

# **Harriet L. Wilkes Honors College of Florida Atlantic University**

## **Guidelines for Annual Evaluation of Faculty<sup>1</sup>**

APPROVED BY HC P&T COMMITTEE NOVEMBER 2010

### **5. ANNUAL REVIEW/EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Annual reviews will be conducted by the faculty member's chair and reviewed by the Dean and Associate Dean. A faculty member may request in writing a meeting with an administrator at the next higher level to discuss concerns regarding the evaluation which were not resolved in previous discussions with the evaluator(s). In addition, each candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor may choose to have a Faculty Advisor, who is an academic/professional mentor with no supervisory responsibilities. The Faculty Advisor must be a tenured member of the HC faculty. The candidate in consultation with the Associate Dean would select the Faculty Advisor. At the request of the faculty member, the advisor may attend meetings between the faculty member and his or her supervisor regarding issues of assignment.

Evaluations of research/scholarship/creative activity for P&T are not based on a simple average of the annual evaluations, and thus consistently excellent annual evaluations may not necessarily result in an excellent P&T assessment. For example, guidelines for annual evaluations establish that presenting papers at two international conferences in one year may, by itself, merit an excellent evaluation in research for that year. However, a faculty member who earned five consecutive excellent ratings in research by presenting 10 papers at 10 international conferences, two per year, but who had no publications, cannot expect to meet promotion-and-tenure criteria for research. On the other hand, a faculty member who receives 3 excellent and 3 marginal research evaluations over the course of 6 years as a result of publication of one book at a leading University press and two Articles in leading journals published in the same year may likely meet promotion-and-tenure criteria for research. In the case of teaching and service, evaluation for P&T may reflect the pattern of annual evaluations.

#### **5.1 Annual Evaluation of Teaching**

Materials used to Evaluate Instruction will include Student evaluation data (SPOT scores), and evidence of teaching enhancement activities. See §4.1 of the Colleges P&T Guidelines for list of teaching enhancement activities and a key for translating SPOT scores into 'excellent/good/marginal/unsatisfactory'.

Note: In interpreting the student evaluation numbers, evaluators must consider factors such as patterns in student narrative comments, the size of the course (Is the course relatively large for the HC, or is the course so small that one student could significantly change the outcome?) and the role of the course in the curriculum (Is it a Core course, a gateway course for a concentration, a concentration requirement, or an elective?).

---

<sup>1</sup> The first set of guidelines was initially approved by the Faculty of the Honors College on January 29 2002. An April 12 2002 version reflects changes made on March 27 2002. A further revision was made in Oct. 17 2007. This version is a substantial revision of previous versions and constitutes the latter half of the Colleges P&T Guidelines, also available online at [http://www.fau.edu/divdept/honcol/PT\\_Guidelines\\_HC\\_2010.pdf](http://www.fau.edu/divdept/honcol/PT_Guidelines_HC_2010.pdf).

Translating SPOT scores into the P&T categories:

Item #20 will be used, which asks students to “Rate the quality of instruction as it contributed to your learning in the course.”

A SPOT score falling between 1 and 2 will be considered excellent.

A SPOT score falling between 2 and 3 will be considered good.

A SPOT score falling between 3 and 4 will be considered marginal.

A SPOT score falling between 4 and 5 will be considered unsatisfactory.

Excellent: Documented successful participation in at least one teaching enhancement activity or activity that contributes to teaching in the HC as listed below, and a pattern of excellent student teaching evaluations, defined as: a majority of courses rate an excellent; or the rating across courses of the instructor averages as excellent (scoring between 1 and 2).

Other considerations, where a faculty falls just short of excellent by this criteria, could bump a rating up to excellent: e.g., a pattern of excellent narrative comments, or other evidence such as highly positive peer evaluations.

Alternatively, documented successful participation in several significant teaching enhancement activities or activities that contribute to HC teaching, and a pattern of very good student evaluations, defined as a SPOT score between 2 and 2.5, along with other indications of excellent teaching, can warrant an excellent rating in teaching.

Good: Documented successful participation in at least one teaching enhancement activity or activity that contributes to teaching in the HC as listed below, and a pattern of good SPOT evaluations (score between 2 and 3), defined as: a majority of courses rate a good; or the rating across courses of the instructor averages good. Other evidence that may contribute to the ranking of good includes the results of peer evaluation, syllabi, course assignments etc.

Marginal: A pattern of marginal student evaluations, as indicated by one or more of the following: a majority of evaluations with a rating of marginal; an average numerical ranking that is marginal.

Unsatisfactory: Failure to achieve at least a marginal rating.

## **5.2 Annual Evaluation of Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity**

Faculty members may report research during years when accepted for publication or during years when published but not both.

Excellent: A rating of excellent will be achieved by accomplishing one or more of the following during the period of evaluation:

1. Acceptance or publication of an Article in a peer-reviewed national or international journal or a chapter in a peer-reviewed book.
2. Acceptance or exhibition/performance of peer-reviewed creative work in nationally or internationally recognized venues.
3. Acceptance of a book by a University press or commercial publisher on the basis of an externally peer reviewed manuscript.
4. Revision and Publication of a book by a University press or commercial publisher

5. A significant grant or grants received as a result of an external review process.
6. Acceptance or publication of a peer-reviewed textbook or revised version of a textbook by University or commercial publisher.
7. Editing a peer-reviewed book accepted by contract for publication.
8. Jurying or curating an exhibition or performance.
9. Acceptance of creative writing or other creative product in peer-reviewed national or international journals, books or magazines.
10. Presentation of 2 papers/posters at peer reviewed national or international conferences.

Non-peer-reviewed books: In some cases a book or other scholarly product that is not peer-reviewed but which makes a significant contribution to a field or fields will be considered in evaluating research. The faculty must document the significance of the work.

Good: A rating of good will be achieved by accomplishing one or more of the following during the period of evaluation:

1. Acceptance or publication of a substantial Article in a local or regional peer-reviewed journal.
2. Acceptance or exhibition/performance of peer-reviewed creative work in locally or regionally recognized venues.
3. The presentation of 2 scholarly papers/posters at peer-reviewed professional conferences—local, state, or regional; or of 1 paper/poster at a peer reviewed national or international conference.
4. Significant favorable critical reviews and citations of recently published work of the candidate
5. Awards, Fellowships, and other academic honors.
6. Acceptance of creative writing or other creative product in regional or state peer-reviewed journals, books, or magazines.
7. Publication of a substantial book, exhibition, or performance review in a journal that is considered major in an area of inquiry.
8. Submitting grants for external review processes.

Marginal: Evidence of continuing research/creative activity and submission of research/creative product for publication; presentation of a paper at a local, state or regional professional conference; applying for grants; manuscript(s) or other creative work in progress. Overall, scholarly activity that has a reasonable expectation of leading to peer-reviewed publication or receipt of externally reviewed grants.

Unsatisfactory: Failure to meet the requirements of a marginal rating.

### **5.3 Annual Evaluation of Service**

Examples of service include: chairing or serving on a standing or ad hoc College committee (ad hoc committees include search committees); participating in the regional, state or national honors community by attending conferences; serving on a university committee; advising/assisting student organizations; participating in University governance (e.g. UFF, Faculty Senate); assisting with recruiting activities (e.g. visiting schools, participating in open houses); serving in professional associations; community outreach (e.g. talks to the community or local schools); organizing events for the community that bring them to the campus. This list is not exhaustive.

The committee will take into account both the quality and quantity of activity in deciding the overall

rating. Quality of service can be documented by memos from a committee chair, fellow member, college chair or administrator, or participants or beneficiaries of a service activity.

Unlike the evaluation of research/scholarly and creative activity, evaluation of service for promotion and tenure will reflect annual evaluations of service, with the recognition that faculty who are given reduced service loads as a way of assisting them in producing research for when they go up for tenure will not be penalized for having reduced service in those years. Annual evaluations of service in years when a faculty has reduced service will make clear that the faculty had a reduced service load, and the P & T committee, when evaluating service for tenure and promotion, will not include lower ratings in years of a reduced service load in determining the overall pattern of service ratings.

Excellent: The following examples represent a sample of activities that would merit a rating of excellent during the period of evaluation. This list is not exhaustive, as other potential combinations of activities might also apply.

1. Providing exemplary service chairing a HC Committee.
2. Providing exemplary service in a leadership role in organizing and encouraging student activities.
3. Providing significant service on multiple HC Committees; or on an HC committee and: a University Committees, in University governance, community service, or professional service.
4. Exemplary service on an HC Committee as well as participation in student activities or recruitment.

Good: The following examples represent a sample of activities that would merit a rating of good during the period of evaluation. This list is not exhaustive, as other potential combinations of activities might also apply.

1. Significant service on an HC Committee, University committee, or ad-hoc committee.
2. Significant participation in student activities.
3. Service on a committee and participation in recruitment fairs.
4. Significant community service (i.e. Multiple lectures, meetings or other services).
5. Significant service to the profession (e.g. chair of panel and member of advisory board for a journal).
6. Other combinations of good College, University, and Professional service.

Marginal: A faculty member participates in the governance of the college through regular attendance and participation at faculty meetings and activities. In addition, a faculty member is expected to accept assignments to participate in regular College and University functions.

Unsatisfactory: This rating should be given to faculty members whose service does not meet any of the criteria listed above.

## 6. ANNUAL APPRAISAL OF PROGRESS TOWARDS TENURE

Based on the candidate's record and the tenure criteria in this document, the candidate will be appraised on an annual basis and informed on whether they are making progress towards tenure. The annual appraisal of progress toward tenure will be included in the candidate's tenure file.