

DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES, LINGUISTICS, AND COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Sustained Performance Evaluation (SPE) Criteria and Procedures

Adopted by faculty on August 21, 2017

According to the Provost's Sustained Performance Evaluation (SPE) memorandum of October 3, 2016 mandating a Sustained Performance Evaluation (SPE), the basis of SPE evaluation is the faculty member's annual performance considered over a broad (7-year) period, with the faculty member's Annual Evaluations from this seven-year period serving as a primary (but not sole) set of reference documents. To this point, the Provost's memorandum also adds that "the SPE is separate and distinct from annual and other employee evaluations in that the evaluation will focus on long-term accomplishments over a period of multiple years." This point is addressed in further detail at the end of this document.

The faculty member under review will provide the following items in the SPE portfolio: (a) a current curriculum vitae; (b) copies of the last seven annual assignments and annual evaluations; (c) a copy of the SPE performance evaluation criteria and procedures of the department; (d) a brief (two- to three-page) narrative of accomplishments in all three areas of teaching, research, and service for the period under review; and if applicable, (e) a copy of the previous SPE report, if such exists.

The SPE portfolio will be reviewed by the departmental personnel committee, which includes all tenured faculty members. In keeping with departmental personnel committee procedures, all members of the personnel committee (both associate and full tenured professors) will discuss and vote on the portfolios of associate professors, whereas only full professors will discuss and vote on the portfolios of full professors.

If the faculty member under review disagrees with the decision of the departmental committee, the dossier will be reviewed by the DFSCAL College Performance Review Committee.

The results of each SPE review will be documented by the chair of the department. Full records of this documentation, including portfolios, will be delivered to and stored in the DFSCAL Dean's Office. The department will also keep a copy of same.

Given that the purpose of the SPE is to measure a faculty member's performance in a holistic sense over a period of seven years, and given that the Provost's SPE guiding memorandum clarifies that each academic unit "shall define expectations for sustained performance among its faculty in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and research," we hereby establish the following point-value ranking system for each Annual Evaluation category in order to establish point-value thresholds for each of the three Provost-mandated SPE evaluative categories of Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, and Fails to Meet Expectations. Please note that in determining a feasible point scale for assessing sustained faculty performance, we proceed from several basic principles:

- That a rating of 'Good' on four Annual Evaluations would equate to the Provost-mandated category of 'Meets Expectations';

- That there is already a formal mechanism in place separate from the SPE—via the Collective Bargaining Agreement—for the formal establishment of a “PIP” (Performance Improvement Plan) that is monitored by the Office of the Provost.

Primary Weighted Scale for SPE Evaluation

There will be a formal point value assigned to each of the current categories of faculty achievement on the Annual Evaluation (see below). We further propose this as the basis for establishing a faculty member’s global SPE evaluation score. Because the SPE evaluation covers a seven-year period, the de facto point range would be from 35 at the high end to 7 at the low end.

Based on the premise of equivalency between an overall annual rating of “Good” and an SPE evaluative rating of “Meets Expectations,” we propose the following thresholds and ranges for the Provost mandated three tier rating system of the SPE:

Exceptional	5
Outstanding	4
Good	3
Needs Improvement	2
Unsatisfactory	1
Exceeds Expectations	At threshold, and in range, of 21 and up
Meets Expectations	At threshold, and in range, of 17 to 20
Fails to Meet Expectations	16 or below

Examples:

1. **Exceeds Expectations:** A faculty member receives a consistent ‘Good’ on all seven years of annual evaluation. This rating would give them 3 points for each year over seven years and therefore their score would be 21 points (3 pts for each ‘Good’ X 7 years = 21 pts). This would put them in the tier of ‘Exceeds Expectations’.
2. **Meets Expectations:** A faculty member receives a consistent ‘Good’ for four of the years (3 pts for each year X 4 = 12 pts), a ‘Needs Improvement’ for two years (2 pts x 2 years = 4 pts), and an ‘Unsatisfactory’ for one year (1 pt X 1 year = 1 pt) . Their score would be 17 points. This would put them in the tier of ‘Meets Expectations’.

Note: Our committee discussed various scenarios at length, and determined collectively that whereas three years of performance below a rating of “Good” should most likely not be equated to an overall SPE evaluation of “Meets Expectations,” two years of annual

evaluation below the level of “Good” should not make it impossible for a faculty member to earn an overall SPE evaluation of “Meets Expectations.” In short, we feel that it is important to emphasize the “sustained” overall performance of a faculty member.

3. **Exceeds Expectations:** A faculty member receives an ‘Outstanding’ for 7 years. This rating would give them 4 points for each year over seven years and therefore their score would be 28 points.
4. **Exceeds Expectations:** A faculty member receives an ‘Outstanding’ for 4 years (4 pts for each ‘Outstanding’ X 4 years = 16 pts) and a ‘Good’ for three years (3 pts for each year X 3 = 9 pts) therefore earning an overall 25 points.
5. **Exceeds Expectations:** A faculty member receives an ‘Outstanding’ for 4 years (4 pts for each ‘Outstanding’ X 4 years = 16 pts) and a ‘Good’ for two years (3 pts for each year X 2 = 6 pts), and an ‘Unsatisfactory’ for one year (1 pt for each year X 1 = 1 pts), therefore earning an overall 23 points.

Deriving a Numerical Score for Annual Evaluations Conducted Prior to 2015

Because the SPE evaluative process references a broad span of years, our committee recognizes the need to establish an equivalency chart for annual evaluations conducted prior to 2015 in which there are only four categories of assessment (e.g., Excellent; Above Satisfactory; Satisfactory; Below Satisfactory). We therefore propose the conversion of these prior faculty evaluations to a 5-point evaluation system, with our current criteria for annual evaluation as the guiding document for this translational process. See below for an example:

Excellent (highest category)	5 points
Above Satisfactory	5 points
Satisfactory	4 points
Below Satisfactory (lowest category)	Either 1 or 2 points, based on our current criteria which provide for the distinction between “below satisfactory” (2 points) and “unsatisfactory” (1 point)

Long-Term Accomplishments Not Captured by Annual Evaluations

As stated in the Provost’s memorandum, “the SPE is separate and distinct from annual and other employee evaluations in that the evaluation will focus on long-term accomplishments over a period of multiple years.” If the SPE candidate has applicable accomplishments in any of the areas of teaching, research, and service which are not fully represented in the annual evaluations, the candidate should address these accomplishments both in the submitted curriculum vitae and in the short narrative. The department’s established criteria for annual review and for promotion and tenure may serve as baseline guides for identifying same.