FAU COLLEGE FOR DESIGN AND SOCIAL INQUIRY
Florida Atlantic University

SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION POLICY

The College for Design and Social Inquiry (CDSI) is dedicated to promoting safe, healthy and sustainable communities through education, research and design. The College is a unique configuration of professional programs addressing social justice, design, public policy and planning in and for communities. The College strives to develop solutions through the integration and synergy of diverse disciplines. In doing so, the College prepares future leaders, scholars, and innovators to advocate for solutions through action.

As engaged faculty, we contribute to the achievement of the CDSI mission through excellence in teaching, meaningful research, significant creative work, and useful service to our communities. The CDSI is devoted to scholarly excellence and creative activities that serve the public good, and values the contributions of faculty as an essential component of our College's mission.

CDSI SPE Guiding Principles

Sustained performance evaluation (SPE) is a shared collegial process, as is Tenure/Promotion, of accomplishment, evaluation, and recognition. Tenure guarantees annual reappointment for the academic year until a faculty member voluntary resigns, retires, removed for just cause, or layoff. Sustained Performance Evaluation provides an opportunity to encourage faculty, provide faculty with mentoring and support in professional development where appropriate, and to recognize faculty for their ongoing and progressive accomplishments.

To these ends, the faculty of the CDSI, in compliance with the requirements of the Florida Board of Governors, the Florida Atlantic University Board of Trustees (BOT), and the Provost's memo on SPE (dated October 3, 2016), endorse the following guidelines for Sustained Performance Evaluations. If there is any discrepancy between these guidelines and The Florida Atlantic University Board of Trustees and United Faculty of Florida Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) takes precedence. Although the CBA applies only to "in-unit" faculty, Sustained Performance Evaluation policies and procedures are consistent for all faculty.

General Information

The College for Design and Social Inquiry has approved a Sustained Performance Evaluation policy to become effective at the beginning of the 2018-2019 academic year. The SPE requires that tenured faculty members receive a sustained performance evaluation once every seven

years following the award of tenure or their most recent promotion. The purpose of this evaluation is to document sustained performance as a tenured faculty member during the previous six years of assigned duties and to encourage continued professional growth and development.

The CDSI will operate within the general guidelines specified by the Provost memo (dated October 3, 2016), as detailed below, with only minor variations to account for the complexity of our various schools and to provide relief in situations where a faculty member can request an administrative review of the findings by the School's SPE Committee to the Dean.

SPE Responsibility

In order to account for the diversity of School's in the CDSI, the CDSI faculty agreed on December 2, 2016 to the following:

- Each School in the College for Design and Social Inquiry will develop and maintain the criteria used for Sustained Performance Evaluation.
- Each School will conduct the SPE for faculty. Each evaluation will occur seven years after the faculty member's first SPE, or when they have served seven years after being tenured or promoted
- The College-wide policy will include a process for review and appeal for faculty receiving an unfavorable evaluation.
- It is based on these items that this college wide policy is constructed.

SPE Review Schedule

Effective AY 2018-2019 and forward, the Sustained Performance Evaluations will be conducted annually for all eligible faculty in the college. Each eligible faculty member shall be notified of the scheduled review date by their School Director by the end of the spring semester prior to the SPE review year.

To avoid an overwhelming number of evaluations in a single year, the SPE policy will be phased in over seven-years. The first evaluation of each faculty member who received promotion to Associate Professor or Professor prior to August 2011 will occur in the year determined by the last digit of his or her Z-number, as follows:

- 0 or 5: AY 2018-19
- 1 or 6: AY 2019-20
- 2 or 7: AY 2020-21
- 3 or 8: AY 2021-22
- 4 or 9: AY 2022-23

The first evaluation for tenured faculty members who were promoted to Associate Professor or Professor after August 2011 will occur seven years after their most recent promotions.

After the initial evaluation "phase-in" period, all faculty members will be scheduled for review every seven years after their first review, or when they have served seven years after being tenured or promoted.

Exceptions to the SPE

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 or her discretion, add one extra year to the faculty member's SPE cycle.
- Faculty members on phased retirement, in DROP, or whose retirement date the University has accepted 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.
- Time a faculty member spends serving as a Department Chair, School Director, Dean, Associate Dean, or in any other full-time administrative position subject to regular administrative review may not count toward the SPE cycle. The faculty member may choose, upon returning to a non-administrative faculty position on a full-time basis, whether his or her seven-year cycle either restarts or resumes.
- Time a faculty member spends on medical or family leave may be included or excluded in the SPE cycle at the request of the faculty member.
- The SPE may be postponed for one year for faculty who will be on leave (including sabbatical) during the year when it is scheduled to occur.

SPE Evaluation File

The CDSI SPE, consistent with the University's requirements, will be conducted based on a file containing a brief summary of the faculty member's activities during the entire seven-year period under review. The file should contain, at minimum:

1. a current curriculum vita that clearly highlights accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service during the period under review,
2. copies of the faculty member's last seven annual assignments and annual evaluations,

3. a copy of the report of the previous SPE, if available,
4. a copy of the published performance expectations from the faculty member's School, and
5. a brief (2 page) narrative from the faculty member.

Although these documents are required by the University, each School in CDSI may establish guidelines requiring additional items to be included in its faculty members' SPE files.

The contents of each SPE file, including the SPE Committee Report, including the SPE recommendation, are to be kept confidential throughout the evaluation process.

School Responsibility

Each School in the CDSI is required to develop and maintain their SPE policy. Periodically each School may review and revise the SPE process consistent with the CDSI and University policies.

Each School's SPE policy is provided in Appendix A of this document.

Conduct of the SPE

Each School's SPE Committee will prepare a brief report, to be added to the SPE file, summarizing its recommended assessment of each faculty member's performance during the evaluation period that is consistent with each School's SPE policy. The School's SPE Committee report will indicate whether the faculty member's performance Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, or Fails to Meet Expectations, and cite specific reasons and evidence to support their conclusion.

Any faculty member whose performance Exceeds Expectations in the judgment of the School's SPE Committee, with concurrence from the Dean, shall receive a 3% performance increase to his or her base salary.

Any faculty member whose performance Meets Expectations in the judgment of the School's SPE Committee, with concurrence from the Dean, shall receive a 1.5% performance increase to his or her base salary.

Any faculty member whose sustained performance Fails to Meet Expectations shall work in concert with the School Director and the Dean (or the Dean's designee) to draft a Sustained Performance Improvement Plan (SPIP) setting specific annual milestones that the faculty member will be responsible to meet over a period of no less than three and no more than five

years. The Dean must approve the draft sustained performance improvement plan (SPIP) before it becomes final. The faculty member has the right to appeal the contents of a SPIP that has been approved by the Dean to the University Provost. The Provost will meet with the faculty member, the School Director, and the Dean to finalize the SPIP.

The performance targets laid out in an SPIP will be implemented through a series of annual Performance Improvement Plans. For in-unit faculty, the relevant section [currently 10.3(c)(4)] of the Collective Bargaining Agreement will govern these annual Performance Improvement Plans. Satisfactory performance in meeting SPIP targets should result in positive Annual Evaluations during this period, but the faculty member will continue to receive annual Performance Improvement Plans until all targets of the SPIP have been met or until the three- to five-year term of the SPIP ends.

At the end of the SPIP, or when all of its specific targets have been accomplished, the faculty member will prepare a written summary of how and when those targets were achieved. The Dean, in consultation with the School Director, will decide whether the targets laid out in the Plan have

substantially been achieved, or whether some of those targets should become the basis for further Performance Improvement Plans in subsequent annual evaluation(s).

Reporting and Record Keeping

Once all Sustained Performance Evaluations are complete for each School, the School Director will forward all complete SPE files to the Dean's office by the second (2) week of November. The Dean's office will prepare a report to the University Provost listing all evaluations in the College that year, and the result of each. The University will store the SPE files in accordance with its general policies for evaluation files. In all cases, however, the Schools and the Dean's office should retain copies of all Performance Improvement Plans for consultation during the annual evaluation cycle.

Administrative Review and Appeal of Outcome

All faculty members in the CDSI have the right to request an administrative review by the CDSI Dean of their SPE findings, and prior to the Dean's final determination. If a faculty member requests an administrative review, the faculty member must, within five (5) business days after receiving the School's SPE report, request to meet with the Dean of the CDSI to review the SPE report. Prior to the meeting with the Dean, the faculty member must provide written documentation specifying how the School's SPE Report was incorrect.

After meeting with the faculty member, if the Dean concurs with the SPE Committee recommendation, the decision will be final. However, after meeting with the faculty member, the Dean disagrees with the SPE recommendation, the Dean shall meet with the SPE committee and School Director to discuss the case and attempt to reach a shared recommendation. If a shared recommendation cannot be reached, the Dean shall add a letter to the SPE file that is submitted to the Provost citing specific reasons for his/her recommendation and final decision.

Regardless of the outcome of the CDSI administrative review, the faculty member may also appeal the final decision to the University Provost. The faculty member will be allowed one week after receiving the Dean's written decision to prepare a written response to it. After reviewing the SPE file, the Provost (or his or her designee) will meet with the faculty member, the School Director, and the CDSI Dean to discuss the outcome of the SPE. The Provost will prepare a written decision, which is not subject to further appeal. The faculty member shall receive a copy of this written decision.

Each faculty member being reviewed under the guidelines established herein, will meet with the School Director and the CDSI Dean to discuss the final outcome of the SPE process. The discussion should center on the faculty member's future professional development, with the goal of enhancing meritorious work and/or improving performance in areas identified by the School's SPE Report. The faculty member shall receive copies (paper or electronic) of the School's SPE Report and the letter from the Dean regarding the outcome of the SPE at or before this meeting.

Appendix A
Individual Schools' SPE

FAU COLLEGE FOR DESIGN AND SOCIAL INQUIRY
Florida Atlantic University

SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION POLICY:

Florida Atlantic University School of Architecture

INTRODUCTION

Sustained Performance Evaluation in the Florida Atlantic University School of Architecture is designed to promote the mission and goals of the School of Architecture, the College for Design and Social Inquiry, and the University in relation to teaching, research, and service. Implementation of this policy provides accountability to FAU peers, administrators, and students, while also recognizing the principles of academic freedom and professional responsibility.

The SPE process will be carried out in accordance with the following terms of FAU Provost's SPE policy:

- Post-tenure faculty are evaluated every seven years by peers.
- Post-tenure faculty will submit the necessary documentation as described in the Provost's Directive.
- An SPE Committee will be formed annually within the School, consisting of tenured faculty.

Only tenured associate professors and professors are eligible to vote on SPE of associate professors. Only full professors are eligible to vote on SPE of full professors.

The SPE Committee will rate each professor as either:

1. Exceeding expectations,
2. Meeting expectations, or
3. Failing to meet expectations.

CRITERIA FOR SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE

The ratings of the SPE Committee will be based upon the prior six years of the faculty member's "Annual Evaluations," as well as "Alternative Indicators" of the faculty member's

teaching, research, and service as provided in the faculty member's SPE package.

Annual Evaluations

The SPE Committee will consider each faculty member's annual evaluations as follows:

a) Exceeding expectations:
Consistent annual ratings of a faculty member on annual evaluations as 'exceptional' (score 5) and 'outstanding' (score 4) (with occasional deviations) provides sufficient evidence for scoring that faculty member's performance as 'Exceeding Expectations' (i.e., average score of 3.5 and above on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period).

b) Meeting expectations:
Consistent annual ratings of 'good' (score 3) with occasional downward deviations is sufficient for assigning a value of 'Meets Expectations' on SPE (i.e., average score of 2.5 and above, but below 3.5 on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period).

c) Failing to meet expectations:
Three or more annual ratings of 'unsatisfactory' (score 2) or 'needs improvement' (score 1) may be used as a basis for evaluating a faculty member's SPE performance as 'Failing to Meet Expectations' (i.e., average score below 2.5 on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period).

A faculty member who was evaluated as exceeding or meeting expectations on annual evaluations during four or more of the previous six years shall not be rated below "meeting expectations" in the sustained performance evaluation and shall not be subject to a performance improvement plan.

Alternative Indicators of Sustained Performance

This section describes alternative indicators that faculty members may provide to demonstrate sustained post-tenure performance that meets or exceeds expectations. The examples provided below are meant to be illustrative of sustained performance, rather than an exhaustive list.

Because the School of Architecture values empowerment and creativity, tenured faculty may recognize contributions of their peers that go beyond what may be considered traditional methods of furthering the mission and goals of the School, College, and University. Faculty members may identify additional indicators of sustained performance in each of the

designated three areas—teaching, research, and service—as explained below.

Teaching:

Teaching performance includes effectiveness in presenting knowledge, information, and ideas by means or methods such as studio project, lecture, discussion, assignment, demonstration, practical experience, mentoring junior faculty in teaching, supervising students, directing independent studies, and consultation with students. Evaluation of teaching may include: consideration of effectiveness in imparting knowledge and skills; effectiveness in stimulating students critical thinking and/or creative abilities; the development or revision of curriculum and course structure;: contributions to the accreditation and reaffirmation processes of the National Architectural

Accreditating Board (including the self-study and ongoing program evaluation); and adherence to accepted standards of professional behavior in meeting responsibilities to students (including the American Institute of Architects Code of Ethics). The SPE Committee may take into account class notes, syllabi, student exams, assignments, online learning content, student feedback, and any other materials relevant to the faculty's teaching assignments. The teaching evaluation must take into account any relevant materials submitted by the faculty and may not be based solely on student evaluations when this additional information has been made available to the SPE Committee.

Research:

Research performance is marked by advancement of knowledge in the faculty's field of study to produce beneficial impacts for society. The School of Architecture values a broad range of research, including qualitative, quantitative, policy, basic, applied, action, and design research. Criteria for evaluating research may include, but are not limited to: receipt of peer-reviewed design awards, publishing peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly books, and chapters in scholarly books; editing scholarly books; participating in editorial boards and review processes for scholarly journals; presenting outcomes of research and other scholarly activities at regional, national, or international scientific or professional meetings; being recognized by peers for scholarship and professional contributions related to research; facilitating research knowledge transfer (to the public, professional architects, public policy makers, and other consumers of architecture); demonstrating progress in research activities such as collecting data, developing manuscripts, pursuing and administering funding for research and other scholarly activities; and mentoring junior faculty and/or students in research activities and collaborating in research with them. The SPE Committee may consider the quantity, quality, and impact of publications and other relevant materials presented by the faculty, and other evidence of contributions to the academic community, to the profession, and to society in general.

Service:

Faculty members may demonstrate service to the School, College, University, professional architectural community, and community at large. Examples of service within the School, College, and University include active participation in meetings, membership in or leadership of committees, performing administrative and supervisory functions, participation in governance, promotion of scholarly activities on campus, and *ad hoc* initiatives that contribute to the School, College, or University. Service to the profession includes service to professional architectural associations, advocacy for the profession, and other activities that contribute to the profession of architecture. Service to the community includes community-based education, participation in policy and legislative advocacy, engaging community partners in charitable or community- enhancing activities, and building bridges between the university and the community (e.g., knowledge transfer and application).

*****

The School of Architecture believes in building on the strengths of its faculty members, meaning that different faculty members may contribute to the School, College, and University in different ways. Although some tenured faculty members may contribute equally in the areas of teaching, research, and service, others may devote most of their time and energy to one or two particular areas (e.g., a faculty member who is assigned major administrative roles may not be able to contribute as much in the areas of research, teaching, and service). The Sustained Performance Evaluation process is designed to promote and acknowledge the strengths of faculty, while also providing a system of accountability.

FAU COLLEGE FOR DESIGN AND SOCIAL INQUIRY
Florida Atlantic University

SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION POLICY:

Florida Atlantic University, School of Criminology & Criminal Justice

INTRODUCTION

The School of Criminology & Criminal Justice (SCCJ) believes in building on the strengths of its faculty members, meaning that different faculty members may contribute to the School, College, and University in different ways. Although some tenured faculty members may contribute equally in the areas of teaching, research, and service, others may devote most of their time and energy to one or two particular areas (e.g., a faculty member who is assigned major administrative roles may not be able to contribute as much in the areas of research, teaching, and service). The Sustained Performance Evaluation (SPE) takes this into consideration and faculty may choose to have the SPE focus on all or a combination of the following: instruction, scholarship, and/or academic leadership (as well as other alternative indicators of professional development). The SPE process is designed to promote and acknowledge the diverse strengths of faculty, provide a system of accountability to FAU peers, administrators, and students, while also recognizing the principles of academic freedom.

SPE in the SCCJ at Florida Atlantic University (FAU) is designed to promote the mission and goals of the School, the College for Design and Social Inquiry (CDSI), and the University in relation to instruction, scholarship, service, or academic leadership. The SCCJ process will be carried out following what has been required by the FAU Provost's SPE policy:

- Post-tenure faculty are evaluated every seven years by peers.
- Post-tenure faculty will submit the following documentation (as described in the Provost's Directive).
    - 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 assessments, 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; and
    - A brief (2 page) narrative from the faculty member.
- An SPE Committee will be formed annually within the School, consisting of tenured

and tenure earning faculty who will vote on the SPE of all professors. The vote will be confidential.

According to the Provost's Directive, the SPE Committee will rate each professor as either:

1. Exceeding expectations,
2. Meeting expectations, or
3. Failing to meet expectations.

CRITERIA FOR SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE

The ratings of the SPE Committee will be based upon the prior six years of the faculty member's
(1) "Annual Evaluations" and/or **(2)** "Alternative Indicators" of the faculty member's collegiality, teaching, research, service, academic leadership, and/or community engagement, as provided in the faculty member's SPE package, and should also be used to increase a faculty member's SPE rating.

Annual Evaluations

Some tenured faculty members may contribute equally in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Others may devote most of their time and energy to one or two particular areas (e.g., a faculty member who is assigned major administrative roles may not be able to contribute as much in the areas of research, teaching, and service). The SPE Committee will therefore consider each faculty member's annual evaluations as follows:

Faculty can use either:

- All three Annual Evaluation Categories (Weighted or Unweighted) to come up with their average Annual Evaluation Rating for the last six years

OR

- Two of the Annual Evaluation Categories (Weighted or Unweighted) to come up with their average Annual Evaluation Rating for the last six years
    - Faculty going through the SPE process who elect to use only two Categories per year, must use the same two across all six years to calculate their average Annual Evaluation Rating.

OR

- Faculty going through the SPE process who elect to use only one Category per year, must use the same one across all six years to calculate their average Annual Evaluation Rating.2

Exceeds Expectations

a) For Faculty that wish to use all three Annual Evaluation Categories - Instruction, Scholarship, and Service - consistent annual ratings of a faculty member on annual evaluations as 'exceptional' (score 5) and 'outstanding' (score 4) (with occasional deviations) provides sufficient evidence for scoring that faculty member's performance as 'Exceeding Expectations' (i.e., **average score of 3.5** and above [either weighted or unweighted, whichever is higher] on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period).

OR

b) For Faculty that wish to use only two Annual Evaluation Categories, an average Instruction/Scholarship Rating (Instruction Rating + Scholarship Rating divided by two per year) over the last six years of 3.75 OR an average Scholarship/Service Rating (Scholarship Rating + Service Rating divided by two per year) over the last six years of 3.75 OR an average Service/Instruction Rating (Service Rating + Instruction Rating divided by two) average over the last six years of 3.75 provides sufficient evidence for scoring that faculty member's performance as 'Exceeding Expectations' (i.e., **average score of 3.75** and above [either weighted or unweighted, whichever is higher] on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period).

OR

c) For Faculty that wish to use only one Annual Evaluation Category of either Instruction Rating OR Scholarship Rating OR Service Rating average over the last six years of 4.00 provides sufficient evidence for scoring that faculty member's performance as 'Exceeding Expectations' (i.e., **average score of 4.00** and above [either weighted or unweighted, whichever is higher] on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period).

- Faculty who receive an SPE Rating at one of the aforementioned levels shall receive a 3.0% performance increase to his/her base salary.

Meets Expectations

a) For Faculty that wish to use <u>all three</u> Annual Evaluation Categories - Instruction, Scholarship, and Service - consistent annual ratings of a faculty member on annual evaluations as 'good' (score 3 = "Meritorious") with occasional downward deviations provides sufficient evidence for scoring that faculty member's performance as 'Meets Expectations' (i.e., **average score of 2.5 to 3.49** [either weighted or unweighted, whichever is higher] on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period).

OR

b) For Faculty that wish to use <u>only two</u> Annual Evaluation Categories, an average Instruction/Scholarship Rating (Instruction Rating + Scholarship Rating divided by two per year) over the last six years of 2.75 OR an average Scholarship/Service Rating (Scholarship Rating + Service Rating divided by two per year) over the last six years of 2.75 OR an average Service/Instruction Rating (Service Rating + Instruction Rating divided by two) average over the last six years of 2.75 provides sufficient evidence for scoring that faculty member's performance as 'Meets Expectations' (i.e., **average score of 2.75** [either weighted or unweighted, whichever is higher] and above on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period).

OR

c) For Faculty that wish to use <u>only one</u> Annual Evaluation Category of either Instruction Rating OR Scholarship Rating OR Service Rating average over the last six years of 3.00 provides sufficient evidence for scoring that faculty member's performance as 'Meets Expectations' (i.e., **average score of 3.00** [either weighted or unweighted, whichever is higher] and above on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period).

- Faculty who receive an SPE Rating at the aforementioned level will receive a 1.5% performance increase to his/her base salary (unless the SCCJ SPE Committee finds that "Alternative Indicators" justify raising the SPE rating to the "Exceeds Expectations" rating).

- The SPE Committee must consider **Alternative Indicators** of Sustained Performance to determine if a faculty that "Meet Expectations" should have their SPE rating raised to "Exceeds Expectations".
    - Faculty that have their SPE rating raised to "Meets Expectations" shall receive a 3.0% performance increase to his/her base salary.
    - Alternative Indicators can only be used to increase a faculty members SPE rating.

Fails to Meet Expectations

a) For Faculty that wish to use all three Annual Evaluation Categories - Instruction, Scholarship, and Service – three or more annual average ratings of 'unsatisfactory' (2) or 'needs improvement' (1) may be used as a basis for evaluating a faculty member's SPE performance as 'Failing to Meet Expectations' (i.e., **average score of 2.49 or lower** [either weighted or unweighted, whichever is higher] on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period).

OR

b) For Faculty that wish to use only two Annual Evaluation Categories, an average Instruction/Scholarship Rating (Instruction Rating + Scholarship Rating divided by two per year) over the last six years of 2.74 or lower OR an average Scholarship/Service Rating (Scholarship Rating + Service Rating divided by two per year) over the last six years of 2.74 or lower OR an average Service/Instruction Rating (Service Rating + Instruction Rating divided by two) average over the last six years of 2.74 or lower may be used as a basis for evaluating a faculty member's SPE performance as 'Failing to Meet Expectations' (i.e., **average score of 2.74 or lower** [either weighted or unweighted, whichever is higher] and above on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period).

OR

c) For Faculty that wish to use only one Annual Evaluation Category of either Instruction Rating OR Scholarship Rating OR Service Rating average over the last six years of 2.99 or lower may be used as a basis for evaluating a faculty member's SPE performance as 'Failing to Meet Expectations' (i.e., **average score**

of 2.99 or lower [either weighted or unweighted, whichever is higher] and above on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period).

- A faculty member who received satisfactory (or higher) annual evaluations during four or more of the previous six years shall not be rated below satisfactory in their SPE and shall not be subject to a performance improvement plan.
- The SPE Committee must consider **Alternative Indicators** of Sustained Performance to determine if a faculty that "Fails to Meet Expectations" should have their SPE rating raised to "Meets Expectations".
    - Faculty that have their SPE rating raised from "Fails to Meet Expectations" to "Meets Expectations" shall receive a 1.5% performance increase to his/her base salary.
    - Alternative Indicators can only be used to increase a faculty members SPE rating.

Alternative Indicators of Sustained Performance to Increase SPE Rating

This section describes alternative indicators that faculty members may provide to demonstrate sustained post-tenure performance that meets or exceeds expectations. The examples provided below are meant to be illustrative of sustained performance, rather than an exhaustive list.

Because the SCCJ values empowerment and creativity, tenure-earning faculty may recognize contributions of their peers that go beyond what may be considered traditional methods of furthering the mission and goals of the School, College, and University. Faculty members may identify additional indicators of sustained performance in each of the designated six areas— collegiality, instruction, scholarship, service, academic leadership, and community engagement—as explained below.

- Alternative Indicators can only be used to increase a faculty members SPE rating.

Collegiality:

The SCCJ believes that each faculty member's demonstration of Collegiality helps to

foster a working environment that enhances the ability of other faculty members to further develop and prosper in the areas of instruction, scholarship, and service. Lack of Collegiality might inhibit such progress. While concrete indicators of Collegiality may be difficult to come by, daily interaction with colleagues throughout the last six years should easily be able to justify whether the faculty member going through SPE has helped to add to a positive working environment.

Instruction:

Teaching performance includes effectiveness in presenting knowledge, information, and ideas by means or methods such as lecture, discussion, assignment, demonstration, practical experience, and supervising students (e.g. through Directed Independent Studies, Thesis Projects, scoring of comprehensive exams, etc.). Evaluation of teaching may include: consideration of effectiveness in imparting knowledge and skills; effectiveness in stimulating students' critical thinking (e.g.

Directed Independent Research) and/or creative abilities (e.g. Quality Matters certification of a course, Quality Enhancement Plans and/or OURI projects); the development or revision of curriculum and course structure; arranging and/or supervising internships; and/or contributions to program evaluation and/or development. The SPE Committee may take into account class notes, syllabi, student exams, assignments, online learning content, student feedback, publishing articles and/or books on instruction and any other materials relevant to the faculty's teaching assignments. The teaching evaluation must take into account any relevant materials submitted by the faculty and may not be based solely on student evaluations when this additional information has been made available to the SPE Committee.

Scholarship:

Research performance is marked by advancement of knowledge in the faculty's field of study to produce beneficial impacts for society. The SCCJ values diversity in research. Therefore, it values a broad range of research, including qualitative, quantitative, clinical, policy, basic, applied research and/or theory testing. Criteria for evaluating research may include, but not are not limited to: publishing peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly books, and chapters in scholarly books; editing scholarly books; participating in editorial boards and review processes for scholarly journals; presenting outcomes of research and other scholarly activities at regional, national, or international scientific or professional meetings; unpublished research that has an impact on the SCCJ, the college, the university, and/or society at large; documented

citations of one's work; being recognized by peers for scholarship and professional contributions related to research; facilitating research knowledge transfer; demonstrating progress in research activities such as collecting data, developing manuscripts, pursuing funding for research and other scholarly activities; and mentoring junior faculty and/or students in research activities and collaborating in research with them (e.g. DIR's, OURI projects, student/faculty publications).

Service:

The SCCJ believes that each faculty member's demonstration of service should continue in the last six years since being awarded Promotion and Tenure. Involvement in service may improve SPE ratings. Faculty members may demonstrate service to the School, College, University, professional social work community, community at large and/or society in general. Examples of service within the School, College, and University include active participation in meetings, membership in or chairing of committees, performing administrative and supervisory functions, participation in governance, promotion of scholarly activities on campus, supervising clubs and/or students, attending scholarly meetings and/or employment enhancement functions, and *ad hoc* initiatives that contribute to the School, College, or University. Service to the profession includes partnerships with criminal justice agencies, service to criminal justice associations, advocacy for the profession, and other activities that contribute to the criminal justice arena.

Service to the community includes community-based education, participation in criminal justice policy and legislative advocacy, engaging community partners in charitable or community- enhancing activities, and building bridges between the university and the community (e.g., knowledge transfer and application).

Academic Leadership:

The Provost's memo states in a bullet (notice "Academic Leadership): "Recognize and reward sustained excellence in scholarship, research, teaching, public service, or academic leadership." Although every faculty member may be considered an academic leader in their intellectual pursuits, for the purposes of SPE this area is marked by efforts in formal or informal leadership roles to advance the mission and goals of the School, College and/or University. Any evidence of achievements in academic leadership that surpass basic expectations of faculty members will be considered as an alternative

indicator for SPE.

Community Engagement:

In 2015, President Kelly established the Community Engagement Executive Leadership Team and the Community Engagement Task Force. A statement on the University's web page on community engagement states that "Florida Atlantic University embodies a culture of strategic and collaborative community engagement that results in mutual benefit to the institution and the diverse internal and external communities that it serves." Furthermore, according to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, community engagement can be defined as follows:

> Community engagement describes collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.

Faculty members may demonstrate community engagement in their involvement with other academic institutions, organizations, groups, practitioners, and industry representatives both locally and abroad. Faculty members will express how such involvement reflects the community engagement ethos of the University. Any evidence of community engagement will be considered as an alternative indicator for SPE.

FAU COLLEGE FOR DESIGN AND SOCIAL INQUIRY
Florida Atlantic University

SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION POLICY:

Florida Atlantic University, School of Public Administration

1. This policy document articulates for the School of Public Administration the Sustained Performance Evaluation Policy, as prescribed in the Provost's memo of October 3, 2016.

2. Teaching, Scholarship, and Service: The School of Public Administration expects tenured faculty eligible for Sustained Performance Review to maintain a level of productivity, quality, and professionalism consistent with the expectations of promotion to Professor. The College for Design and Social Inquiry Promotion and Tenure Criteria as revised April 2011 elaborates on the criteria for meeting these expectations. Assessment of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service for the Sustained Performance Evaluation (SPE) will be based upon:
   - a current curriculum vitae 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 this policy document,
   - a brief (2 page) narrative from the faculty member.

3. Additional considerations include:
   - that faculty members have varying responsibilities within their academic units, as reflected in their annual assignments,
   - that faculty can make essential contributions to the University's mission in various ways, that the nature of an individual's contributions may vary over time,
   - that innovative scholarly work may take time to bear fruit, and may sometimes fail,
   - that unusual or unpopular scholarship, teaching, and service are not by themselves sufficient cause for a negative evaluation, and
   - that faculty are evaluated annually on their annual assignment.

4. Neither unethical conduct nor malfeasance will be tolerated.

5. The SPE Committee shall be the members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee as constituted in SPA.

6. The SPA SPE Committee will vote by majority decision rule, by secret ballot with total yea and nay votes recorded and reported, to determine the following overall assessment:
   - exceeds expectations (distinction or excellence),
   - meets expectations (competence),
   - fails to meet expectations.

FAU COLLEGE FOR DESIGN AND SOCIAL INQUIRY
Florida Atlantic University

SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION POLICY:

Florida Atlantic University, Phyllis and Harvey Sandler School of Social Work

INTRODUCTION

Sustained Performance Evaluation in the Phyllis and Harvey Sandler School of Social Work at Florida Atlantic University is designed to promote the mission and goals of the School of Social Work, the College for Design and Social Inquiry, and the University in relation to teaching, research, and service. Implementation of this policy provides accountability to FAU peers, administrators, and students, while also recognizing the principles of academic freedom and professional social work responsibility.
The SPE process will be carried out in accordance with the following terms of FAU Provost's SPE policy:

- Post-tenure faculty are evaluated every seven years by peers.
- Post-tenure faculty will submit the necessary documentation as described in the Provost's Directive.
- An SPE Committee will be formed annually within the School, consisting of tenured faculty.

Only tenured associate professors and professors are eligible to vote on SPE of associate professors. Only full professors are eligible to vote on SPE of full professors.
The SPE Committee will rate each professor as either:

1. Exceeding expectations,
2. Meeting expectations, or
3. Failing to meet expectations.

CRITERIA FOR SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE

The ratings of the SPE Committee will be based upon the prior six years of the faculty member's "Annual Evaluations," as well as "Alternative Indicators" of the faculty member's teaching, research, and service as provided in the faculty member's SPE package.

Annual Evaluations

The SPE Committee will consider each faculty member's annual evaluations as follows:

a) Consistent annual ratings of a faculty member on annual evaluations as 'exceptional' (score 5) and 'outstanding' (score 4) (with occasional deviations) provides sufficient evidence for scoring that faculty member's performance as 'Exceeding Expectations' (i.e., average score of 3.5 and above on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period).

b) Consistent annual ratings of 'good' (score 3) with occasional downward deviations is sufficient for assigning a value of 'Meets Expectations' on SPE (i.e., average score of 2.5 and above, but below 3.5 on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period).

c) Three or more annual ratings of 'unsatisfactory' (2) or 'needs improvement' (1) may be used as a basis for evaluating a faculty member's SPE performance as 'Failing to Meet Expectations' (i.e., average score below 2.5 on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period).

d) A faculty member who received satisfactory (or higher) annual evaluations during four or more of the previous six years shall not be rated below satisfactory in the sustained performance evaluation and shall not be subject to a performance improvement plan.

Alternative Indicators of Sustained Performance

This section describes alternative indicators that faculty members may provide to demonstrate sustained post-tenure performance that meets or exceeds expectations. The examples provided below are meant to be illustrative of sustained performance, rather than an exhaustive list. Because the School of Social Work values empowerment and creativity, tenured faculty may recognize contributions of their peers that go beyond what may be considered traditional methods of furthering the mission and goals of the School, College, and University. Faculty members may identify additional indicators of sustained performance in each of the designated three areas—teaching, research, and service—as explained below.

Teaching:

Teaching performance includes effectiveness in presenting knowledge, information, and ideas by means or methods such as lecture, discussion, assignment, demonstration, practical experience, mentoring junior faculty in teaching, supervising students in field education, and direct consultation with students. Evaluation of teaching may include: consideration of effectiveness in imparting knowledge and skills; effectiveness in

stimulating students critical thinking and/or creative abilities; the development or revision of curriculum and course structure; training and working with field educators: contributions to the accreditation and reaffirmation processes of the Council on Social Work Education (including the self-study and ongoing program evaluation); and adherence to accepted standards of professional behavior in meeting responsibilities to students (including the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics). The SPE Committee may take into account class notes, syllabi, student exams, assignments, online learning content, student feedback, and any other materials relevant to the faculty's teaching assignments. The teaching evaluation must take into account any relevant materials submitted by the faculty and may not be based solely on student evaluations when this additional information has been made available to the SPE Committee.

Research:

Research performance is marked by advancement of knowledge in the faculty's field of study to produce beneficial impacts for society. The School of Social Work values a broad range of research, including qualitative, quantitative, clinical, policy, basic, and applied research. Criteria for evaluating research may include, but not are not limited to: publishing peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly books, and chapters in scholarly books; editing scholarly books; participating in editorial boards and review processes for scholarly journals; presenting outcomes of research and other scholarly activities at regional, national, or international scientific or professional meetings; being recognized by peers for scholarship and professional contributions related to research; facilitating research knowledge transfer (to social workers, public policy makers, program developers, and other consumers of social work research); demonstrating progress in research activities such as collecting data, developing manuscripts, pursuing funding for research and other scholarly activities; and mentoring junior faculty and/or students in research activities and collaborating in research with them. The SPE Committee may consider the quantity, quality, and impact of publications and other relevant materials presented by the faculty, and other evidence of contributions to the scientific community, to the profession of social work, and to society in general.

Service:

Faculty members may demonstrate service to the School, College, University, professional social work community, and community at large. Examples of service within the School, College, and University include active participation in meetings, membership in or leadership of committees, performing administrative and supervisory functions, participation in governance, promotion of scholarly activities on campus, and *ad hoc* initiatives that contribute to the School, College, or University. Service to the profession includes partnerships with social work agencies and professionals, service to professional

social work associations, advocacy for the profession, and other activities that contribute to the profession of social work. Service to the community includes community-based education, participation in social policy and legislative advocacy, engaging community partners in charitable or community-enhancing activities, and building bridges between the university and the community (e.g., knowledge transfer and application).

*****

The Phyllis and Harvey Sandler School of Social Work believes in building on the strengths of its faculty members, meaning that different faculty members may contribute to the School, College, and University in different manners. Although some tenured faculty members may contribute equally in the areas of teaching, research, and service, others may devote most of their time and energy to one or two particular areas (e.g., a faculty member who is assigned major administrative roles may not be able to contribute as much in the areas of research, teaching, and service). The Sustained Performance Evaluation process is designed to promote and acknowledge the strengths of faculty, while also providing a system of accountability.

FAU COLLEGE FOR DESIGN AND SOCIAL INQUIRY
Florida Atlantic University

SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION POLICY:

Florida Atlantic University, School of Urban and Regional Planning

INTRODUCTION

Sustained Performance Evaluation in the Florida Atlantic University School of Urban and Regional Planning promotes the mission and goals of the School of Urban and Regional Planning, the College for Design and Social Inquiry, and the University in relation to teaching, research, and service. Implementation of this policy provides accountability to FAU peers, administrators, and students, while also recognizing the principles of academic freedom and professional urban and regional planning practices.
The SPE process will be carried out in accordance with the following terms of FAU Provost's SPE policy:

- Post-tenure faculty are evaluated every seven years by peers.
- Post-tenure faculty will submit the necessary documentation as described in the Provost's Directive.
- An SPE Committee will be formed annually within the School, consisting of tenured faculty.

Only tenured associate professors and full professors are eligible to vote on SPE of associate professors. Only full professors are eligible to vote on SPE of full professors.
The SPE Committee will rate each professor as either:

- Exceeding expectations,
- Meeting expectations, or
- Failing to meet expectations.

CRITERIA FOR SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE

The ratings of the SPE Committee will be based upon the prior six years of the faculty member's "Annual Evaluations," as well as "Alternative Indicators" of the faculty member's teaching, research, and service as provided in the faculty member's SPE package.

Annual Evaluations

The SPE Committee will consider each faculty member's annual evaluations as follows:

a) Consistent annual ratings of a faculty member on annual evaluations as 'exceptional' (score 5) and 'outstanding' (score 4) (with occasional deviations) provides sufficient evidence for scoring that faculty member's performance as 'Exceeding Expectations' (i.e., average score of 3.5 and above on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period).
b) Consistent annual ratings of 'good' (score 3) with occasional downward deviations is sufficient for assigning a value of 'Meets Expectations' on SPE (i.e., average score of 2.5 and above, but below 3.5 on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period).
c) Three or more annual ratings of 'unsatisfactory' (2) or 'needs improvement' (1) may be used as a basis for evaluating a faculty member's SPE performance as 'Failing to Meet Expectations' (i.e., average score below 2.5 on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period).
d) A faculty member who received satisfactory (or higher) annual evaluations during four or more of the previous six years shall not be rated below satisfactory in the sustained performance evaluation and shall not be subject to a performance improvement plan.

Alternative Indicators of Sustained Performance

This section describes alternative indicators that faculty members may provide to demonstrate sustained post-tenure performance that meets or exceeds expectations. The examples provided below are meant to be illustrative of sustained performance, rather than an exhaustive list. Because the School of Urban and Regional Planning values empowerment and creativity, tenured faculty may recognize contributions of their peers that go beyond what may be considered traditional methods of furthering the mission and goals of the School, College, and University. Faculty members may identify additional indicators of sustained performance in each of the designated three areas—teaching, research, and service—as explained below.

Teaching:

Teaching performance includes effectiveness in presenting knowledge, information, and ideas by means or methods such as lecture, discussion, assignment, demonstration, practical experience, mentoring junior faculty in teaching, and direct consultation with students. Evaluation of teaching may include: consideration of effectiveness in imparting knowledge and skills; effectiveness in stimulating students' critical thinking and/or creative abilities; the development or revision of curriculum and course structure; training and working with the public or private sector; contributions to the accreditation and reaffirmation processes of

the Planning Accreditation Board (including the self-study and ongoing program evaluation); and adherence to accepted standards of professional behavior in meeting responsibilities to students and the field of planning (including the American Institute of Certified Planners Code of Ethics irrespective of certification). The SPE Committee may take into account class notes, syllabi, student exams, assignments, online learning content, student feedback, and any other materials relevant to the faculty's teaching assignments. The teaching evaluation must take into account any relevant materials submitted by the faculty and may not be based solely on student evaluations when this additional information has been made available to the SPE Committee.

Research:

Research performance is marked by advancement of knowledge in the faculty's field of study to produce beneficial impacts for society. The School of Urban and Regional Planning values a broad range of research, including qualitative, quantitative, policy, basic, and applied research. Criteria for evaluating research may include, but not are not limited to: publishing peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly books, and chapters in scholarly books; editing scholarly books; participating in editorial boards and review processes for scholarly journals; presenting outcomes of research and other scholarly activities at regional, national, or international scientific or professional meetings; being recognized by peers for scholarship and professional contributions related to research; facilitating research knowledge transfer (to urban and regional governing bodies and related entities, public policy makers, program developers, and other consumers of urban and regional planning research); demonstrating progress in research activities such as collecting data, developing manuscripts, pursuing funding for research and other scholarly activities; and mentoring junior faculty and/or students in research activities and collaborating on research with them. The SPE Committee may consider the quantity, quality, and impact of publications and other relevant materials presented by the faculty, and other evidence of contributions to the scientific community, to the profession of urban and regional planning, and to society in general.

Service:

Faculty members may demonstrate service to the School, College, University, professional planning community, and community at large. Examples of service within the School, College, and University include active participation in meetings, membership in or leadership of committees, performing administrative and supervisory functions, participation in governance, promotion of scholarly activities on campus, and *ad hoc* initiatives that contribute to the School, College, or University. Service to the profession includes partnerships with governmental and related agencies and professionals, service to professional planning and related associations, advocacy for the profession, and other

activities that contribute to the profession of planning. Service to the community includes community-based education, participation in planning policy and legislative advocacy, engaging community partners in charitable or community-enhancing activities, and building bridges between the university and the community (e.g., knowledge transfer and application).

*****

The School of Urban and Regional Planning believes in building on the strengths of its faculty members, meaning that different faculty members may contribute to the School, College, and University in different manners. Although some tenured faculty members may contribute equally in the areas of teaching, research, and service, others may devote most of their time and energy to one or two particular areas (e.g., a faculty member who is assigned major administrative roles may not be able to contribute as much in the areas of research and teaching). The Sustained Performance Evaluation process is designed to promote and acknowledge the individual strengths of faculty, while also providing a system of accountability.