

Florida Atlantic University

School of Communication and Multimedia Studies

Post Tenure Review (PTR) Criteria

Adopted 11/5/23

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

According to the Provost's guidelines on "Post-Tenure Review" (PTR), the 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.

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).
 - Curricular and program development through course review, revision, and update as needed.

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 3 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).
 - 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 SCMS.

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 three (3) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
 - Did not meet the above criteria for "meets expectations."
 - SPOT scores are significantly worse than the college mean.
 - 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.
 - There is documented evidence that 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.

2. 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 some or all 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)
 - Has an active and productive research agenda, with a new peer-reviewed scholarly book in press or in print.
 - At least three peer-reviewed works in press or in print in the period under review: journal articles, book chapters, edited works, curated exhibits, juried films/plays, 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 or exhibitions, performance or other artistic/creative endeavors.
 - 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 three (3) 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.

- There is documented evidence that 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.

3. 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 some or all 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.
 - Has served as an area coordinator for at least three years during the review period.
 - Has served as associate director of the school, director of graduate studies, GTA coordinator, chair of the promotion and tenure committee, or chair of the undergraduate program committee for at least three years total during the review period.

- Significant participation in departmental/college/university events as appropriate (e.g. Graduation, Recruitment Events, Department Meetings, Community Engagement, Faculty Governance.).
- Recruiting and other program-based outreach to high schools.
- Formal mentoring of junior faculty or training of new faculty and teaching assistants.
- Has taken responsibility for facility and equipment management, or developed tech fee proposals.
- 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 presented one's scholarship or creative endeavor to nonacademic or public audiences.
- Has organized events on campus or for professional and academic organizations.
- 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 three (3) 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.
- There is documented evidence that 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.