

**DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY**

ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Provisions of the document on the same subject preceding this one remain in force except where obsolete or replaced by the provisions of this document (Florida Atlantic University Department of Anthropology Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation and Merit Pay, Revised 2/13/17). Annual evaluation and merit criteria approved unanimously by Department faculty vote February 20, 2017.

I. Annual Faculty Evaluation:

A. Teaching:

Teaching will be evaluated holistically, utilizing a variety of materials, including SPOT scores as specified below and other indicators of teaching activities and accomplishments. In addition to SPOT scores, overall teaching evaluation shall include consideration of such items as the following:

- Directed independent studies (DIS)
- Undergraduate research supervision
- Internship supervision
- Graduate and undergraduate thesis supervision
- Dissertation supervision
- Thesis committee participation
- Dissertation committee participation
- New course preparation
- Teaching a new preparation
- Teaching training (internal or external)
- Developing/teaching a Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) course
- Major syllabus revisions
- Increased use of new technology as part of pedagogy
- Distance Learning courses
- Teaching awards
- Peer reviews
- Significant improvement over previous low SPOT scores
- Additional evaluation procedures
- Any other activity relevant to the improvement or practice of teaching

The Student Perception of Teaching (SPOT) form shall be evaluated by calculating the mean of Items #1-5. These five criteria are the best indicators on the SPOT form for assessing quality of teaching and, moreover, are applicable to any type of teaching situation (large lecture class, small discussion group, lab, etc.).

The overall mean of Items #1-5 will be rated as follows:

Exceptional	=	1.0 - 1.8
Outstanding	=	1.9 - 2.6
Good	=	2.7 - 3.1
Needs Improvement	=	3.2 - 3.5
Unsatisfactory	=	> 3.5

The rating obtained by this procedure shall be modified by other inputs **as listed above and/or** as supplied by the faculty member or otherwise obtained for purposes of evaluation, and any other pertinent information.

B. Research:

Each faculty member's research and creative activities shall be rated Exceptional, Outstanding, Good, Needs Improvement, and Unsatisfactory based on consideration of their total publications, exhibitions, grant writing, fieldwork, laboratory analyses, and other research-related activities during the period under review in accordance with the system below.

Anthropological projects are normally the result of several years of research and writing. Multi-year research and writing projects are eligible for consideration in the annual evaluation process when 1) they are included in the annual assignment, and 2) the outcomes and expected time to completion are stipulated and reasonable.

Exceptional: Achievement of ONE of the following:

1. A scholarly book or monograph issued by a university press or other reputable publisher shall count for two years (e.g., when a manuscript is accepted, and when it is published).
2. Publication of an edited scholarly book issued by a reputable publisher.
3. An external grant from a major granting agency (e.g., NSF or other federal agency, Fulbright, major foundation, etc.), and/or a grant of \$10,000 or more.
4. Publication of an edited special issue of a scholarly journal.

OR Achievement of AT LEAST ONE of Items 5-7 PLUS ONE of Items 5-10:

5. Publication of an article in a peer-reviewed journal.
6. Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book.
7. A major museum exhibition and/or travelling exhibition.
8. An external or internal grant less than \$10,000.
9. Preparation and submission of a major research or technical report to an agency or corporation.
10. Conference presentation.

Outstanding: Achievement of ONE of the following:

1. Publication of an article in a peer-reviewed journal.
2. Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book.
3. Demonstrate evidence that two or more of the above has been submitted and is under review for publication.
4. A major museum exhibition and/or travelling exhibition.

Good: Achievement of ONE of the following:

1. Publication of an article in a non-refereed medium.
2. A minor museum exhibition.
3. Submission of an external or internal grant application for less than \$10,000.
4. Publication of a research note in a refereed journal.
5. Preparation and submission of a research or technical report to an agency or corporation.
6. Significant research and writing geared to publication as a book or refereed journal article.

7. A book review, comment, or other brief item published in a refereed journal.
8. Conference presentation.
9. Chairing, organizing, or being a discussant for a symposium or section at a professional conference.
10. Invited academic talk.

Needs Improvement: Little evidence of progress directed toward publication on the basis of original research.

Unsatisfactory: No evidence of research work.

Any combination of these items, and any form of research activity not specifically mentioned, will be evaluated in keeping with these guidelines. A convincing argument that a publication or other evidence of research deserves a higher rating than these guidelines allow will be considered. Exceeding the criteria within any one category results in a rating in the next higher category.

The rating obtained by this procedure may be modified by other inputs as supplied by the faculty member or otherwise obtained for purposes of evaluation, and any other pertinent information.

C. Service and Other Activities:

Each faculty member's service shall be rated Exceptional, Outstanding, Good, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory based on consideration of their total time and effort devoted to service-related activities during the period under review in accordance with the system outlined below. Untenured faculty have a reduced service expectation.

Exceptional: Service as chair or other officer on one or more university committees, including university, college, and/or department committees, councils, assemblies, and/or senates of recognized importance to university governance, operation or work environment; and/or appointed or elected to a high office in a national or international scholarly or professional association; and/or professional service as editor or book review editor for a scholarly journal.

Outstanding: Service on a major university committee, including university, college, and/or department committees, councils, assemblies, and/or senates of recognized importance to university governance, operation or work environment; service on an editorial board; and/or service on a conference, association, community, and/or government board, committee, or equivalent. Other professional service includes external reviewer for a manuscript or grant, promotion and tenure external review, and external program review.

Good: Service on one or more minor university/college/department committees, service on a one-day conference/association/community/government committees, and/or significant community outreach such as giving talks on research to community organizations.

Needs Improvement: Little participation in assigned committee service (e.g., regularly absent).

Unsatisfactory: No service to university/college/department committees or to profession.

The rating derived here may be modified by evidence of university, public or professional service; evidence of accomplishment in student advising; and/or service to the university community, the community at large, etc. Exceeding the criteria within any one category results in a rating in the next higher category.

The rating obtained by this procedure may be modified by other inputs as supplied by the faculty member or otherwise obtained for purposes of evaluation, and any other pertinent information.