**DRAFT**

**POST TENURE REVIEW POLICY**

**School of Public Administration**

**Dorothy F. Schmidt College of Arts and Letters**

**Florida Atlantic University**

Consistent with the University’s policy on Post Tenure Review (PTR), this policy document articulates how the School of Public Administration will conduct Post Tenure Review for eligible faculty.

# Process

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.

The School Director will, after consultation with tenured faculty, appoint a PTR Advisory Committee annually of at least three tenured faculty members in years that a tenured faculty member will be considered for PTR. For the review of associate professors, the PTR Advisory Committee shall consist of professors of at least associate rank in the school. For the review of full professors, the committee shall consist of all full professors in the school. Should there be less than three (3) professors in the school at the required rank, the School Director and the SPA tenured faculty 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 PTR Advisory Committee will select the committee chair by a simple majority vote.

The PTR Advisory Committee will review each PTR file and prepare a report for each faculty member based on the criteria identified herein. The PTR Advisory Committee’s report shall include a recommended Performance Rating based on the report. The PTR Advisory Committee will submit their report to the School Director along with the PTR files. The PTR Advisory Committee’s report shall not be binding upon the School Director, 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.

* 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; unapproved absences from teaching assigned courses; and substantiated student complaints. If needed, the unit head shall be responsible for adding these documents to the PTR File and assessing the impact of these documents on their recommended PTR ranking. The faculty member in the 2-page narrative may also provide explanations in relation to substantiated noncompliance with relevant laws, regulations, and policies.

The PTR process will be carried out in accordance with the following terms consistent with the University’s PTR policy:

* Tenured faculty will be evaluated every five years by the School’s PTR Advisory Committee, the School’s Director, the Dean, and the Provost.
* Tenured faculty will submit the necessary documentation as described in the University’s policy and what is articulated in this policy document.
* Faculty may rebut the PTR Advisory Committee, School Director, and Dean’s recommendation by submitting a letter within five business days of receipt of each recommendation letter.
* Portfolios will be submitted through Interfolio, unless otherwise directed by the University.
* Contents of the PTR portfolio must include, at minimum, the following:
* 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 identified herein,
* a brief (2 page) narrative from the faculty member, and
* other relevant measures of faculty conduct as appropriate.

The PTR Advisory Committee will rate each faculty member as follows:

* **Exceeds Expectations**: a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the unit’s and University’s written criteria, and beyond the average performance of faculty across the faculty member’s discipline and unit.
* **Meets Expectations**: an expected level of accomplishment based on the unit’s and University’s written criteria, compared to faculty across the faculty member’s discipline and unit.
* **Fails to Meet Expectations**: performance falls below the unit’s and University’s written criteria, compared to faculty across the faculty member’s discipline and unit, but is capable of improvement.
* **Unsatisfactory**: performance fails to meet the unit’s written criteria which reflects disregard or failure to follow previously documented and/or otherwise given advice or other efforts to provide correction; or documented incompetence or misconduct, as defined in applicable University regulations and policies, or applicable CBA provisions.

The PTR Advisory Committee will vote by majority decision rule, by secret ballot with total votes recorded for the performance rating recommendation and reported in the recommendation memo prepared by the PTR Advisory Committee Chair.

The School Director will review the following for each faculty member being considered for PTR:

* The faculty member’s PTR file, including the Schools 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 non-compliance 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 School Director will prepare a report for each faculty member being considered for PTR based on the criteria identified herein and attach their report to the PTR file. The School Director’s report shall include a recommended Performance Rating and shall not be binding upon the Dean or the Provost.

The School Director will provide each faculty member being considered for PTR with access to the complete PTR file, including all reports, and notify each 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 School Director will forward the PTR files to the College Dean

# PTR Evaluation Criteria

Assessment of research, teaching, and service for the PTR will be based, in part, upon the following:

1. Annual Assignment. The PTR Advisory Committee will consider each faculty member’s annual assignment based on the following:
* Each annual evaluation shall be based on twelve (12) contact hours of instruction or equivalent, where it is assumed that one 3 credit course is equivalent to 10 hours of work per week. If a faculty member is assigned a 3-2 teaching load, the PTR Advisory Committee must weigh each component of the review appropriately.
1. Research, Teaching and Service

This section describes indicators that faculty members may provide to demonstrate post-tenure performance that meets or exceeds expectations. The examples provided below are meant to be illustrative of actual performance, rather than an exhaustive list. The PTR Advisory 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 being evaluated for PTR may identify additional indicators of performance in each of the designated three areas—research, teaching, and service—as explained below.

Consistent with the University’s memo, the PTR Advisory Committee and the School Director must consider the following:

* that faculty members have varying responsibilities within their academic units, as reflected in their annual assignments,
* that faculty can make essential contributions to the University’s mission in various ways,
* that the nature of a faculty member’s contributions may vary over time,
* that innovative scholarly work may take time to bear fruit, and may sometimes not result in a grant, journal article, or other scholarly product,
* that unusual or unpopular scholarship, teaching, and service are not sufficient cause for a negative evaluation.
	1. Research:

Research performance is marked by advancement of knowledge in the faculty’s field of study to produce beneficial impacts for society. The SPA values a broad range of research, including qualitative, quantitative, policy, basic, and applied research.

The PTR Advisory Committee shall 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.

a.1 Research Evaluation Criteria

For the purpose of the PTR, the faculty member will use the SCImago Journal & Country Rank index, Google Scholar ranking, Web Science or other journal ranking information to determine the quality of the journal for each article published or under revise and resubmit, over the five-year evaluation period. Peer-review, blind-review should be clearly indicated and faculty may choose to provide information on the quality of a journal article which can be based, for example, on a measure from Journal Citation Reports®, or cited reputational rankings.

Rating Criteria – Research

Exceeds Expectations

* Received a rating in the top two categories for research in four (4) of the last five (5) annual evaluations
* Demonstrated a record of consistent and original contributions indicative of research/scholarly excellence, as evidenced by at least three (3) of the following. (Remarkable productivity in one category may be counted twice at the discretion of the committee)
	+ Has in print, or fully accepted, peer-reviewed scholarly book.
	+ At least three peer-reviewed works in press or in print in the period under review: journal articles, book chapters, edited works, and databases.
	+ Has received a significant extramural grant(s) as PI or Co-PI.
	+ Has given an invited lecture or keynote address at another university or professional association or academic group.
	+ Has organized research symposia or academic conferences
	+ Has been recognized by academic peers for scholarly achievement via awards or other professional scholarly recognition (e.g., Best Paper in an academic peer-reviewed journal, Best Paper for a peer-reviewed award at an academic conference).
	+ Regularly presenting their research at local/regional/national/international conferences/colloquia/symposia.
	+ Co-authored and/or co-presented with undergraduate and graduate students (which may overlap with teaching).
	+ Reviewed book proposals, grants, or manuscripts (which may overlap with professional service).

Meets Expectations

* Received a rating in the top three categories for research in three (3) of the last five (5) annual evaluations,
* Demonstrated a record of scholarly contributions, as evidenced by some or all of the following. Any of the criteria identified under Exceeds Expectation can be used to satisfy Meets Expectation.
	+ Publication of peer-reviewed scholarship in traditional or electronic form (e.g., monographs, journal articles, book chapters, edited collections, textbooks)
	+ Publication of editorially-reviewed scholarship and contributions to the field in appropriate and respected venues (book reviews, encyclopedia entries, review essays, edited works, newspaper or magazine articles, public history projects).
	+ Applied for research/creative grants as PI or Co-PI.
	+ Book proposals and/or series/journal editorial work.
	+ Creative activity/achievement/grants/awards in the discipline (local/state/regional/national).
	+ Present their research at local/regional/national/international conferences/colloquia/symposia.

Fails to Meet Expectations

* Demonstrated by the following:
* Faculty member has not met expectations in any of the following ways:
	+ Received a rating in the bottom two categories for research in at least two (2) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
	+ Failure to meet the requirements of either Meets or Exceeds Expectations
	+ Has had Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) for research during the period with some improvement, and there is documented evidence that the faculty member is putting effort toward meeting the PIP goals, but does not satisfy the criteria for “meet the expectations” in the five years under review.

Unsatisfactory Criteria – Research

* Demonstrated by the following:
	+ - Documented consistent incompetence or intentional misconduct, as defined in applicable University regulations and policies, or applicable CBA provisions.
		- Based on annual assignments, faculty member performance consistently fails to meet the unit’s criteria as reflected and documented in Annual Evaluations.
		- Performance reflects intentional disregard and/or patent failure to follow prior professional improvement plans (PIPs) to improve research.
	1. 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. The teaching evaluation shall consider 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 PTR Advisory Committee.

Evaluation of teaching may include:

* Student perceptions of teaching (SPOT).
* Peer review. A faculty member may ask for a teaching evaluation by a tenured member of the School as assigned by the Director in consultation with the faculty member. The review may be based on syllabi and other appropriate teaching materials, and should include classroom/course observation. The observation must be scheduled ahead of time by the Director in consultation with the faculty member.
* Course syllabi, tests, and other course materials.
* Evidence of the development of new courses, curriculum, or programs, including the revision of courses and the development of new teaching methods.
* Teaching and advising awards.
* Student advising.
* Participation in professional development activities relating to pedagogy, publishing on teaching, or formal presentations concerning teaching and learning.
* Chairing or serving on dissertation committees.
* Supervising/mentoring students in research papers or projects.
* Contributions to the School’s teaching mission taking into consideration items such as:
* required or elective courses
* undergraduate or graduate courses
* class size
* number of course preparations
* new courses/preparations and the difficulty of the course being taught.
* 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.

 Rating Criteria – Teaching

Exceeds Expectations: Received a rating in the top two categories for teaching in four (4) of the last five (5) annual evaluations. Evidence in at least three of these categories:

* A strong teaching peer review
* Recognition via University or Extramural Teaching Award.
	+ - Serving on two successfully completed doctoral dissertation committees over the five-year evaluation period
		- Development and adoption of a new for-credit course or an extensive redesign of existing courses along highly innovative lines.
		- Development of a new degree program.
		- Mentoring junior faculty in teaching and/or instructional activities resulting in significant identifiable improvement in teaching performance.
		- Submission of an external/internal grant proposal for an instructional program or related activities.
		- Supervision of Directed Independent Research
		- Chairing doctoral dissertation committees or serving as a committee member in at least three ongoing doctoral dissertation committees.
		- Working with students in research projects that lead to published articles.
* Presentation at a teaching conference or workshop

Meets Expectations: Received a rating in the top three categories for teaching in four (4) of the last five (5) annual evaluations., and two of the following criteria. Any of the criteria identified under Exceeds Expectation can be used to satisfy Meets Expectation.

* + - Supervision of Directed Independent Study
		- Participation on doctoral committees
		- Developing and delivering instruction to communities and other constituencies (such as a community Workshop/seminar presentation to a local government).
		- Commitment to student engagement (availability to students, mentoring, providing academic guidance, etc.).
		- Positive classroom peer review by faculty chosen by the department chair in consultation with the candidate.
		- SPOT evaluations that are consistent with the departmental mean.
		- Acquiring Quality Matters certification for a course
		- Attend teaching conference/workshop/training
		- Curricular and program development through course review, revision, and update as needed.

Fails to Meet Expectations Criteria – Teaching

* Faculty member has not met expectations in any of the following ways:
	+ Received a rating in the bottom two categories for teaching in at least two (2) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
	+ Failure to meet the requirements of either Meets or Exceeds Expectations
	+ 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, but does not satisfy the criteria for “meet the expectations” in the five years under review..

Unsatisfactory Criteria – Teaching

* + - Documented consistent incompetence or intentional misconduct, as defined in applicable University regulations and policies, or applicable CBA provisions.
		- Based on annual assignment, faculty member performance consistently fails to meet the unit’s criteria as reflected and documented in Annual Evaluations.
		- Performance reflects intentional disregard and/or patent failure to follow prior professional improvement plans (PIPs) to improve teaching.
	1. Service:

Faculty members may demonstrate service to the School, College, University, professional community, and community at large in various ways. Service to the profession includes working 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, community-enhancing activities, and building bridges between the university and the community (e.g., knowledge transfer and application).

Rating Criteria – Service

Exceeds Expectations: Received a rating in the top two categories for service in four (4) of the last five (5) annual evaluations. Demonstrated a consistent and meaningful commitment to service excellence, as indicated by three (3) of the following:

* Has made documented leadership contributions to their department, college, university, and/or discipline through their service.
* Has received national or international recognition for their service to the university, profession, or community.
* Collaboration with a community-based and/or government organizations;
* Present one’s scholarship or creative endeavor to nonacademic or public audiences;
* Conducts community-engaged curricular work;
* Continues to contribute to student service-learning activities and mentoring student internships; and conducting creative or public scholarship (e.g., blogs, podcasts, documentaries).
* Continues to serve as an officer in state, national or international professional organizations/boards.
* Has organized research symposia or academic conferences
* Chair of a program or member of a conference organizing committee for an international or national academic conference.
* Chairing a school, college, or university committee, institute or academy.
* Editorship of a scholarly journal
* Assisting with student extracurricular activities that receive recognition for accomplishment
* Participation as an official member in major international, federal, or state commissions, task forces, or boards.
* Participation in two or more school, college, or/and university committees or other committees that require an unusual time commitment.
* Program chair or member of a conference organizing committee for a major regional, national, or international scholarly or professional conference.
* Regular review of scholarly journal articles or books
* Participates at academic conferences as a discussant or panel chair/organizer.
* Participates as an official member in regional or county commissions, task forces, or boards.
* Active with a high level of participation in community engagement activities.

Meets Expectations: Received a rating in the top three categories for Service in four (4) of the last five (5) annual evaluations. Demonstrated a consistent and meaningful commitment to service excellence, as evidenced by some or all of the following:

* Member of school, college, or university committee.
* Officer in an incorporated local or university scholarly or professional Organization.
* Member of a program or conference committee for a scholarly or professional conference.
* Serving as faculty advisor for student groups and/or organizing School student events and activities with those groups
* Editorial Board Membership.
* Speeches or (Gratis) consulting for community and/or practitioner groups
* Participation as an official member in local commissions, task forces, or boards.
* Peer review of a scholarly article, monograph, or book.

Fails to Meet Expectations Criteria –Service

* Faculty member has not met expectations in any of the following ways:
	+ Received a rating in the bottom two categories for service in at least two (2) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
	+ Failure to meet the requirements of either Meets or Exceeds Expectations
	+ Has had Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) for research during the period with some improvement, and there is documented evidence that the faculty member is putting effort toward meeting the PIP goals, but does not satisfy the criteria for “meet the expectations” in the five years under review..

Unsatisfactory Criteria – Service

* Faculty member has not met expectations in any of the following ways:
	+ Performance consistently fails to meet the unit’s written criteria as stated in Annual Evaluation criteria and PTR criteria.
	+ Performance reflects disregard or failure to follow prior professional improvement plans (PIPs) to improve service.
	+ Documented incompetence or misconduct, as defined in applicable University regulations and policies, or applicable CBA provisions.

# Overall PTR Rating

To determine a faculty member’s overall PTR rating requires weighting each component of the evaluation based on the average annual percentage assigned for research, teaching, and service over the five-year evaluation period.

| Overall PTR Rating FormSchool of Public Administration Academic YearNAME |
| --- |
|  | Rating (R) | Average Percentage of Annual Assignment (A) | R\*A |
| Research |  |  |  |
| Teaching |  |  |  |
| Service |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |
|  | 2=Exceeds Expectation1=Meets Expectation0=Fails to Meet Expectations | Based on Average Annual Assignment data over the five-year evaluation period. |  |

Exceeds Expectations: An overall rating of Exceeds Expectations requires a total score greater than 1.49.

Meets Expectations: An overall rating of Meets Expectations requires a total score greater than .99.

Fails to Meet Expectations: An overall rating of Fails to Meet expectations requires a total score less than .99.

Performance Does Not Meet Expectations: 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. The Provost, in consultation with the Unit Head and/or Dean, will decide whether the targets laid out in the PIP have been achieved.

Failure to satisfy the conditions of the PIP, will automatically result in an Unsatisfactory Rating.

Unsatisfactory: An overall rating of Unsatisfactory requires a total score less than 75, or failure to satisfy the conditions of the PIP. Receiving this overall rating reflects disregard or failure to follow previously documented and/or otherwise given advice or other efforts to provide correction, and may result in termination.

1. Non-Academic Criteria

If sufficient and substantiated evidence exists over the five-year evaluation period that a faculty member purposely violated any applicable laws, BOG and University regulations, and University policies within the scope of their university employment which warrants termination; has documented unapproved absences from teaching assigned courses which warrants termination; or has had sufficient disciplinary action issued by the University which warrants termination, the faculty member will be subject to termination.