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A well-qualified and productive faculty is essential to the core teaching, scholarship, and service missions of Florida Atlantic University (FAU). Post Tenure Review (PTR) serves as a periodic review of tenured faculty and is designed to foster sustained excellence and professional development and recognize and reward outstanding achievement.

PTR is separate and distinct from annual and other employee evaluations in that PTR will focus on long-term accomplishments over a period of five years. Most importantly, the PTR process has been designed to uphold the University’s fundamental principles of tenure, academic freedom, due process, and confidentiality in personnel matters.

The office of the Dean of each College and the Office of the Provost shall maintain a schedule of PTR evaluations listing all tenured faculty members in the College. The Dean’s Office shall notify faculty members of their upcoming PTR no less than six months in advance of the due date for the evaluation file, starting in AY 2024-2025.

The PTR will be conducted based on a file containing a summary of the faculty member’s activities, and history of professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities to the University and its students during the entire five-year Review Period.

The PTR file should contain the following documents relevant to the five-year review period:

* a current curriculum vita that clearly highlights accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service
* copies of the faculty member’s last five annual assignments and annual evaluations including any attached written rebuttals by a faculty member under review
* a copy of the report of the previous SPE or PTR, if available
* a copy of the published criteria from the faculty member’s academic unit (see Articulation of Unit Expectations below)
* a brief (2 page, doubled-spaced, 11-point font) narrative from the faculty member.

During the five-year Review Period, the PTR shall also include consideration of the following:

* The faculty member’s history of performance of academic responsibilities to the University and its students, and professional conduct per University regulations and policies
* The faculty member’s non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors’ regulations, including approved accreditation standards, and University regulations and policies within the scope of their University employment
* Unapproved absences from teaching assigned courses.
* Substantiated student complaints
* Other relevant measures of faculty conduct as appropriate.

The review shall not consider or otherwise discriminate based on faculty members’ political or ideological viewpoints.

Eligible Faculty Members shall prepare and submit their completed PTR file, based on the aforementioned Criteria and reporting requirements of the five-year Review Period defined above, to the Chair by the date and via Interfolio or the method specified by the University.

The chair will convene a PTR Advisory Committee consisting of a minimum of three professors in the Eligible Faculty Member’s Unit who shall be elected by tenure earning colleagues in the department. For the review of associate professors, the Committee shall consist of at least three professors of at least associate rank in the Eligible Faculty Member’s Unit. For the review of full professors, the committee shall consist of three professors in the unit. Should there be less than an adequate number of professors in the unit at the required rank, the Chair and the Unit full professors will select professors within the college at the appropriate rank so that there are three professors at the appropriate rank or above serving on the committee.

The History Department PTR Advisory Committee will review each PTR file and prepare a report for each Eligible Faculty Member based on the Criteria and Report Requirements of the five-year Review Period defined above. The Chair’s PTR Advisory Committee’s report shall include a recommended Performance Rating. The PTR Advisory Committee will affix their reports to the PTR files and return them to the Chair. The PTR Advisory Committee’s report shall not be binding upon the Chair, the Dean, or the Provost.

In all cases, any person with a plausible, perceived conflict of interest in evaluating a particular faculty member cannot serve on the PTR Advisory Committee in the year of that faculty member’s PTR.

**History Department Criteria for PTR**

The Department of History is committed to excellence in teaching, production of original scholarship and creative work, and service to the department, college, university, academic profession and wider community. History faculty members publish scholarly books, articles, essays and book reviews; they present papers at national and international conferences and edit scholarly journals. They are teachers committed to increasing the knowledge and skills of their students, and they support the wider programs of the university by their commitment to service and governance. These criteria remain consistent across the department yet are met somewhat differently depending on a faculty member’s assignment and area of specialization. They engage in academic outreach that brings scholarly expertise to the public sphere through such activities as involvement in continuing education programs, participating in media interviews, and giving public lectures and presentations, writing for periodicals, blogs, or websites. Those with expertise in public history engage in public programming, curate exhibits or supervise student internships at museums and historical societies.

**Articulation of Departmental Criteria for Meeting Expectations**

The criteria to be used to evaluate a faculty member’s sustained performance will consist of a mixture of quantitative and qualitative factors. These criteria are tied to the five-year period of annual assignments and evaluations and will not extend beyond the scope of the relevant activities undertaken by the faculty member during that time.

The Departmental PTR Committee will determine the faculty member’s PTR rating with reference to the Research/Teaching/Service ratings as well as the Overall rating for each of the faculty member’s Annual Evaluations for the period of assessment.

If applicable, the PTR File should also include documentation regarding the faculty member’s substantiated non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors’ regulations, and University regulations and policies within the scope of their University employment

If needed, the unit head shall be responsible for adding documents related to faculty conduct to the PTR File and assessing the impact of these documents on their recommended PTR ranking.

As the criteria for “Meeting Expectations” is the standard by which “Exceeds,”“Does Not Meet,” and “Unsatisfactory” is based, it is articulated in full.

Faculty members will be deemed as having “Met Expectations” if

* They have received an Overall Rating of “Good” or higher on four out of five of their Annual Evaluations
* They have a record of appropriate faculty conduct in the period of assessment.

Meets Teaching Expectations

History faculty members are expected to challenge and inspire their students in the classroom, demonstrating pedagogical currency by regular revision of course syllabi and materials. Despite the limitations of the SPOT forms, the department acknowledges the validity of student input as one part of a holistic approach to the evaluation of teaching. Yet, faculty in the History Department also value other factors which also provide evidence of a faculty member’s commitment to excellence in teaching, evidence which the chair uses in determining performance for the annual evaluation of a faculty member.

In order to assess whether or not a tenured faculty member of the department of History has met teaching expectations during the relevant period covered by the PTR, the faculty member will be evaluated on the basis of the following expectations:

1. The faculty member must have a rating of “Good” or higher for teaching in four (4) of his/her last five (5) annual evaluations.
2. The faculty member must have a demonstrative 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:
3. Evidence of strong commitment to student engagement (availability to students,

mentoring, providing academic guidance, etc.).

1. Classroom Peer Review of teaching by faculty chosen by Chair in consultation with candidate.
2. SPOT evaluations
3. Committee membership/Chairing of Theses (Undergraduate and Graduate)
4. Supervision of internships
5. Recognition of teaching (e.g. Departmental/College/University nominations or awards)
6. Grant activity related to teaching.
7. Creation of new courses or significant revision of existing courses
8. Creation of online courses.
9. Creation of programs, workshops, or symposia related to teaching.
10. Publications of teaching materials, presentations related to teaching.
11. Contributions to the college’s interdisciplinary programs
12. Participation in pedagogy workshops or courses
13. Unsolicited commentaries of students, faculty and other pertinent information in the possession of the chair.

Meets Scholarship Expectations

In order to assess whether or not a tenured faculty member of the department of History has met researchexpectations during the relevant period covered by the PTR policy, the faculty member will be evaluated on the basis of the following expectations:

1. Faculty member must have a rating of “Good” or higher for research in four (4) of his/her last five (5) annual evaluations.
2. Faculty member must have a demonstrative 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:
3. Publication of peer-reviewed works, in traditional or electronic form (e.g., monograph, articles, book chapters, book reviews, encyclopedia entries, review essays, edited works
4. Grants, fellowships, book proposals
5. Series/Journal editorial work
6. Active participation in local/regional/national/international conferences/colloquia/symposia.
7. A book or article or book chapter manuscript in progress
8. Published digital histories.
9. Museum exhibits, films, and historic sites (such as exhibit design, educational program design)
10. Historic preservation, as for instance site survey reports, documenting and preserving sites.
11. Creation of bibliographies and databases for use by other scholars
12. Public humanities projects
13. Digital humanities projects

Meets Service Expectations

In order to assess whether or not a tenured faculty member of the department of History has met service expectations during the relevant period covered by the PTR, the faculty member will be evaluated on the basis of the following expectations:

1. Faculty member must have a rating of “Good” or higher for service in 4 of 5 years of 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 assessing 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.

d). Grant activity

**Exceeds Expectations**

A faculty member achieves a ranking of “Outstanding” or higher in two out of the three areas (i.e., Research, Teaching, Service), and achieves a ranking of “Good” or higher in the third area, on four out of five evaluations under consideration.

Faculty member has an active and productive research agenda, with a new peer reviewed scholarly book in press or in print in an academic or university press or a completed manuscript accepted for publication in an academic or university press; or has three of the following peer reviewed works in press or in print in the period under review: journal articles, book chapters, edited works, curated exhibits, and databases.

They remain active in their field, presenting their research at local/regional/national/international conferences/colloquia/symposia on a consistent basis.

Teaching both survey/required and specialization-focused courses, their teaching evaluations (SPOT, Peer Review) are consistently better than the college mean.

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.

They have a record of appropriate faculty conduct in the period of assessment, as outlined above.

**Does Not Meet Expectations**

A faculty member fails to achieve a ranking of “Good” or higher in at least one of the three areas (i.e., Research, Teaching, Service) on two out of five evaluations under consideration.

Faculty member has not met expectations in teachingin any of the following ways:

1. Received a rating in the bottom two categories for teaching in at least two (2) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
2. Failure to meet the requirements of either Meets or Exceeds Expectations and
3. Has had Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) for teaching during the period with some improvement, and there is documented evidence that the faculty member is putting effort toward meeting the PIP goals.

Faculty member has not met expectations in scholarshipin any of the following ways:

1. Received a rating in the bottom two categories for scholarship in at least two (2) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
2. Failure to meet the requirements of either Meets or Exceeds Expectations and
3. Has had Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) for teaching during the period with some improvement, and there is documented evidence that the faculty member is putting effort toward meeting the PIP goals.

Faculty member has not met expectations in service in any of the following ways:

1. Received a rating in the bottom two categories for service in at least two (2) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
2. Failure to meet the requirements of either Meets or Exceeds Expectations and
3. Has had Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) for service during the period with some improvement, and there is documented evidence that the faculty member is putting effort toward meeting the PIP goals.

They have a record of appropriate faculty conduct in the period of assessment, as outlined above.

Any faculty member whose sustained performance Does Not Meet Expectations shall work with the Unit Head to draft a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) setting specific milestones that the faculty member will be responsible to meet over a period of no more than 12 months to achieve documented requirements of the PIP. The Dean, in consultation with the Unit Head, must review and approve the PIP and forward a copy to the Provost.

The faculty member may appeal the contents of a PIP to the Provost. The appeal must be submitted within seven calendar days of receiving the approved PIP. The Provost shall make final decisions regarding the PIP requirements. At the end of the PIP, or when all of the PIP targets have been accomplished if before the PIP deadline(s), the faculty member will prepare a written summary of how and when those targets were achieved.

**Unsatisfactory**

A faculty member fails to achieve a ranking of “Good” or higher in at least one of the three areas (i.e., Research, Teaching, Service) on two out of five evaluations under consideration.

Faculty member has not met expectations in any of the following ways:

1. Performance consistently fails to meet the unit’s written criteria as stated in Annual Evaluation criteria and PTR criteria.
2. Performance reflects disregard or failure to follow prior professional improvement plans (PIPs) to improve teaching, scholarship, or service.
3. Documented incompetence or misconduct, as defined in applicable University regulations and policies, or applicable CBA provisions.

**Chair’s Review and Report**

The Chair shall review the following for each Eligible Faculty Member:

* The PTR file, including the Chair’s PTR Advisory Committee report and Performance Rating.
* Personnel file, records of accomplishments and awards, annual evaluations, and faculty responses as applicable during the entire five-year Review Period.
* Any findings of a completed and substantiated inquiry or investigation of noncompliance with applicable laws, BOG and University regulations, and University policies within the scope of their University employment during the entire five-year Review Period.
* Any records of substantiated unapproved absences during the five-year Review Period, and
* Any disciplinary action issued by the University during the entire five-year Review Period.

The Chair shall prepare a report for each Eligible Faculty Member based on the aforementioned Criteria and Report Requirements and affix the report to the PTR files. The Chair’s report shall include a recommended Performance Rating and shall not be binding upon the Dean or the Provost.

 The Chair shall provide the Eligible Faculty Member with access to the complete PTR file, including all reports, and notify the Eligible Faculty Member that they have five calendar days to submit a rebuttal to be included in the PTR file.

After the five-calendar day response period, the Chair shall forward the PTR files to the College Dean

**Appeals Process**

PTR outcomes may be appealed pursuant to University regulations and policies, and the CBA, if applicable. However, notwithstanding any University regulations and policies or applicable CBA, PTR outcomes may not be appealed beyond the level of the President, or President’s designee, and are not subject to arbitration. The filing of a grievance does not toll the action/decision of the University, including termination. Reporting and Record Keeping Once all PTRs are complete, the Dean’s office will prepare a report.