

Sustained Performance Evaluation (SPE) Proposal
SCMS Ad Hoc SPE Criteria Committee (Stephen Charbonneau, Joey Bargsten, Bill Trapani)
March 2017

General Principles Guiding SCMS SPE Evaluation Criteria

According to the Provost's Sustained Performance Evaluation (SPE) memorandum of October 3, 2016 (see attached document), the SPE is "separate and distinct from annual and other employee evaluations in that the evaluation will focus on long-term accomplishments over a period of multiple years."

Given that this is a "separate and distinct" evaluation designed to be a holistic account of a faculty member's performance over a seven year period, we propose assigning a point value to each Annual Evaluation category in order to establish point-value thresholds for each of the three Provost-mandated SPE evaluative categories of "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," and "Fails to Meet Expectations."

In determining a feasible point scale for assessing sustained faculty performance, our SPE committee will proceed from several basic principles:

- That a consistent rating of 'Good' on the Annual Evaluation would equate to the Provost-mandated category of "Meets Expectations";
- That special consideration is due to any annual evaluation rated as "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory"; especially since more than one annual evaluation during a seven-year period might indicate lack of satisfactory sustained performance, even if the overall rating score equates to "Good";
- That our school's SPE committee may add up to seven points to a colleague's baseline point total (up to 20%) to ensure that the final score reflects the full range of our activities and workload (see below).

Creation of Primary Weighted Scale for SPE Evaluation

As a baseline, the SCMS SPE committee will assign a formal point value to each of the current categories of faculty achievement on the Annual Evaluation (see below). Because the SPE evaluation covers a seven-year period, the de facto point range would be from 35 at the high end to 7 at the low end.

- ★ Exceptional – 5
- ★ Outstanding – 4
- ★ Good – 3
- ★ Needs Improvement – 2
- ★ Unsatisfactory – 1

Based on the premise of equivalency between an overall annual rating of "Good" and an SPE evaluative rating of "Meets Expectations," we propose the following thresholds and ranges for the Provost mandated three tier rating system of the SPE:

- ★ “Exceeds Expectations” – At threshold, and in range, of 23 to 35
- ★ “Meets Expectations” – At threshold, and in range, of 18 to 22
- ★ “Fails to Meet Expectations” – Below threshold of 18

Cumulative Assessment

As mentioned above, the SCMS SPE committee has the discretion to add points to a colleague’s initial baseline score for a final score that more holistically reflects the depth and breadth of a colleague’s activities over a seven year period.

More precisely, the SPE committee may, at their discretion, add 1 additional point to the cumulative total for each year of review (for a possible total of seven additional points).

This is crucial in light of three issues:

1. The SPE is not meant to purely replicate the annual evaluation process.
2. Annual evaluations cap out in ways that might limit a genuine evaluation of a colleague’s work on either a year-to-year or cumulative basis (e.g. faculty may be deserving of more than a 5 in a category in any given year or some assessments can only be appropriately and adequately measured *across review periods*.)
3. The SPE should reflect and ideally render visible the totality of a colleague’s labors on behalf of the school and the university.

The SPE committee may not reduce the overall point value generated by adding scores from individual annual reports.

Examples of activities that might be recognized by additional points – above and beyond the sum of annual evaluations – could be, but are NOT limited to:

- Any research, service, and teaching activities that have been un- or under-represented in annual evaluations;
- *Community Service* (e.g. outreach to high schools; mentoring; volunteer work with local non-profit organizations);
- *Public Engagement* (e.g. authorship of op-eds, interviews with local/national/global media, lectures in community settings to a general public);
- *Invited Talks/ Lectures/Workshops* (For instance, lectures and talks that are not “conference presentations,” but are often easily overlooked or get lost on our evaluation forms);
- *Exhibition/Event Organizing* (e.g. conference events; campus events)
- *Festival Participation* (e.g. jury membership; panel membership; mentoring; workshop participation);
- *Awards/Public Recognition* (The committee may want to acknowledge a colleague for generating visibility for our school, college, and university through important contributions made to their discipline as reflected by awards or other forms of public recognition);

- *Media Innovation* (The committee should acknowledge any technological accomplishments or hardware/software development that might get lost in our current evaluation process);
- *Facility Management* (e.g. labor performed running Davie Labs, the Living Room Theaters, and any other SCMS-run facilities, including training of new faculty, adjuncts, and teaching assistants; authorship of tech fee proposals);
- *Recruitment* (e.g. participation in and coordination of recruitment activities at the undergraduate and graduate levels; volunteering to be at recruitment events; phone calls to high school students, etc.);
- *Grad Student Development* (e.g. acknowledgement of graduate student mentorship; bearing heavy thesis advisory duties; etc.).
- *Continuous School Leadership* (e.g. multiple years of leadership as an area coordinator; years of sustained committee work; rationale here is that sustained and consistent involvement in the administration of SCMS should be recognized above and beyond a mere compilation of annual evaluation scores).

The SPE committee additionally welcomes any information or memoranda from the faculty member under review that might highlight the range of their labors performed on behalf of SCMS and FAU, thus ensuring a genuine and fair evaluation process.

Examples:

- Meets Expectations:** A faculty member receives a consistent 'Good' on all seven years of annual evaluation. This rating would give them 3 points for each year over seven years and therefore their score would be 21 points (3 pts for each 'Good' X 7 years = 21 pts). This would put them in the tier of "Meets Expectations."
- Meets Expectations:** A faculty member receives a consistent 'Good' for five of the years (3 pts for each year X 5 = 15 pts), a 'Needs Improvement' for one year (2 pts X 1 year = 2 pts), and an 'Unsatisfactory' for one year (1 pt X 1 year = 1 pt). Their score would be 18 points. This would put them in the tier of 'Meets Expectations.'
- Exceeds Expectations:** A faculty member receives an 'Outstanding' for 4 years (4 pts for each 'Outstanding' X 4 years = 16 pts) and a 'Good' for three years (3 pts for each year X 3 = 9 pts) therefore earning an overall 25 points.
- Exceeds Expectations:** A faculty member receives an 'Outstanding' for 4 years (4 pts for each 'Outstanding' X 4 years = 16 pts) and a 'Good' for two years (3 pts for each year X 2 = 6 pts) and an 'Unsatisfactory' for one year (1 pt for each year X 1 = 1 pt), therefore earning an overall 23 points.

Deriving a Numerical Score for Annual Evaluations Conducted Prior to 2015

Because the SPE evaluative process references a broad span of years, there needs to be an equivalency chart for annual evaluations conducted prior to 2015 in which there are only four categories of assessment (e.g. Excellent, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Below Satisfactory). We therefore propose the conversion of these prior faculty evaluations to a 5-point evaluation system, with our current criteria for annual evaluation as the guiding document for this process. See below for an example:

- ★ Excellent (highest category) – 5 points
- ★ Above satisfactory – 5 points
- ★ Satisfactory – 4 points
- ★ Below Satisfactory (lowest category) – Either 1 or 2 points

The conversion serves as a baseline and, as above, the SPE committee has discretion to add points where deemed appropriate.

The three-person SCMS SPE Committee will be constituted annually based on an alphabetical rotation among the School's Associate and Full Professors. In year one, the first three Associate or Full faculty on a list of the last names of all Associate and Full professor in SCMS shall constitute the Committee. From that point, the rotation would proceed annually, with three new members in year two replacing those from year one, and so on. The SPE Committee will select its own chair each year. (Added September 1, 2017).