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The PTR process and procedures will follow the Provost guidance and memorandum. The following document only addresses the unit level criteria.

A well-qualified and productive faculty is essential to the core teaching, scholarship, and service missions of Florida Atlantic University (FAU). Post Tenure Review (PTR) serves as a periodic review of tenured faculty and is designed to foster sustained excellence and professional development, and recognize and reward outstanding achievement.

PTR is separate and distinct from annual and other employee evaluations in that PTR will focus on long-term accomplishments over a period of five years. The record is to be evaluated in keeping with the appropriate approved criteria and is to include consideration of annual assignments and performance evaluations.

Most importantly, the PTR process has been designed to uphold the University’s fundamental principles of tenure, academic freedom, due process, and confidentiality in personnel matters.

**Academic Performance Criteria**

1. **Teaching**

*Meets Expectations*

* Received a rating in the top three categories for teaching in four (4) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
* Demonstrated a commitment to teaching excellence, as evidenced by:
  + Commitment to student engagement (availability to students, mentoring, providing academic guidance, etc.).
  + Positive classroom peer review by faculty chosen by the department chair in consultation with the candidate.
  + Received a 2.50 or better on question #6 of the majority of university evaluation forms or SPOT evaluations during the 5 years of review (note that 1 is the best score).
  + Evidence of positive written comments in SPOT evaluations.
  + Curricular and program development through course review, revision, and update as needed.
  + Evidence of willingness to teach courses that fulfill the department’s needs as determined by the chair, subject to respecting the teaching responsibilities specified in one’s contract and dual appointment obligations.

*Exceeds Expectations*

* Received a rating in the top two categories for teaching in four (4) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
* Evidence of at least 4 of the following:
  + Received a 1.75 or better on question #6 of the majority of university evaluation forms or SPOT evaluations during the 5 years of review (note that 1 is the best score).
  + Evidence of substantially positive written comments in SPOT evaluations.
  + New innovative teaching practices or curricula that are documented and included in the portfolio.
  + The development of two or more new classes or the significant revision to two or more classes.
  + Recipient of national or international recognition for teaching excellence.
  + Pedagogical publications and/or conference presentations and/or professional pedagogical workshops outside of the normal research area(s).
  + Recognition of teaching, such as departmental, college, or university nominations or awards or grants for teaching or curriculum development.
  + Demonstrated commitment to undergraduate research through mentorship or participation in OURI, service learning, or community engagement.
  + Supervising Directed Independent Study, supervising postdoctoral fellows, participating in thesis or dissertation committee, teaching or organizing extracurricular educational activities, teaching honors compact, and teaching WAC or RI courses.
  + Two good peer (faculty) evaluation within the five years of review. Must be completed by a tenured member of FAU, with at least one being from the philosophy department.

*Fails to Meet Expectations*

* Faculty member has failed to meet expectations in any of the following ways
  + Received a rating in the bottom two categories for teaching in at least two (2) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
  + Did not meet the above criteria for "meets expectations."
  + Received a score worse than 2.50 on question #6 of the majority of university evaluation forms or SPOT evaluations during the 5 years of review (note that 1 is the best score).
  + Has had Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) for teaching during the period with some improvement, and there is documented evidence that the faculty member is putting effort toward meeting the PIP goals.

*Unsatisfactory*

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

1. **Research**

*Meets Expectations*

* Received a rating in the top three categories for research in four (4) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
* Demonstrated a record of scholarly contributions, as evidenced by at least one of the following.
  + Publication of peer-reviewed scholarship in traditional or electronic form (e.g., monographs, journal articles, book chapters, edited collections, textbooks)
  + Publication of editorially-reviewed scholarship and contributions to the field in appropriate and respected venues (book reviews, encyclopedia entries, review essays, edited works, newspaper or magazine articles, public history projects).
  + Applied for research/creative grants as PI or Co-PI.
  + Exhibitions, performances or other artistic/creative endeavors in appropriate venues, preferably juried, auditioned, invited or peer-reviewed.
  + Book proposals and/or series/journal editorial work.
  + Creative activity/achievement/grants/awards in the discipline (local/state/regional/national).
  + Remains active in their field, presenting their research at local/regional/national/international conferences/colloquia/symposia on a consistent basis.
  + Has organized research symposia, expositions, performances.

*Exceeds Expectations*

* Received a rating in the top two categories for research in four (4) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
* Demonstrated a record of consistent and original contributions indicative of research/scholarly excellence, as evidenced by at least 4 of the following. (Remarkable productivity or qualitative achievement in one category may be counted more than once at the discretion of the committee)
  + A new peer-reviewed scholarly book in-press or in print.
  + At least three peer-reviewed or editor reviewed works in press or in print in the period under review: journal articles, book chapters, substantial encyclopedia and dictionary articles, articles in symposia, edited books (including anthologies, textbooks, journals or special editions) , and databases.
  + Has received a significant extramural grant(s) as PI or Co-PI.
  + Has given an invited lecture or keynote address at another university or significant association or academic group.
  + Has presented at least three peer-reviewed conferences.
  + Has organized research symposia, expositions, performances that resulted in a book of collected essays, proceedings, juried outcome, etc..
  + Has received national or international recognition for their research.
  + Significant creative activity/achievement/grants/awards in the discipline (national/international).

*Fails to Meet Expectations*

* Demonstrated by any of these appropriate to the candidate’s discipline:
  + Received a rating in the bottom two categories for research in at least two (2) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
  + Failure to meet the requirements of either Meets or Exceeds Expectations.
  + Has had Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) for research during the period with some improvement, and there is documented evidence that the faculty member is putting effort toward meeting the PIP goals.

*Unsatisfactory*

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

1. **Service**

*Meets Expectations*

* Received a rating in the top three categories for Service in four (4) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
* Demonstrated a consistent and meaningful commitment to service excellence, as evidenced by at least one of the following:
  + Active membership on and contribution to departmental, college, and university committees/initiatives.
  + Advising to on-campus student organizations.
  + Professional service (membership in and/or leadership positions in professional organizations, peer reviewer for journals, judge/jury for artistic competitions at state and regional levels).
  + Participation in departmental/college/university events as appropriate (e.g. Graduation, Recruitment Events, Department Meetings, Community Engagement, Faculty Governance).

*Exceeds Expectations*

* Received a rating in the top two categories for teaching in four (4) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
* Demonstrated a consistent and meaningful commitment to service excellence, as indicated by four (4) of the following:
  + Is an active member of departmental/college/university committees/initiatives, and discipline-based organizations..
  + Significant participation in departmental/college/university events as appropriate (e.g. Graduation, Recruitment Events, Department Meetings, Community Engagement, Faculty Governance.).
  + Has made documented leadership contributions to their department, college, university, and/or discipline through their service.
  + Has received national or international recognition for their service to the university or professional community.
  + Has collaborated with or contributed to community-based and/or government organizations.
  + Has spoken at community events, or presenting one’s scholarship or creative endeavor to nonacademic or public audiences.
  + Has conducted community-engaged curricular work.
  + Has contributed to student service-learning activities and mentoring student internships; and conducting creative or public scholarship (e.g., blogs, podcasts, documentaries).
  + Has served as an officer in state, national or international professional organizations/boards.

*Fails to Meet Expectations*

* Faculty member has not met expectations in any of the following ways
  + Received a rating in the bottom two categories for services in at least two (2) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
  + Failure to meet the requirements of either Meets or Exceeds Expectations and
  + Has had Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) for service during the period with some improvement, and there is documented evidence that the faculty member is putting effort toward meeting the PIP goals.

*Unsatisfactory*

* 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.

**Overall Ratings**

An overall rating of **Exceeds Expectations** requires an Exceeds Expectations in 2 categories *and* at least a Meets Expectations in the third.

An overall rating of **Meets Expectations** requires at least a Meets Expectations in all 3 categories, but does not meet the requirements for Exceeds Expectations.

An overall rating of **Fails to Meet Expectations** results from a rating of Fails to Meet Expectation in any category.

An overall rating of **Unsatisfactory** results from a rating of Unsatisfactory in any category.

**NON- ACADEMIC CRITERIA**

If applicable, the PTR File should also include documentation 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; 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 and assessing the impact of these documents on their recommended PTR ranking.

The faculty member may include a response to the unit head’s letter and ranking. In that letter, they may choose to address the additional documents alleging substantiated noncompliance with relevant laws, regulations, and policies.