

## **Post-Tenure Faculty Review.**

Post-tenure review is required of all tenured faculty at the University of Florida. It is intended to recognize and honor exceptional achievement, affirm continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a professional development plan and return to expected levels of productivity. Post-tenure review includes review of dossier, the last five years of annual performance reviews by the department head (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation, such as program director, dean, or designated supervisor; hereafter referred to as department head), the faculty member's disciplinary file covering the past five years. These three items are hereafter referred to as the packet.

### **(1) Timing and Eligibility**

- (a) Each tenured faculty member shall have a comprehensive post-tenure review of 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 date of the last promotion.
- (b) Tenured faculty in administrative roles shall be reviewed annually by their supervisors. Upon returning to a faculty role, these faculty shall undergo post-tenure review in the fifth year following a return to a full-time faculty appointment.

### **(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). 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 a concomitant increase in another category. Except in the case of significant other responsibilities, tenured faculty should retain a minimum of 15% research, scholarship, or creative work. Quality performance is expected in all assigned areas.

- (a) The comprehensive post-tenure review shall include consideration of the following.
  - 1. The level of accomplishment and productivity relative to the faculty member's assigned duties in research, teaching, and service, 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. Criteria for rating faculty performance shall be established by departmental faculty and approved by the department head, dean, and provost office. The Criteria should clearly describe performance expectations for tenured faculty. These discipline-specific clarifications shall (1) Take into consideration the department's mission (2) Be adaptable to various assigned duties, so that department faculty have an equitable assessment regardless of their assignments; and (3) Be detailed enough that a reasonable faculty member should not be

uncertain or confused about what performance or accomplishment is sufficient in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service to earn each performance evaluation rating. The clarifications shall identify for each assignment area some representative examples of the achievements or performance characteristics that would earn each performance evaluation rating.

At minimum, rating categories for post tenure review shall include: exceeds expectations, meets expectation, needs improvement, unsatisfactory each defined according to university standards and departmental criteria.

- a. Exceeds expectations: a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performance of faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit. Faculty performing in the top 20% of unit and peer/aspirational peer departments. Performance is appreciably better than the average college faculty member of the candidate's present rank and field.
- b. Meets expectations: expected level of accomplishment compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit. Satisfactory performance rating in each annual evaluation during the last 5 years. Satisfactory or greater assessment of each area of assignment.
- c. Does not meet expectations: performance falls below the normal 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 5 years and unsatisfactory performance in any single area of assignment over multiple years. Pattern of non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies
- d. 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 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 unsatisfactory performance in any two areas of assignment over the majority of the review period. Pattern of failing to perform duties assigned by the University and sustained violations of applicable state and federal law and applicable published College, University, and Board of Governors regulations, policies, and procedures,

### (3) Process Requirements

- (a) The faculty member shall complete a university-designated dossier highlighting accomplishments and demonstrating performance relative to assigned duties and submit the dossier to the appropriate department chair.
- (b) The faculty member's department chair shall review the completed dossier, the last five years of annual evaluations, and the faculty member's disciplinary file covering the past 5 years (the packet),
- (c) The faculty member's department chair shall provide an assessment of the level of achievement and certification that the letter includes, if applicable, any concerns regarding professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance during the period under review.
- (d) The faculty member's department chair shall forward the packet and the chair's letter, to the appropriate college post tenure review committee for review.
- (e) The College post tenure review committee shall be advisory to the Dean. The college PTR committee will serve in a fact-finding and consultative role, reviewing the candidates' dossier and annual evaluations and reporting on the strengths and weaknesses of the records. The purpose of this assessment is to evaluate and affirm that the individual is making contributions consistent those expected of a tenured faculty member; provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development, when needed; Recognize faculty members who continue to exceed expectations
- (f) The dean of the college shall review the packet, the chair's letter, and the findings of the college faculty committee.
- (g) The dean of the college shall add to the dossier a brief letter assessing the 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 using the criteria established by departmental or college faculty and approved by the department head, dean, and Provost.

- (h) The dean of the college shall forward the dossier to the chief academic officer for review.
- (i) The chief academic officer shall review the dossier provided by the dean of the college.
- (j) With guidance and oversight from the university president, the chief academic officer will rate the faculty member's professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance during the review period. The chief academic officer may accept, reject, or modify the dean's recommended rating. The chief academic officer may request assistance from a university advisory committee in formulating an assessment. Each faculty member reviewed will receive one of the following performance ratings, as defined in above.
  - 1. Exceeds expectations
  - 2. Meets expectations
  - 3. Does not meet expectations
  - 4. Unsatisfactory
- (k) The chief academic officer shall notify the faculty member, the faculty member's department chair, and the appropriate college dean of the outcome.

(4) Outcomes

- (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 chief academic officer appropriate recognition and/or compensation in accordance with the faculty member's performance and university regulations and policies. The chief academic officer 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 chief academic officer.

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 improvement plan.

a. The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated departmental or college/school criteria developed under the provision of this procedure) 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 Professional Development 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 to be committed in support of the plan; Set timelines for achieving goals and outcomes; and Indicate the criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan.

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 Professional Development Plan..

2. Each faculty member who fails to meet the requirements of a performance improvement plan by the established deadline shall receive a notice of termination from the chief academic officer. The faculty member will be afforded a two semester non-renewal period.

3. Each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of "unsatisfactory" shall receive a notice of termination from the Provost. The faculty member will be afforded a two semester non-renewal period.

(c) Final decisions regarding post-tenure review may be appealed under university regulations or collective bargaining agreements, as applicable to the employee. The arbitrator shall review a decision solely for the purpose of determining whether it violates a university regulation or the applicable collective bargaining agreement and may not consider claims based on equity or substitute the arbitrator's judgment for that of the university.