

**SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE  
EVALUATION POLICY:**

**School of Public Administration**

**Dorothy F. Schmidt College of Arts and Letters  
Florida Atlantic University**

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.

**I. Process**

The SPE process will be carried out in accordance with the following terms of the 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 memo.
- Faculty may rebut the SPE Committee's recommendation by attaching a letter to the Committee's memo within five business days of receipt of the recommendation memo. Rebuttal letters will be forwarded to the dean's office along with the SPE Committee's memo.
- Portfolios will be stored in the SPA office upon completion.
- Contents of the SPE portfolio are as follows:
  - 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 six annual assignments and annual self- and director's evaluations;
  - a copy of the report of the previous SPE, if available;
  - a copy of this policy document; and
  - a brief (two-page) narrative from the faculty member highlighting accomplishments in research, teaching, and service during the period under review.

The SPE Committee will consist of all tenured faculty. This means that the SPE Committee shall be the members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee as constituted in SPA. The SPE Committee will rate each professor as follows, as defined in the subsequent sections:

- i. exceeds expectations,
- ii. meets expectations, or
- iii. fails to meet expectations.

The SPA SPE Committee will vote by majority decision rule, by secret ballot with total Yes and No votes recorded and reported in the recommendation memo prepared by the Committee.

## II. Criteria

Assessment of research, teaching, and service for the SPE will be based upon annual evaluations and alternative indicators as follows:

1. The SPE Committee will consider each faculty member's annual evaluations as follows:
  - a. An average score of 3.5 and above on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation provides sufficient evidence for scoring that faculty member's performance as 'Exceeds Expectations'.
  - b. An average score of 2.5 and above, but below 3.5, on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period is sufficient for scoring that faculty member's performance as 'Meets Expectations'; however, the SPE Committee may score such a faculty member's performance as 'Exceeds Expectations' if warranted by its evaluation of the optional alternative indicators listed below.
  - c. An average score below 2.5 on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period may result in a score of 'Fails to Meet Expectations' depending on the SPE Committee's evaluation of the optional alternative indicators listed below. A faculty member who received satisfactory (or higher) annual evaluations during four or more of the previous seven years shall not be rated below satisfactory in the SPE and shall not be subject to a performance improvement plan.

### 2. Alternative indicators:

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. The SPE Committee 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—research, teaching, and service—as explained below.

#### a. 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 Public Administration values a broad range of research, including qualitative, quantitative, policy, basic, and applied research. Criteria for evaluating research may include, but 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 public policy makers, program developers, and other consumers of research in public administration;
- 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 public administration, and to society in general.

b. 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 sector;
- contributions to the accreditation and reaffirmation processes of the school's self-study and ongoing program evaluation; and
- adherence to accepted standards of professional behavior in meeting responsibilities to students and the profession including the ASPA 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.

c. Service:

Faculty members may demonstrate service to the School, College, University, professional 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 and related associations, advocacy for the profession, and other activities that contribute to the profession of public administration. Service to the community includes community-based education, civic participation, engaging community partners in charitable or community-enhancing activities, and building bridges between the university and the community (e.g., knowledge transfer and application).

3. Additional considerations include:

- a. faculty members have varying responsibilities within their academic units, as reflected in their annual assignments;
- b. faculty can make essential contributions to the University's mission in various ways, and that the nature of an individual's contributions may vary over time;
- c. innovative scholarly work may take time to bear fruit, and may sometimes fail;
- d. unusual or unpopular scholarship, teaching, and service are not by themselves sufficient cause for a negative evaluation;
- e. faculty are evaluated annually on their annual assignment; and
- f. neither unethical conduct nor malfeasance will be tolerated.