

Florida Atlantic University

Department of Philosophy

Sustained Performance Evaluation

Departmental Criteria

Adopted February 20, 2017

Revised August 29, 2017

Approved by Faculty September 1, 2017

The Sustained Performance Evaluation (SPE) is separate and distinct from annual and other faculty evaluations in that the SPE will focus on long-term accomplishments over a period of multiple years. Similarly, the SPE should not be confused with formal evaluation and application for promotion and tenure. The main objectives of the SPE are to:

- Provide a forum for a regular, constructive conversation regarding each faculty member's role in his/her academic unit, College, University, and discipline at large.
- Identify ways in which the University can help facilitate faculty success.
- Recognize and reward sustained excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.
- Identify and address unsatisfactory performance in these areas.

Furthermore, the SPE is also guided by two primary goals: (1) To actively assist the individual faculty member in his/her continued professional development and (2) to ensure the continued productivity of the department in fulfilling its University mission and in advancing University strategic priorities and goals.

Additionally, the continuance process provides the opportunity for tenured faculty in the department to mentor and assist junior faculty in developing their professional skills and reputation, while establishing themselves as productive and influential members of the department and University community.

General Information

The University requires that tenured faculty members receive a Sustained Performance Evaluation. The stated purpose of this evaluation is to document sustained performance during the previous seven years of assigned duties. The evaluation is designed to determine if a tenured faculty member's extended performance is decisively and determinately satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

Nothing in these departmental guidelines for SPE supersedes or replaces the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

A. Evaluation Cycle

The SPE will follow a seven-year cycle for each tenured faculty member, with the following exceptions:

- Any successful application for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor resets the applicant's seven-year cycle. If such an application is unsuccessful then, upon request of the applicant, the University Provost may at his/her discretion add one extra year to the faculty member's SPE cycle.
- Faculty members on phased retirement, in DROP, or whose notification of retirement has been accepted by University are exempt from the SPE.
- Faculty holding special positions that require regular reviews beyond the standard annual evaluation, such as named chairs, endowed chairs, and eminent scholars, are exempt from the SPE.
- Any time spent by a faculty member while serving as a department chair, school director, dean, associate dean, or any other full-time administrative position subject to regular administrative review may not count toward the SPE cycle. Upon returning to a non-administrative faculty position on a full-time basis, the faculty member may choose whether his/her seven-year cycle either restarts or resumes.
- Time spent by a faculty member on medical or family leave may either be included or excluded in the SPE cycle, at the request of the faculty member.
- The SPE may be postponed for one year for those faculty members who will be on leave (including sabbatical) during the year when the SPE is scheduled to occur.

B. Evaluation Process

The department of philosophy will constitute an SPE committee consisting of the Associate and Full professors, and the committee will elect its own chair.

Once the SPE evaluation has been concluded, a copy of the SPE records will be kept in the department files either as hard copies, electronic copies, or both.

C. Evaluation File

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

- A current *curriculum vita* that clearly highlights accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service during the period under review.
- Copies of the faculty member's last seven annual assignments and annual evaluations.
- A copy of the report of the previous SPE, if available.
- A copy of the published performance expectations from the faculty member's academic unit (see Articulation of Unit Expectations below).
- A brief (2 page) narrative from the faculty member.

The contents of each SPE file are to be kept confidential throughout the evaluation process.

D. Articulation of Unit Expectations

The criteria to be used to evaluate a faculty member's sustained performance will consist of a mixture of quantitative and qualitative factors. These criteria are tied to the seven-year period of annual assignments and evaluations and will not extend beyond the scope of the relevant activities undertaken by the faculty member during that time.

1. Teaching Expectations for Sustained Performance

In order to assess whether or not a tenured faculty member of the department of philosophy has met *teaching* expectations during the relevant period covered by the SPE, the faculty member will be evaluated on the basis of the following expectations:

1. The faculty member must have received an overall evaluation rating of good or higher on six (6) of his/her previous seven (7) annual evaluations.
2. The faculty member must have a rating of good or higher for *teaching* in six (6) of his/her last seven (7) annual evaluations.
3. The faculty member must have a verified record of honoring and enforcing the *teaching* policies and procedures of the department of philosophy.
4. The faculty member must have a demonstrative record of consistent and meaningful commitment to *teaching* excellence. *The following items are not intended to be a complete list but, rather, to serve as examples of the activities which may be taken into consideration in assessing continuous teaching excellence:*

- a) Evidence of strong commitment to student engagement (availability to students, mentoring, providing academic guidance, etc.).
- b) Classroom observation comments by an impartial faculty chosen by the Chair.
- c) Recognition of teaching (e.g. Departmental/College/University nominations or awards)
- d) Development of new courses or innovative pedagogy

2. Scholarship Expectations for Sustained Performance

In order to assess whether or not a tenured faculty member of the department of philosophy has met *research* expectations during the relevant period covered by the SPE policy, the faculty member will be evaluated on the basis of the following expectations:

1. Faculty member must have received an overall evaluation rating of good or higher on six (6) of his/her previous seven (7) annual evaluations.
2. Faculty member must have a rating of good or higher for *research* in six (6) of his/her last seven (7) annual evaluations.
3. Faculty member must have a verified record of honoring and following the *research* policies and procedures of the department of philosophy.
4. Faculty member must have a demonstrative record of consistent and original contributions indicative of *research/scholarly* excellence. *The following items are not intended to be a complete list but, rather, to serve as examples of the activities which may be taken into consideration in assessing continuous research excellence:*
 - a) Research supervision (e.g. undergraduate research, honors theses, graduate thesis or dissertation)
 - b) Participation in professional development activity centered on research (serving on an editorial board, chairing or serving on a thesis or dissertation committee)
 - c) Recognition of research activity (e.g. Departmental/College/University nominations or awards)

3. Service Expectations for Sustained Performance

In order to assess whether or not a tenured faculty member of the department of philosophy has met *service* expectations during the relevant period covered by the SPE, the faculty member will be evaluated on the basis of the following expectations:

1. Faculty member must have received an overall evaluation rating of good or higher on six (6) of his/her previous seven (7) annual evaluations.
2. Faculty member must have a rating of good or higher for *service* in six (6) of his/her last seven (7) annual evaluations.
3. Faculty member must have a verified record of honoring and enforcing the **service** policies and procedures of the department of philosophy.
4. Faculty member must have a demonstrative record of consistent and meaningful commitment to *service* excellence. *The following items are not intended to be a complete list but, rather, to serve as examples of the activities which may be taken into consideration in assessing continuous service excellence:*
 - a). Review of manuscripts, book chapters, etc.
 - b). Leadership positions/memberships in professional associations
 - c). Service to editorial boards.
 - d). Serving on *ad hoc* departmental, College and University Committees
 - e). Advising to on-campus student organizations.
 - f). Recognition for service (Professional, community, Department/College/University nominations or awards), etc.

E: Expectations for Rating of “Exceeds Expectations”

- In order to receive a rating of “Exceeds Expectations” for his/her SPE, a faculty member must have earned an overall rating of “Exceptional” or above on at least four (4) out of the last seven (7) annual evaluations, and
- An overall rating of no less than “Good” in the other three (3) annual evaluations.
- An assessment that the faculty member is committed to excellence in teaching, research, and service. The committee’s assessment will take into account not only annual evaluations but also items D.1.3 and D.1.4 under ‘Teaching’, D.2.3 and D.2.4 under ‘Research’, D.3.3, and D.3.4 under ‘Service’.

F: Expectations For Rating of “Meets Expectations”

- In order to receive a rating of “Meets Expectations” for his/her SPE, a faculty member must have earned an overall rating of “Exceptional” or above on at most three (3) out of the last seven (7) annual evaluations, and
- An overall rating of “Needs Improvement” or below in no more than one (1) of the other annual evaluations.

- An assessment that the faculty member is satisfying basic expectations in teaching, research, and service. The committee's assessment will take into account not only annual evaluations but also items D.1.3 and D.1.4 under 'Teaching', D.2.3 and D.2.4 under 'Research', D.3.3, and D.3.4 under 'Service'.

G: Expectations For Rating of "Below Expectations"

- In order to receive a rating of "Below Expectations" for his/her SPE, a faculty members must have earned an overall rating of "Needs Improvement" or below on at least two (2) out of his/her last seven (7) annual evaluations.
- An assessment that the faculty member is not meeting basic expectations in teaching, research, and service. The committee's assessment will take into account not only annual evaluations but also items D.1.3 and D.1.4 under 'Teaching', D.2.3 and D.2.4 under 'Research', D.3.3, and D.3.4 under 'Service'.