

ENGLISH ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA

Adopted on April 5, 2001
Revised and Submitted in Fall 2010 and Spring 2011
Approved by the Provost on March 4, 2011
Revised and Submitted to the Dean Spring 2016
Rejected and Returned to the Department Fall 2016
Revised and Approved by Department February 21, 2017

Faculty members in the Department of English are evaluated in three general areas:

- Instruction
- Research/creative/professional activities
- Service

Procedures

The Annual Review of faculty members is conducted by a committee made up of the Chair and at least four tenured members of the English Department faculty, who serve three-year terms. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will consider the quality of accomplishment in the three categories as well as other meritorious activity that (given the wide range of faculty activities in English) may not all be specified in these criteria.

The ratings are as follows:

- Exceptional
- Outstanding
- Good
- Needs Improvement
- Unsatisfactory

1. All full-time faculty members submit a completed Annual Evaluation form to the Chair. This shall include supporting materials to substantiate accomplishments in the areas of the faculty member's annual assignment.

2. The Faculty Evaluation Committee reviews the materials submitted and meets with the Chair to discuss and evaluate each faculty member in the terms defined by the faculty member's assignment as well as the Department's criteria.

3. With the advice of the Faculty Evaluation Committee and in accordance with the Department criteria and the faculty member's assignment, the Chair determines the annual evaluation rating of each faculty member. The Chair provides written notification to the faculty member and forwards the results to the Dean of the College.

Criteria

Instruction: University-level instruction encompasses a complex and multivalent set of pedagogical activities, all of them geared towards providing students with the most rigorous possible education. Faculty members develop curricula, create new courses and revise existing courses, and generally work towards keeping their teaching effective and current within the discipline. Faculty members teach WAC courses and service learning courses, they teach in the major and at the graduate level, and they serve as committee members on graduate theses, dissertations, and comprehensive exams. The instructional process goes beyond the classroom and includes directing students in independent studies, promoting and supervising undergraduate and/or graduate research, supervising graduate teaching assistants, and shepherding students from the major into graduate programs and career positions.

To arrive at the rating they recommend for instruction, the Committee will consider evidence of teaching effectiveness and currency. They will review syllabi, documentation of the development of new courses and/or revision of existing courses, and awards or other special recognition received for teaching during the academic year under review. The Committee also considers the numerical scores on the SPOT forms. Faculty members may also choose to include a peer-review by a tenured Department colleague who has observed their teaching.

All graduate faculty are expected also to advise graduate student theses and/or to supervise graduate comprehensive exams. Completed theses or exams chaired by the faculty member will receive most weight, followed by committee work on completed theses or exams, chairing of theses or exams actively in-progress, and committee work on theses or exams actively in-progress (i.e., the faculty member has offered feedback on drafts during the period under review.)

When considering the SPOT scores, the Committee will take the index item, currently #6. If warranted, the Committee may also request a complete set of student responses to individual courses; a selection will not ordinarily be considered. The SPOT scores constitute only part of the holistic evaluation of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness. They will, however, be a factor in the Committee's final recommendation for teaching effectiveness. If special circumstances have affected the faculty member's teaching during the terms under evaluation, these may be briefly described in a statement included among the supplementary materials. In evaluating teaching, the English Department recognizes that there are many effective teaching methods and styles. In arriving at individual recommendations about teaching, the Committee will weigh all elements of the faculty member's teaching materials. No single element will be decisive, but no element can be waived or ignored.

Note: The SPOT scores and thesis or exam advisement for first-year Assistant Professors will be viewed by the Committee with some latitude, as the Department recognizes the challenges of this transitional year. The Chair and the Committee will also exercise discretion in evaluating faculty members with unusual annual assignments and faculty members whose instructional activities focus intensely in one or two areas.

Instructional Activities

- thesis, dissertation, and/or comprehensive exam supervision
- internal and/or external grant on pedagogical development
- teaching WAC courses
- new course development
- revision of existing courses
- Directed Independent Studies
- promotion and supervision of graduate research
- supervising GTAs

- mentoring students (advising, taking students to conferences and readings, participating in students' events, writing recommendation letters, etc.)
- teaching research intensive (RI) undergraduate courses, courses supported by the OURI curriculum grants program, or otherwise offering supervised research experiences
- community engagement through experiential-learning courses such as academic service learning, field experience, co-ops, internships, co-curricula, and independent study
- others

Exceptional: To earn this rating, a faculty member is expected to have engaged in **three** activities listed above and to have earned SPOT scores at or better than 2.0 in the majority of classes taught. When a faculty member has served on four or more thesis, dissertation, or comprehensive exam committees, the requirement is two activities. The Committee will make allowances for especially challenging classes, including WAC courses, new courses, and other required courses. In weighing the SPOT scores, the Committee will take into consideration the special difficulties of courses taught for the first time, WAC courses, and required courses at all levels.

Outstanding: To earn this rating, a faculty member is expected to have engaged in **two** activities listed above and to have earned SPOT scores at or better than 2.5 in the majority of classes taught. When a faculty member has served on three thesis, dissertation, or comprehensive exam committees, the requirement is one activity.

Good: To achieve this rating, a faculty member is expected to have engaged in **one** activity listed above, and to have earned SPOT scores at or better than 3.0 in the majority of classes taught.

Needs Improvement: This rating indicates that a faculty member does not meet the criteria of "Good." The designation of "Needs Improvement" serves as an indication to the faculty member that future progress in this category is expected.

Unsatisfactory: To merit the rating of "Unsatisfactory," the faculty member must demonstrate performance that egregiously fails to meet departmental expectations. Failure to improve in the year after receiving a "Needs Improvement" rating will result in a rating of "Unsatisfactory." This designation serves as a warning to the faculty member that significant improvement is urgently required.

The expectations for SPOT scores given above are guidelines, subject to exception on the basis of unusual teaching assignments, extraordinary circumstances, or other atypical conditions.

Research, Creative, and Professional Activity: Typically, faculty members engage in multiple research and creative projects. Some are long-term, some are near-completion, and some are newly undertaken. The Committee and Chair will be holistic in evaluating a faculty member's creative activities and research. The following categories of publication will be considered, in this order of importance:

- refereed books
- refereed articles, chapters, and creative publications
- non-refereed books, articles, chapters, and creative publications

- encyclopedia articles, reviews, interviews
- conference papers and other professional activities

The Department recognizes that excellence in research and creative writing is documented by a pattern of sustained and significant publication over time. We affirm, too, that research/creative excellence is demonstrated when faculty members receive professional recognition such as grants and awards, or when their expert opinions are sought by other scholars or creative writers in their field(s) beyond the FAU campus. All faculty accomplishments tending to increase the Department's and University's reputation for scholarly and creative excellence are valid elements in an Annual Evaluation Report. Citation of faculty scholarship by other scholars and/or reprinting of previously published work are further examples of Research/ Creative effectiveness that will be considered by the Committee.

The ratings associated with individual projects are given below, but multiple activities that suggest broad professional engagement and recognition will tend to raise the rating. According to the guidelines below, for example, a faculty member absorbed in a long-term project, with no publication in a given year and one conference within the last year who has received an NEH Summer Stipend in recognition of the promise of the scholarly project would raise the rating to at least "Above Satisfactory." The award in a very competitive and stringently refereed national program would in its own way affirm the faculty member's current research project as highly significant.

Attention to multiple factors is part of the English Department's holistic approach to evaluation; but this does not mean (for instance) that three conference presentations in a single year, particularly in cases where variations on the same paper are presented, will increase a research/creative rating threefold, or even by one step. Excellence in research and creative activities is to be judged in terms of the quality and significance of publications and other research/creative activities, not in quantity per se.

Note: In all cases, co-written publications will be evaluated in terms of the extent of the faculty member's contribution, which should be clearly described in the Annual Report.

Exceptional: This rating acknowledges a refereed publication within the last year (article or short work) or two years (book), or an invited book publication within the last year. A refereed publication or invited book publication within the last year should be accompanied by some other indication (aside from work in progress) of continuing scholarly or creative activity: an item in press or accepted for publication, a book review or encyclopedia entry, a conference presentation, a digital humanities project, a residency or fellowship granted by an outside institution, or some other such endeavor. In determining what constitutes acceptable evidence of continuing scholarly or creative activity, the Chair and Faculty Evaluation Committee will be mindful that members of the English department do very different kinds of work in very different professional environments; the available outlets for academic and creative accomplishment will vary widely from one faculty member to another.

Within the last two years:

- a refereed book from a university press or from a trade press; for Creative Writing candidates, a refereed book published by a university press, trade press, or literary small press. (A book counts in the year of its acceptance and the year it is in print. If both activities happen in the same year, it counts again in the following year.)
- a refereed book published electronically by a recognized academic e-publisher

- a textbook or pedagogically oriented study that has received external reviews
- a scholarly edition that has received external reviews.

Within the last year:

- an edited collection that has received external reports, whether scholarly, pedagogical, or creative in focus.
- a scholarly article or chapter in a book that has received external reports
- a work of short fiction, a poem, a work of nonfiction, or a translation of any of these genres.
- refereed scholarship of shorter length that advances pedagogical theories and practices. Among these might be included a refereed article, website, video, or database.
- an invited book in the faculty member's field
- an invited chapter in a book

Outstanding: This acknowledges a refereed article accepted or a briefer editor-reviewed publication within the last year to be evaluated in terms of complexity as well as the quality of the journal in which reviews appear. As implied by the criteria given above for Exceptional ranking, an isolated refereed publication within the last year, without any other evidence of continuing scholarly or creative activity, would earn the rank of Outstanding.

- an entry for an encyclopedia, handbook, or reference work
- an editor-reviewed textbook
- a reprint of work previously published. Such re-publication attests to the continuing importance of the work

Good: This rating acknowledges evidence of conference presentations, works under review, works under contract but still in progress, and works in progress.

Needs Improvement: This rating indicates that a faculty member does not meet the criteria of "Good." The designation of "Needs Improvement" serves as an indication to the faculty member that future progress in this category is expected.

Unsatisfactory: This rating indicates that a faculty member has had no publication, conference presentation, or evidence of professional activity. The designation of "Unsatisfactory" serves as a warning to the faculty member that significant improvement is urgently required.

As mentioned above, in addition to publications, professional activities that document a faculty member's research/creative activities will be factors affecting the overall rating. Such factors include (but given the range of English faculty members' activities are not limited to) the following:

- an award for a research or creative publication
- applying for and/or receiving an internal or external grant
- serving as editor of a scholarly journal
- designing professional websites or databases
- inquiry, investigation, or creative discovery in partnership or collaboration with undergraduate or graduate students that results in a shared publication, presentation, juried exhibition, or performance
- community-engaged, collaborative research or creative activity with the goal of contributing to the discipline and strengthening the well-being of community stakeholders

Evidence of national or international professional recognition of research/creative activities that is well documented in the Annual Evaluation report will be considered in determining the faculty member's overall rating.

Service: The Department of English prioritizes junior faculty members' research and creative activities over service and thus evaluates them by criteria different from those applied to tenured faculty members. We expect all faculty members to serve diligently and participate actively in the Department's life. In documenting committee service, faculty members should briefly describe the work of each committee, the frequency of meetings, and the estimated hours needed to prepare. Faculty members should also report, and receive credit for, professional and community services outside the confines of the university.

University Service:

- chairing a committee or taskforce (University, College, or Department)
- serving on a committee or taskforce (University, College, or Department)
- serving as an officer in College FA or UFF
- mentoring a junior colleague
- advising student bodies, such as EGSS, *Coastlines*, Sigma Tau Delta, and directing the English Internship Program, etc.
- mentoring undergraduate students in research and inquiry through the department or a grants program; serving as judge or reviewer for undergraduate research journals, grant programs, symposia, etc.
- other services to the Department, College, and University

Professional service:

- organizing or chairing panels for professional conferences
- judging professional competitions
- serving as an officer in state, regional, and professional organizations
- serving on the editorial board of or as a referee for scholarly journals and presses
- writing external reviews of P&T cases
- community-engaged service that applies professional expertise in collaboration with the community in order to address a community-identified need and support the goals and mission of the university
- other professional services

CRITERIA FOR TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS:

Exceptional: To earn this rating, a faculty member is expected to have engaged in **four** activities listed above.

Outstanding: To earn this rating, a faculty member is expected to have engaged in **three** activities listed above.

Good: To earn this rating, a faculty member is expected to serve on **two** University, College, or Department committees.

Needs Improvement: This rating indicates that a faculty member does not meet the criteria of “Good.” The designation of “Needs Improvement” serves as an indication to the faculty member that future progress in this category is expected.

Unsatisfactory: To merit the rating of “Unsatisfactory,” the faculty member must demonstrate performance that egregiously fails to meet departmental expectations. Failure to improve in the year after receiving a “Needs Improvement” rating will result in a rating of “Unsatisfactory.” This designation serves as a warning to the faculty member that significant improvement is urgently required.

CRITERIA FOR TENURE-EARNING FACULTY:

Exceptional: To earn this rating, a faculty member is expected to serve productively in one committee and engage in two other activities listed above.

Outstanding: To earn this rating, a faculty member is expected to serve productively in one committee and engage in one other activity listed above.

Good: To earn this rating, a faculty member is expected to serve in one committee.

Needs Improvement: This rating indicates that a faculty member does not meet the criteria of “Good.” The designation of “Needs Improvement” serves as an indication to the faculty member that future progress in this category is expected.

Unsatisfactory: To merit the rating of “Unsatisfactory,” the faculty member must demonstrate performance that egregiously fails to meet departmental expectations. Failure to improve in the year after receiving a “Needs Improvement” rating will result in a rating of “Unsatisfactory.” This designation serves as a warning to the faculty member that significant improvement is urgently required.