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In compliance with the Board of Governors adopted Regulation 10.003, which requires SUS faculty to undergo a comprehensive post-tenure review (PTR) every five years, this document outlines the protocol and criteria adopted by the Department of Visual Arts & Art History. At present and until the establishment of the next Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), PTR will be an exercise in addition to and not in substitution of the existing protocol and criteria for Sustained Performance Evaluation (SPE). The stated principle for PTR is that “*A well-qualified and productive faculty is essential to the core teaching, scholarship, and service missions of Florida Atlantic University (FAU).”* The stated purpose of the exercise is *“… to foster sustained excellence and professional development, and recognize and reward outstanding achievement …* [and] *… to uphold the University’s fundamental principles of tenure, academic freedom, due process, and confidentiality in personnel matters.”*

PTR, like SPE, refers closely to annual faculty reports, but it is an exercise separate from annual evaluation, and it focuses on a separate file that is submitted separately by the faculty member under review and reviewed independently by a committee of peers within the department via the Department Chair. PTR files are submitted to the Dean of the College for review and then forwarded to the university administration. The departmental criteria are a written expression of the expectations by which each faculty will be evaluated in respect to the most recent five-year period of employment. The evaluation cycle is conditioned by a series of specific exceptions that are listed in the charter governing document from the Office of the Provost (please refer to this document in respect to promotion, retirement, service in out-of-unit administrative roles, leave instances, and other particular circumstances).

**PTR Review File Preparation**

The PTR will be conducted based on a file containing a summary of the faculty member’s activities, and history of professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities to the University and its students during the entire review period. The PTR file should include:

* a current *curriculum vita* that clearly highlights accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service,
* copies of the faculty member’s last five annual assignments and annual evaluations including any attached written rebuttals by a faculty member under review,
* a copy of the report of the previous SPE or PTR, if available,
* a copy of the published criteria from the faculty member’s academic unit (see Articulation of Unit Expectations below),
* a brief (2 page) narrative from the faculty member, and
* other relevant measures of faculty conduct as appropriate (see below).

Eligible Faculty Members shall prepare and submit their completed PTR file to the Department Chair by the established review date and via Interfolio or another method specified by the University.

The review shall not consider or otherwise discriminate based on faculty members’ political or ideological viewpoints; however, if applicable, the PTR File can also include documentation for the period of review regarding the faculty member’s substantiated non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors’ regulations, and University regulations and policies within the scope of their University employment; substantiated unapproved absences from teaching assigned courses; and substantiated student complaints. If needed, the unit head shall be responsible for adding these documents to the PTR File after notifying the faculty member and assessing the impact of these documents on their recommended PTR ranking. Cases under investigation shall not be included in the faculty’s dossier. Unresolved and inconclusive cases shall not be considered relevant.

The contents of each PTR file are to be kept confidential, pursuant to Florida law and University regulations and policies.

**PTR Review Process**

The Department Chair will convene a PTR Advisory Committee consisting of a minimum of three professors in the department. For the review of Associate Professors, the Committee shall consist of professors of at least Associate rank; for the review of Full Professors, the committee shall consist of all Full Professors in the unit. Should there be less than an adequate number of professors in the department at the required rank, the Department Chair and the department’s Full Professors will select professors within the college at the appropriate rank so that there are three professors at the appropriate rank or above serving on the committee.

The PTR Advisory Committee will review each PTR file and prepare a report for each eligible faculty member based on the departmental criteria and report requirements (see below). The PTR Advisory Committee’s report shall include a recommended Performance Rating that states whether the faculty member’s performance and conduct Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Fails to Meet Expectations, and provide specific reasons to support the determination. The PTR Advisory Committee will affix their reports to the PTR files and return them to the Department Chair. The PTR Advisory Committee’s report shall not be binding upon the Department Chair, the Dean, or the Provost at further levels of review.

Upon receipt of the PTR Advisory Committee’s report, the Department Chair will review the entire PTR file, including the report and Performance Rating and any findings of a completed and substantiated inquiry or investigation of noncompliance with applicable laws, BOG and University regulations, and University policies, any records of substantiated unapproved absences during review period, and any disciplinary action issued by the University within the scope of their employment during the entire five-year Review Period.

The Department Chair will then prepare a report for each Eligible Faculty Member based on the aforementioned Criteria and Report Requirements defined above and affix the reports to the PTR files. The Department Chair’s report shall include a recommended Performance Rating and a brief narrative that analyzes the rating on the basis of the annual reports and related documentation. The Department Chair will provide the faculty member under PTR review with access to the complete PTR file, including all reports, and notify the faculty member that they have five calendar days to submit a response to be included in the PTR file. In that response, the faculty member may choose, also, to address the additional documents alleging substantiated noncompliance with state law, Board of Governors’ regulations, and University regulations and policies within the scope of their University employment, faculty absences, and student complaints.

Following the five-calendar day response period, the Department Chair will forward the PTR files to the College Dean. The Department Chair’s report and recommended Performance Rating shall not be binding upon the Dean or the Provost.

**Departmental Criteria for PTR (VAAH)**

The Department of Visual Arts & Art History is confident in its ability to evaluate its constituent faculty members according to the criteria of their specific disciplines, whether it be the Studio Arts, Graphic Design, or Art History. The primary vehicle for that evaluation is the Annual Report and its concluding scores. PTR evaluation will be measured from a basic score derived from the five-tier verbal scale on reports for annual evaluation during the review period as follows: ‘Exceptional’ – 5 points, ‘Outstanding’ – 4 points, ‘Good’ – 3 points, ‘Needs Improvement’ – 2 points, ‘Unsatisfactory’ – 1 point. The ultimate rating at the department level is derived from an initial rating in each category of evaluation – Research/Creative Activity, Teaching, and service – and an overall evaluation of the ratings in these categories.

**Category Evaluation**

Initially the evaluation will be made separately for each of the three categories – 1) Research/Creative Activity, 2) Teaching, and 3) Service – which the department considers to have equal merit.

An evaluation of ‘Exceeds Expectations’ will be assigned when ratings during the period of review are in the top two tiers in the category for four of the five annual evaluations.

An evaluation of ‘Meets Expectations’ will be assigned when ratings during the period of review are in the top three tiers in three years but no higher than the third tier in two years of the five annual evaluations.

An evaluation of ‘Fails to Meet Expectations’ will be assigned when ratings during the period of review appear in the bottom two categories in at least four of the five annual evaluations. Substantiated improvement following a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) can be considered a mitigating factor and can lead to the revision of ratings for one or more years in the composition of the five-year rating.

**Overall Evaluation**

Upon the assignment of a evaluations for each of the three categories – 1) Research/Creative Activity, 2) Teaching, and 3) Service – an overall rating for the five-year period will be made according to the following criteria:

‘Exceeds Expectations Overall’ will be assigned when the faculty member receives the evaluation ‘Exceeds Expectations’ in two of the three categories.

‘Meets Expectations Overall’ will be assigned when the faculty member receives the rating ‘Meets Expectations’ in at least two of the three categories and up to one evaluation of ‘Exceeds Expectations’.

‘Fails to Meet Expectations Overall’ will be assigned when the faculty member has not met expectations in any of the following ways

○ Received a rating of Fails to Meet Expectations in at least two categories.

○ Has had Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) for any category during the period of review with evidence for some improvement, and indications that the faculty member is putting effort toward meeting the PIP goals.

An evaluation of ‘Unsatisfactory Overall’ will be assigned only when the faculty member has not met expectations in any of the following ways:

○ Performance consistently fails to meet the unit’s written criteria as stated in Annual Evaluation criteria and PTR criteria.

○ Performance reflects disregard or failure to follow prior professional improvement plans (PIPs) to improve service.

○ Documented incompetence or misconduct, as defined in applicable University regulations and policies, or applicable CBA provisions.

The overall evaluation will be the definitive assessment in the reports of the departmental PTR committee and the Department Chair and subject to the review of the Dean and the Provost the basis for PTR Outcomes.

## Performance Does Not Meet Expectations

Any faculty member whose sustained performance Does Not Meet Expectations shall work with the Department Chair to draft a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) setting specific milestones that the faculty member will be responsible to meet over a period of no more than 12 months to achieve documented requirements of the PIP. The Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair, must review and approve the PIP and forward a copy to the Provost.

The faculty member may appeal the contents of a PIP to the Provost. The appeal must be submitted within seven calendar days of receiving the approved PIP. The Provost shall make final decisions regarding the PIP requirements.

At the end of the PIP, or when all of the PIP targets have been accomplished before the PIP deadline(s), the faculty member will prepare a written summary of how and when those targets were achieved. The Provost, in consultation with the Department Chair and/or Dean, will decide whether the targets laid out in the PIP have been achieved.

In the event that any faculty member placed on a PIP does not meet the requirements of the PIP by the stated deadline, the Provost shall propose termination of such faculty member, pursuant to applicable University regulations and policies, and in accordance with applicable provisions of the CBA.

## Unsatisfactory Performance

For any faculty member who receives an Unsatisfactory Performance Rating, the Provost shall propose termination of such faculty member, pursuant to applicable University regulations and policies, and in accordance with applicable provisions of the CBA. PTR outcomes may be appealed pursuant to University regulations and policies, and the CBA, where applicable. The filing of a grievance does not toll the action/decision of the University, including termination.