Post-tenure review is required of all tenured faculty members at the University of South Florida in accordance with State law. The purpose of this review is to ensure continued high standards of quality and sustained productivity among tenured faculty consistent with the mission of the university and with assigned duties in research, teaching, service. In addition, post-tenure review is intended to recognize and honor exceptional achievement. As a formative assessment process, post-tenure review is also intended to provide continued academic professional development, enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a performance improvement plan and return to expected levels of productivity, and, when necessary, identify patterns of performance that are unacceptable or inconsistent with the professional standards of employment in the Florida State University System (SUS).

Faculty are identified for post-

University; sustained and satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies. For each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of "exceeds expectations," the Dean, in consultation with the department Chair, may recommend, and the Provost may determine, appropriate recognition and compensation.

(2) _____: a level of accomplishment that is acceptable, and even commendable, for a faculty member serving at a nationally ranked, Research One University; evidence of at least a satisfactory performance rating in each annual evaluation during the previous 5

(2) The Chair undertakes a holistic assessment of performance, based on the faculty member's CV and narrative record of accomplishments for the past five years relative to assigned effort, the last five years of annual performance reviews by the department Chair, and the faculty member's five-year conduct record.

(3) The Chair prepares a narrative and determines the rating category of performance (1-4, defined above) for each domain (teaching, research/scholarship, and service), based on the materials submitted and the rubric below, with expectations adjusted in accordance with percentages of assigned effort.

(4) An overall score is calculated as the mean of the three 5-year performance category scores weighted by the mean percentages of assignment for each category. The Chair may adjust scores where necessary to reflect a more accurate, holistic, five-year perspective across all categories, which may be partially obscured by the constraints on input from 4-point categorical scales. The result of this calculation is rounded to the nearest whole number to determine the final post-tenure review category.

(5) All new materials, including Chair's narrative and post-tenure review score, are added to existing materials in the Archivum Post-Tenure Review system.

The faculty member's post-tenure review score for each of the three domains is assigned using the rubric below. Elements in the rubric reflect the activities that are typically seen at that category level and that are neither exhaustive nor all required for such a rating. Examples of the kind of information that may be considered both in the faculty member's narrative record and in classifying performance using the rubric are noted in the following non-exhaustive list, based on more detailed descriptions in the MHLP governance and tenure & promotion documents:

: information about efforts in curriculum development and improvement; quality of evaluations of teaching by students and/or peers; student mentoring and corresponding outcomes, including through training grants or mentoring in research grants; scholarly contributions to the science of teaching and learning.

: information about the nature, source, role in, and magnitude of research grants or contracts submitted and funded; internally supported research activity; peer reviewed articles, chapters, books submitted/accepted and/or other scholarly products such as technical reports; scholarly presentations; honors, awards, or other recognition.

Information about participation in university, college, or department committees or other service role or activities on behalf of the university; mentoring of faculty relating to teaching and/or research or other contribution to university, college, or department goals; con

	Peer, observational, or student evaluations of teaching predominantly in the middle sections of rating or reporting ranges, less frequently in upper sections, indicating acceptable performance but with clear indications for improvement. Student mentoring activities with at least one student resulting in successful and timely completion of student projects and progress toward concrete outcomes (presentations and publications/submissions). Administration of a small training grant with significant support of the Department's teaching mission through support of students, and progress toward concrete outcomes (presentations and publications/submissions) by supported students. Evidence of minimal efforts to improve content delivery if needed, to develop curriculum, or to otherwise contribute to student success outside of typical requirements of one's course load.	Funding, or documented progress on submission of a lesser impact grant, as determined by the alignment with university, college, and Department goals; funding source; size of grant; and extent of activities to be funded. Significant progress on, submission of or publication of articles or book chapters, a lesser impact book as determined by the quality of the outlet and the influence of the publication on the field, or other lesser impact product such as an influential or cited technical analysis/report. One or more high impact presentation as evidenced by the quality of the outlet, impact of the presentation, and status of the presenter (e.g., Workshop organizer for a major conference, invited address at a major conference; invited colloquium talk to a highly ranked program; peer-reviewed presentation at a major conference; invited presentation in a workshop).	

	Peer, observational, or student evaluations of teaching predominantly in middle or low sections of rating or reporting ranges. Limited student-mentoring activities or failure to appropriately mentor students to complete projects and/or make progress toward concrete outcomes (e.g., presentations and publications/submissions). Demonstration of insufficient effort to introduce needed improvement in content delivery, curriculum development, or to contribute otherwise to student success outside of typical requirements of the		