Florida Atlantic University

Center for Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies

Sustained Performance Evaluation Criteria

TIMING
The timing of Sustained Performance Evalution (SPE) is determined by the Provost's memo on SPE as well as the contents of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Generally, it follows a seven year cycle.

PORTFOLIO
The SPE for faculty in Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (WGSS) will be conducted based on a brief portfolio containing a summary of the faculty member's activities during the entire seven-year period under review. The file should contain:

- 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 annual assignments and annual evaluations.
- A copy of the report of the previous SPE, if available.
- A copy of these SPE criteria.
- A brief (2 page) narrative from the faculty member.

WGSS will store these portofolios along with all SPE records and evaluation procedures/criteria; copies will be sent to the College. All contents of each SPE file are to be kept strictly confidential throughout the evaluation process. In all cases, any person with a plausible, perceived conflict of interest in evaluating a particular faculty member cannot serve on the SPE Committee in the year of that faculty member's SPE.

COMMITTEE
The SPE Committee will consist of all tenured members of the WGSS Executive Committee at or above the rank of the WGSS faculty member whose SPE is being considered. So, Associate Professors undergoing SPE may be evaluated by Associate and Full Professors. Full Professors may only be evaluated by Full Professors.

EVALUATION CRITERIA
The SPE process offers faculty members a chance to showcase extended work that may not be reflected in individual annual evaluations, as many kinds of work are only realized across multi-year arcs. Those faculty undergoing SPE may wish to highlight extended work in teaching, research, and service within their narrative.

Teaching
Meets Expectations for Sustained Performance

1. The faculty member must have a rating in the top two categores for ***teaching*** in six (6) of his/her last seven (7) annual evaluations.

2. The faculty member must have a demonstrated record of consistent and meaningful commitment to ***teaching*** excellence. *The following items are not intended to be a complete list but, rather, to serve as examples of the activities which may be taken into consideration in assessing continuous teaching excellence:*
    a) Evidence of strong commitment to student engagement (availability to students, mentoring, providing academic guidance, etc.).
    b) Classroom Peer Review of teaching by faculty chosen by Director in consultation with candidate.
    c) SPOT evaluations
    d) Committee membership/Chairing of Theses (Undergraduate and Graduate)
    e) Supervision of Internships
    f) Recognition of teaching (e.g. Departmental/College/University nominations or awards)
    g) Commitment to Undegraduate Research
    h) Curricular and program development
    i) Service learning and community engagement

Exceeds Expectations
In addition to the criteria for "meets expectations," the faculty member regularly exceeds the College mean for SPOT scores and has a demonstrated record of excellence across several of the above items that contribute to teaching excellence.

Fails to Meet Expectations
Does not meet the above criteria for "meets expectations," has SPOT scores significantly worse that the College mean, and has little demonstrated excellence in the indicated items that contribute to excellene in teaching.

Scholarship
Meets Expectations for Sustained Performance

1. Faculty member must have a rating of good or higher for ***research*** in six (6) of his/her last seven (7) annual evaluations.

2. Faculty member must have a demonstrated record of consistent and original contributions indicative of ***research/scholarly*** excellence. *The following items are not intended to be a complete list but, rather, to serve as examples of the activities which may be taken into consideration in assessing continuous research excellence:*
    a) Evidence of an active and productive research agenda:
        a. Publication of peer-reviewed works, in traditional or electronic form (e.g., monograph, articles, book reviews, encyclopedia entries, review essays, edited works, public history projects)
        b. Research grants, book proposals, Series/Journal editorial work
        c. Film or other significant and recognized creative activity
    b) Active participation in local/regional/national/international conferences/colloquia/symposia.

Exceeds Expectations
Faculty member has an active and productive research agenda, with a new peer reviewed scholarly book in press or in print **OR** has two of the following peer reviewed works in press or in print in the period under review: journal articles, book chapters, edited works, curated exhibits, films, and databases. They remain active in their field, presenting their research at local/regional/national/international conferences/colloquia/symposia on a consistent basis.

Fails to Meet Expectations
Faculty member has not published any peer reviewed works (monographs, journal articles, book reviews, etc.) in the period under review. They have not presented or taken part regularly in any local/regional/national/international conferences/colloquia/symposia.

Service
Meets Expectations for Sustained Performance

1. Faculty member must have a rating of good or higher for ***service*** in six (6) of his/her last seven (7) annual evaluations.

2. Faculty member must have a demonstrative record of consistent and meaningful commitment to ***service*** excellence. *The following items are not intended to be a complete list but, rather, to serve as examples of the activities which may be taken into consideration in accessing continuous service excellence:*
   a). Serving on departmental, College, and University Committees and Initiatives
   b). Leadership positions/memberships in professional associations
   c). Advising to on-campus student organizations.

Exceeds Expectations
They are active members of departmental/college/university committees/initiatives, discipline-based organizations, and have chaired at least one or more of these committees during the review period.

Fails to Meet Expectations
Their service load is minimal at the departmental/college/university level and have little if any activity with discipline-based organizations.