

DEPARTMENT OF WORLD LANGUAGES CRITERIA FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW

Submitted:

11, 2023 in alignment with University and Board of Governors' regulation 10.003, as well as Florida law, all tenured faculty members in the Department of World Languages will undergo post-tenure review every five years. The post-tenure review is an evaluation of the previous five years of employment. The review will be conducted based on a dossier comprised of a narrative of accomplishments prepared by the faculty member that covers the previous five years, departmental annual performance reviews for the previous five years, the faculty member's annual evaluations, and, if applicable, the faculty member's disciplinary record.

FACULTY TASKS: CV & NARRATIVE

CV: The original guideless included a five-page CV intended to highlight the last five years. There is no limit to the size of the PDF that can be uploaded to Archivum, however, so faculty who wish to offer a longer CV are allowed to do so. Those entering longer CVs should consider the possibility that at some point in the process, a reader may only focus on the first five pages and should design the file accordingly.

Narrative: The Archivum limit is 12,000 characters including spaces. A faculty member is allowed to enter anywhere from 1 to 12,000 characters. Though the narrative is not required, those undergoing review are highly encouraged to participate in this part of the process.

DEPARTMENT GUIDELINES

Department of World Languages guidelines for post-tenure review ensure that the faculty member's discipline will be reviewed in relation to the standards of the discipline. These guidelines are consistent with the department criteria for annual evaluation that were previously approved by the university. The post-tenure review requires one holistic evaluation score. This score will be the weighted average of the scores in teaching, assignment, and direct instruction categories averaged over the five-year period. Where there is a discrepancy in the scores given by the Salary, Tenure and Promotion committee and the department Chair, the average of the two will be used.

Rating categories for post-tenure review shall include the following:

Exceeds expectations: a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the

and satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies. (1)

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. (2)

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. (3)

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. (4)

- syllabi that not only meet university guidelines but reflect courses that challenge students intellectually, stimulate their interest, and develop their skills through assessments designed to meet the stated goals of the course
- a well-conceived Teaching Narrative that lists a variety of items from the above list or other relevant instructional activities
- mostly high numerical student ratings and an absence of patterns of criticism or complaints in the written commentary

Meets Expectations (2)

The faculty member presents a dossier containing:

- syllabi that not only meet university guidelines but reflect courses that challenge students intellectually, stimulate their interest, and develop their skills through assessments designed to meet the stated goals of the course
- a well-conceived Teaching Narrative that lists items from the above list or other relevant instructional activities
- middling or better student ratings and minimal evidence of patterns of criticism or complaints

Does not meet expectations (3):

The faculty member presents a dossier containing:

- syllabi with major lapses in both syllabus and course design
- a Teaching Narrative that does not describe satisfactory teaching effort
- lower numerical student ratings with patterns of criticism or complaints in the written commentary

Unsatisfactory (4):

The faculty member presents a dossier containing:

- syllabi lacking important required elements
- unacceptable lapses of quality in the design of courses
- a Teaching Narrative that does not describe teaching effort or a lack of Teaching Narrative
- student evaluations that reflect consistently low numbers and patterns of criticism or complaints

RESEARCH

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

There are two lists below that will aid in determining the relative weight of research activities. List A contains the kind of high-level accomplishments associated with the granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to Full Professor, and receipt of the departmental annual rating of 5. List B contains a wide range of items that constitute scholarly activity. The numbered items at the top of list B are given more weight than the non-numbered items further down the list. Below the two lists are the guidelines that the evaluators will use for

determining each rating. The evaluators will also take into account activities not found on the lists when warranted. All items can occur multiple times.

LIST A

1. final acceptance or publication of a substantive peer-reviewed journal article
2. final acceptance or publication of a substantive peer-reviewed chapter in a scholarly book
3. receipt of a major award, grant, or fellowship that is nationally or internationally competitive, including various residential fellowships and those from private sources of funding
4. publication of a peer-reviewed scholarly monograph, edited volume, book-length critical edition, book-length translation, textbook, or other book

PUBLICATION CREDIT: Faculty members have two choices for when to claim credit for a publication, the year of final acceptance or the year in which it first appears. If a publication appears first online and then in print, or vice-versa, it only counts once. Each scholarly monograph will merit Outstanding for three years, while other books will merit Outstanding for two years. For books, the faculty member needs to indicate in which year the two- or three-year clock for credit will begin. Such decisions should be clearly articulated in the Research Narrative. In the absence of clear instructions, the decision will default to the year of first appearance.

LIST B (numbered)

1. submission of an article to a peer-reviewed journal
2. submission of a chapter for a peer-reviewed volume
3. delivery of a scholarly paper at a regional, national, or international refereed conference
4. delivery of an invited scholarly talk in an academic milieu (some talks are service)
5. submission of a book proposal including narrative and chapter outlines and/or evidence that a completed book manuscript is committed to a particular publisher
6. application for a grant or fellowship that is nationally or internationally competitive, including various residential fellowships and those from private funding sources
7. publication of a peer-reviewed translation or creative work

List B (non-numbered)

- a. serving as an invited respondent at a professional conference
- b. submission or publication of a book review or review essay

1.

2 items or fewer