

Biomedical Science Department Criteria for Post Tenure Review

The Post Tenure Review (PTR) is a periodic review of tenured faculty designed to foster sustained excellence and professional development, and to recognize and reward outstanding achievement. The PTR is distinct from the annual review and other evaluations in that it will focus on long-term accomplishments over a five-year cycle.

The PTR is intended to accomplish the following:

- (a) Ensure continued high standards of quality and productivity among the University's tenured faculty.
- (b) Determine whether a faculty member is meeting the responsibilities and expectations associated with assigned duties in research, teaching and service, including compliance with state laws, Board of Governors (BOG) regulations, and University regulations and policies, including approved accreditation standards.
- (c) Recognize and honor exceptional achievement and provide incentives and support for professional growth, development, and retention.
- (d) When appropriate, develop and implement corrective action plans, and refocus academic and professional efforts and take appropriate employment action pursuant to applicable University regulations and policies, and in accordance with applicable provisions of the College of Medicine.

A Departmental PTR Advisory Committee, consisting of at least three tenured faculty members who are at or above the same academic level as the eligible tenured faculty member under consideration, will review each PTR file, in light of the department's published performance expectations and assess whether those expectations have been met. In doing so, the Committee will consider:

- that faculty members have varying responsibilities within their departments, as reflected in their annual assignments,
- that faculty can make essential contributions to the University's mission in various ways,
- that the nature of an individual's contributions may vary over time,
- that innovative scholarly work may take time to bear fruit, and may sometimes fail,
- that unusual or unpopular scholarship, teaching, and service are not by themselves sufficient cause for a negative evaluation, and
- that faculty are evaluated annually on their annual assignment.

The PTR will be conducted based on a file containing a brief summary of the faculty member's activities during the entire five-year period under review. The file will contain:

- a current curriculum vita that clearly highlights accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarship, service and clinical care during the period under review,
- copies of the faculty member's last five annual assignments and annual evaluations,
- a copy of the report of the previous PTR, if available,
- a copy of the published performance expectations from the faculty member's department, and
- a brief (2 page) self-evaluation from the faculty member.

The contents of each PTR file are to be kept confidential throughout the Evaluation process. The Department will store the original PTR files and copies will be sent to the College Faculty Affairs office. Following the review, the Committee will provide a brief report to the Chair summarizing their recommended assessment of each faculty member's performance during the evaluation period, to be added to the PTR file. This will indicate whether the faculty member's performance Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, or is Unsatisfactory, and cite specific reasons and evidence to support their conclusion. The record of overall annual evaluations will therefore form the basis of review, however, patterns of performance over time in each category of assignment, research/scholarship, teaching and service, also will be taken into consideration. The final outcome will be determined after the administrative review. As with annual reviews, departmental expectations in each category will be weighted according to assigned effort in each year.

Criteria for these performance categories are aligned with those described in detail in the Biomedical Science Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and annual evaluation criteria and are as follows:

EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS

There can be no annual evaluations with an overall rating of Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory in any of the prior five years for an evaluation of Exceeds Expectations.

Any tenured faculty member who achieves one or more of the following:

1. Sustained overall annual evaluations of Exceptional or Outstanding in at least three or more of the preceding five years.

OR

2. Exemplary achievement in research, scholarship, teaching or service, in addition to sustained overall annual evaluations of Good or better in each category in each prior year. Examples of exceptional achievements include but are not limited to one or more of the following:

- Exemplary performance in Teaching, which is supported by one or more of the following:
 - Exceptional or Outstanding ratings in Teaching in at least three of the preceding five years
 - Receiving the Distinguished Teacher of the Year Award, the FAU Excellence and Innovation in Teaching Award, or multiple College level teaching awards during one or more of the preceding five years
 - Major contributions to successful development, revision and implementation of curriculum, core courses or novel teaching materials and methods as evidenced by publications, production of texts or teaching software, etc.
 - Adoption of teaching materials and methods by other institutions, presentations in prestigious education meetings, or invited training sessions for teaching by other institutions
- Exemplary performance in Research or Scholarship, which is supported by the following data:
 - Exceptional or Outstanding ratings in Research or Scholarship in at least three of the of annual evaluations of the preceding five years
 - Sustained extramural funding in each year that places the faculty member in the top 25% of funded investigators in the Department in at least three of the previous five years
 - Receiving NIH R01-level funding or equivalent NSF or DOD grants during the review period
 - Receiving multiple R01 or equivalent competitive federal grants during the review period
 - Receiving a National or International Award recognizing significant contributions to science or scholarship, or the FAU Scholar or Researcher of the Year Award during one or more of the preceding five years
 - An exceptional record as corresponding author of scholarly publications, that is corroborated by an objective guide such as H-index (over career and previous five years) or other citation index, taking into account the faculty member's field and type of scholarship
 - Receiving a major extramural Program Grant as PI/Director (PPG, U grants, Center grants etc.)
 - Service as the editor or sole author for a published textbook or other scholarly text during the five-year period, or as an editor-in-chief or section/associate, or equivalent editor for a peer-reviewed journal
- Consistently sustained outstanding performance in Service, which are supported by the following data:
 - Exceptional or Outstanding ratings in Service in at least three of the preceding five years
 - Receiving the FAU President's Leadership Award or any other applicable FAU service award during one or more of the preceding five years
 - Serving as a permanent member of an NIH, NSF or DOD study section
 - Service as a scientific advisor/board member for a National or International Foundation or Academy, or as President/Head of a National or International Scientific or Scholastic Society (ACS, FASEB, SFN, etc.)
 - Service to the NIH, NSF or other federal or state agency on an Advisory Board or Policy Council, etc. (other than grant review)
 - Through philanthropic work or community engagement, attainment of a major financial donation that has a significant positive impact on the reputation/prestige of the University, College, or the Department

MEETS EXPECTATIONS

Any tenured faculty member who has achieved overall annual performance evaluations of Good or better in three or more of the last five years.

- In addition to the number of annual evaluations of Good or better, consideration will be given to the pattern of evaluations over time, in the different categories of assignment.
- Consideration also will be given to the evaluation categories, recognizing that “Does Not Meet Expectations” and “Unsatisfactory” do not carry the same weight in terms of performance outcomes.

DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS

Any tenured faculty member who has failed to receive an overall annual evaluation of Good or better in three or more of the preceding five years.

- In addition to the number of annual evaluations that fall short of Good, consideration will be given to the pattern of evaluations over time, in the different categories of assignment.
- Consideration also will be given to the evaluation categories, recognizing that “Does Not Meet Expectations” and “Unsatisfactory” do not carry the same weight in terms of performance outcomes.

UNSATISFACTORY

Performance fails to meet the unit’s written criteria which reflects disregard or failure to follow previously documented and/or otherwise given advice or other efforts to provide correction; or documented incompetence or misconduct, as defined in applicable University or College regulations and policies.