

**Sustained Performance Review Policy**  
**Department of Curriculum, Culture, and Educational Inquiry**  
**College of Education – Florida Atlantic University**  
**September 1, 2017**

The Department of Curriculum, Culture and Educational Inquiry recognizes Florida Atlantic University's (FAU) position that,

An excellent faculty is essential to the core teaching, scholarship, and service missions of Florida Atlantic University. The Sustained Performance Evaluation (SPE) is a periodic review of tenured faculty that is designed to foster sustained excellence and professional development, and to recognize and reward outstanding achievement.

Consistent with this perspective and FAU's corresponding sustained performance evaluation (SPE) policy, the Department of Curriculum, Culture and Educational Inquiry (CCEI) will evaluate tenured faculty every seven years. The timeline for faculty SPEs is identified within FAU policy (see section A: Evaluation Cycle). According to the university's SPE policy, the faculty member being evaluated is required to submit the following materials:

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

These materials will be submitted in a portfolio format to the CCEI Department Chair for furtherance to the Dean, and will be reviewed by tenured faculty in the Department of Curriculum, Culture and Educational Inquiry. As per the university's SPE policy, "The Committee (CCEI tenured faculty) 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. The committee's 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." [SPE] candidates need to meet expectations in all three categories (Teaching, Research and Service) in order to be deemed meeting expectations overall. Candidates need to exceed expectations in two of three categories in order to be deemed to exceed expectations overall. Candidates who do not meet expectations will be deemed to have failed to meet expectations.

The Committee will return all SPE files to the Chair, Director or Associate Dean by a date fixed by the College. [SPE] All records pertaining to the faculty member's SPE will be kept in the College of Education personnel file in the Dean's office.

According to FAU policy, the SPE at the academic unit level will be guided by the following considerations in research/scholarship, teaching, and service:

- a) that faculty members have varying responsibilities within their academic units, as reflected in their annual assignments;<sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>
- b) that faculty can make essential contributions to the University's mission in various ways;<sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>
- c) that the nature of an individual's contributions may vary over time;<sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>
- d) 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 <sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>
- e) that faculty are evaluated annually on their annual assignment.

### **Criteria/Evidence of Sustained Performance in Research/Scholarship, Teaching, and Service**

#### **Research/Scholarship**

To “meet expectations,” the faculty member will demonstrate a continuous pattern of research and/or scholarship during the period under review. For example a continuous pattern of research/scholarship would require 1) presenting at an average of one state, national or international conference, or its equivalent and 2) an average of one peer-reviewed work submitted or published per year or its equivalent, for a minimum of 4 published and/or funded projects within each seven year cycle, accompanied by a clear rationale for the significance of the work as a scholarship of engagement. Examples of evidence for consideration in this category includes:

- a) Author/co-author/editor/co-editor a book published by a nationally or internationally recognized publishing house; or average one internationally/nationally/refereed articles (or comparable work);
- b) Peer-reviewed book chapters;
- c) Invited book chapters;
- d) Refereed national/international conference presentations;
- e) Publishing with graduate students and junior colleagues;
- f) National or state grant applications/awards;
- g) Peer-reviewed foundation grant applications/awards;

Additional evidence for consideration in this category includes:

- h) Non peer-reviewed publications such as response essays, book reviews;
- i) Periodical submissions that make an academic contribution to the field;
- j) Adjudicated awards from the university, academic organizations, public institutions that recognize excellence in research and scholarship;
- k) Other materials deemed relevant by the faculty member.

“Exceeds expectations” would denote research and scholarly contributions that surpass the above criteria.

## Teaching

To “meet expectations” in the area of teaching, the faculty member will demonstrate a consistent pattern of quality teaching performance during the review period as represented by teaching evaluations that are at or better than the COE mean, or mentoring/ advising responsibilities as indicated below. To “exceed expectations” a faculty member will demonstrate a consistent pattern of teaching excellence as represented by awards for teaching, evidence of mentoring/feedback, or student awards as outcomes of advisement. Submitted evidence to support this area may include:

- a) Mentoring students and/or faculty (e.g., doctoral advising, mentoring students/faculty/instructors);
- b) Teaching honors and/or awards;
- c) A consistent pattern of positive evaluations (SPOTS) of teaching;
- d) Advising/mentoring - Advise undergraduate and master’s students or act as an advisor for doctoral students;
- e) Serve on Dissertation Committees;
- f) Chair Dissertation Committees;
- g) Supervise Directed Independent Studies;
- h) Mentor students for public exhibitions of scholarship;
- i) Evaluate Ph.D. qualifying exams;
- j) Other materials deemed relevant by the faculty member.

## Service

In the area of service a faculty member who “meets expectations” will fulfill service responsibilities commensurate with those of tenured faculty. Typically, this will include evidence of participation in departmental, college, university and community service activities. A faculty member who “exceeds expectations” will complete service responsibilities with a noted and consistent standard of excellence and leadership.

Evidence of service includes:

- a) Contributions at the state level and/or with public schools;
- b) Contributions to committees at the department, college, and/or university levels;
- c) Engagement with schools and educators at the local level;
- d) Leadership within the local community;
- e) Chairing committees at the department, college and university levels;
- f) Serve on community committees;
- g) Serve on State/National/International board/organizational group committee/board/organizational group;
- h) Serve as Editor for a state/national/international peer-reviewed journal;
- i) Serve on the editorial board or as a reviewer for a state/national/international peer-reviewed journal;
- j) Other materials deemed relevant by the faculty member.