

Post-Tenure Review: University-Wide Criteria

February 14, 2024

For distribution to units not covered by the Collective Bargaining Agreement

Tenured faculty at the University of Florida are expected to demonstrate sustained distinction through professional achievements in at least two mission areas, typically (1) research and (2) teaching; however, patient care, service, or extension are appropriate areas of distinction as reflected in the annual assignment. During the post-tenure review process the University will review the cumulative level of accomplishment and productivity over the previous five years relative to the faculty member's assigned duties in research, teaching, and service, including extension, clinical, and administrative assignments. In addition, the University will review the faculty member's professional conduct and performance of their academic responsibilities.

The university provides this guiding document to outline general quantifiable criteria for assignment of performance ratings. Each faculty member will be assigned a single overall rating among the following four options: exceeds expectations; meets expectations; does not meet expectations; unsatisfactory.

The following evaluation scale describes the university-wide general expectations across disciplines for evaluation of post-tenure performance for implementation of Board of Governors' regulation 10.003. Faculty are not necessarily 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 examples of the behaviors are relevant.

1. Research Criteria

A faculty member who **exceeds expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following over the prior 5 years:

- 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 or external financial support commensurate with excellent performance
- Evidence of a high level of professional impact, for example including regular participation in invited presentations, exhibits, commissions, or performances at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within one's field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; professional awards; and citations to or 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, scholarship or creative works

A faculty member who **meets expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following over the prior 5 years:

- 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 or external funding commensurate with other faculty in the discipline
- Evidence of professional impact, for example including regular participation in invited presentations, exhibits, commissions, or performances at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within one's field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; and citations to or reviews of one's scholarly work

A faculty member who **does not meet expectations** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the prior 5 years:

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

A faculty member who is **unsatisfactory** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the prior 5 years:

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

Departmental research criteria clarifications consistent with the foregoing university level research criteria 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 over the prior 5 years, including the following:

- Student teaching evaluations consistently exceeding each of the following, contextualized and adjusted, as appropriate, for 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 indicating excellence in teaching
- Demonstrating pedagogical or curricular innovation enhancing student learning
- Contribution to educational scholarship
- Awards for excellence in teaching or mentoring
- Teaching certificates and significant commitment to pedagogical professional development
- Leadership in regional, national or international educational societies or boards of the candidate's field
- Contribution to funding educational programs through external sources (e.g., grants, foundation, or industry support)

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 over the prior 5 years, including the following:

- Student teaching evaluations consistently exceeding the lower of the following, contextualized and adjusted, as appropriate, for 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)

A faculty member who **does not meet expectations** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the prior 5 years:

- Both of the following, contextualized and adjusted, as appropriate, for 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 3.7 in any course with a greater than 10% response rate
- In cases in which student responses fall below the 10% minimum requirements also exhibit:
 - Record of student evaluations response rates consistently below the department average
 - Absence of peer assessments of teaching, or peer assessments of teaching which fail to document 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)
- Inconsistent acceptance of assignments to meet the teaching needs of the department/unit

A faculty member who is **unsatisfactory** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the prior 5 years:

- Disregard, failure or minimal efforts to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction
- Both of the following, contextualized and adjusted, as appropriate, for 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, 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
- Repeated failure to meet expected performance in teaching as evidenced by missed lectures, late grade submissions, or student complaints related to teaching
- 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 over the prior 5 years:

- Leadership roles or national/international impact on external professional organizations, federal agencies/foundations or conferences.
- Outstanding participation and leadership within the university, including in college or university faculty governance
- Editorial role(s) for prestigious peer-reviewed journals and academic presses
- Judging or jurying prestigious exhibitions
- Contribution to funding service-related programs through external sources (e.g., 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 over the prior 5 years:

- 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, 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 over the prior 5 years:

- Poor attendance or engagement in assigned service duties (e.g., failure to attend >50% of meetings) or faculty shared governance
- 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 prior 5 years:

- Disregard, failure or minimal efforts to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction
- Minimal efforts or failure to participate in assigned service duties
- No documentation of involvement or attempts to become engaged in external professional organizations, peer-review within the discipline

4. Clinical Criteria

A faculty member who **exceeds expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following over the prior 5 years:

- 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 over the prior 5 years:

- 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 prior 5 years:

- 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 prior 5 years:

- 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 prior 5 years:

- 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 prior 5 years:

- 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 prior 5 years:

- 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 prior 5 years:

- 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

A faculty member is expected to demonstrate consistent professional conduct and adhere to academic responsibility in all aspects of their employment.

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 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 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.

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.