and application of extension programs by regularly publishing in appropriate venues and reporting outcomes and impacts
- Seeks and procures external funds to support and advance extension programs

A faculty member who **does not meet expectations** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the PTR Evaluation Period:

- Extension program of insufficient quality and quantity relative to the mission and community needs.
- Not a leader or coordinator of educational/extension programs
- Poor or irregular participation in educational/extension programs in a role other than leader or coordinator
- Irregular publication of extension manuscripts (EDIS) or lay audience publications (1-2 in 5 years)
- No evidence of active membership in industry/ professional organizations
- Irregular public speaking engagements (in person, podcasts, radio, distance learning, webinars, etc.)
- Irregular or non-impactful extension consultation visits (<10 in 5 years)

A faculty member who is **unsatisfactory** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the PTR Evaluation Period:

- Disregard, failure or minimal efforts to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction
- Minimal efforts or failure to participate in assigned extension duties

6. **Professionalism and Academic Responsibilities Criteria:**

A faculty member is expected to demonstrate consistent professional conduct and adhere to academic responsibility in all aspects of their employment, including but not limited to (a)-(h) below:

- a) Show commitment to support the responsible exercise of academic freedom by others;
- b) Observe and uphold the ethical standards of their disciplines in the pursuit and communication of scientific and scholarly knowledge;
- c) Treat students, staff, and colleagues fairly and civilly in discharging one's duties as teacher, researcher, and intellectual mentor;
- d) Avoid any exploitation of such persons for private advantage and treat them in a manner that is free of discrimination or harassment or retaliation;
- e) Respect the integrity of evaluation, evaluating students, staff, and colleagues fairly according to the criteria and procedures specified in evaluation processes;
- f) Represent oneself as speaking for the University only when specifically authorized to do so;
- g) Participate, as appropriate, in the system of shared academic governance, especially at the department level, and seek to contribute to the civil and effective functioning of the faculty member's academic unit (program, department, school and/or college) and the University;
- h) Observe applicable state and federal law and applicable published College, University, and Board of Governors regulations, policies, and procedures, provided that the regulation, policy, or procedure at issue does not contravene contractual or constitutional rights of a faculty member, including the right to criticize or seek revision of those duties, laws, regulations, policies, or procedures. Faculty members seeking change must not do so in ways that unreasonably obstruct the functions of the University.

Only a faculty member's disciplinary record during the evaluation period, as documented in their personnel file may be used to evaluate a faculty member's professionalism and commitment to academic responsibility. Unsubstantiated Investigations and Letters of Counsel, which are coaching and not disciplinary documents, may not be used to negatively impact a PTR

rating unless a Letter of Counsel is part of a faculty member's subsequent discipline on the same or similar conduct.

A faculty member who **exceeds expectations** is generally expected to have, over the prior five years, sustained an unblemished record of professional conduct and performance of academic responsibility. In particular, the faculty member has demonstrated exceptional professionalism and commitment to academic responsibility as evidenced through faculty submissions in the PTR packet and complied with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.

A faculty member who **meets expectations** is generally expected to have, over the prior five years, sustained a record of satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibility. In particular, the faculty member has no documented misconduct in their personnel file during the evaluation period and complied with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.

A faculty member who **does not meet expectations** has, over the prior five years, engaged in documented misconduct as defined in university regulations and applicable collective bargaining agreement, or demonstrated unprofessional behaviors that detract from the effectiveness of the department, college or university missions or operations, or demonstrated non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, or university regulations and policies. Such misconduct is reflected in the faculty member's personnel file during the evaluation period.

A faculty member who is **unsatisfactory** has, over the prior five years, engaged in documented significant or repeated misconduct as defined in university regulations and applicable collective bargaining agreement, demonstrated significant or repeated unprofessional behaviors that detract from the effectiveness of the department, college or university missions or operations, or demonstrated significant or repeated non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, or university regulations and policies. Such misconduct is reflected in the faculty member's personnel file during the evaluation period.