DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY

ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Provisions of the document on the same subject preceding this one remain in force except where obsolete or replaced by the provisions of this document (Florida Atlantic University Department of Anthropology Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation and Merit Pay, Revised 2/16/06). Annual evaluation and merit criteria approved by Department faculty vote October 22, 2010.

I. Annual Faculty Evaluation:

A. Teaching:

Teaching will be evaluated holistically, utilizing a variety of materials, including SPOT scores as specified below and other indicators of teaching activities and accomplishments. In addition to SPOT scores, overall teaching evaluation may include consideration of such items as: directed independent studies, undergraduate and graduate thesis supervision, dissertation supervision, thesis committee participation, dissertation committee participation, new course preparation, teaching a new preparation, teaching training (internal or external), major syllabus revisions, increased use of new technology as part of pedagogy, teaching awards, peer reviews, significant improvement over previous low SPOT scores, and any other activity relevant to the improvement or practice of teaching.

Teaching performance as evidenced in the revised (Fall 2005) Student Perception of Teaching (SPOT) form is determined by calculating the average (mean) of the following seven (7) criteria:

#3  Was organized and prepared for class
#4  Communicated ideas effectively
#8  Made the subject interesting
#10 Was willing to listen to student’s questions and opinions
#12 Showed respect for students
#13 Was concerned with whether students learned
#14 Was interested in teaching

The above criteria are the best indicators on the SPOT form for assessing quality of teaching and, moreover, are applicable to any type of teaching situation (large lecture class, small discussion group, lab, etc.).
The overall mean of these seven questions will be rated as follows:

- **Excellent** = 1.0 - 1.8
- **Above Satisfactory** = 1.9 - 2.6
- **Satisfactory** = 2.7 - 3.4
- **Below Satisfactory** = <3.4

The rating obtained by this procedure may be modified by other inputs as supplied by the faculty member or otherwise obtained for purposes of evaluation, and any other pertinent information.

**B. Research:**

Each faculty member’s research and creative activities shall be rated Excellent, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, or Below Satisfactory based on consideration of their total publications, exhibitions, grant writing, fieldwork, laboratory analyses, and other research-related activities during the period under review in accordance with the system below.

Anthropological projects are normally the result of several years of research and writing. Multi-year research and writing projects are eligible for consideration in the annual evaluation process when 1) they are included in the annual assignment, and 2) the outcomes and expected time to completion are stipulated and reasonable.

**Excellent:** achievement of one or more of the following:

1. A scholarly book or monograph issued by a university press or other reputable publisher shall count for two years (e.g., when a manuscript or proposal is accepted, and when it is published).

2. Publication of an article in a refereed nationally or internationally recognized journal (including journals published by member organizations of the American Anthropological Association, the Society for American Archaeology, the Society for Archaeological Sciences, the American Association of Physical Anthropologists, and other journals of comparable quality).


4. Publication of an edited scholarly book issued by a reputable publisher.
5. A major museum exhibition/exhibit and/or travelling exhibition.

6. A grant or grant application from/to a major granting agency (e.g., NSF or other federal agency, Fulbright, major foundation, etc.), and/or a grant of $10,000 or more.

7. Significant evidence of ongoing research or fieldwork.

**Above Satisfactory:** achievement of one of the following:
1. A published article in a refereed state or regional journal.

2. A published article in a refereed online journal.


4. A grant or grant application from/to a granting agency not included above, generally defined as an application of less than $10,000, requiring an application of less than 10 total pages.

**Satisfactory:** achievement of one of the following:
1. Publication of an article in a non-refereed journal.

2. Publication of a research note of suitable length in a refereed journal.

3. Preparation and submission of a research or technical report to an agency or corporation.

4. Significant research and writing geared to publication as a book or refereed journal article.

5. A book review, comment, or other brief item published in a refereed journal.

6. Presentation of a conference paper.

7. Chairing or organizing a symposium or section at a state or regional meeting.

8. Curation of a small-scale museum exhibition/exhibit.
10. A grant or grant application for less than $5,000 requiring an application of five pages or less.

*Below Satisfactory:* Little evidence of work directed toward publication on the basis of original research.

Any combination of these items, and any form of research activity not specifically mentioned will be evaluated in keeping with these guidelines. A convincing argument that a publication or other evidence of research deserves a higher rating than these guidelines allow will be considered.

Anthropological projects are the result of multi-year periods of research and writing. Multi-year periods of research and writing are eligible for consideration in the annual evaluation process when: 1) included in the annual assignment, 2) outcomes and an expected time to completion are stipulated and reasonable.

C. Service and other activities:

Each faculty member’s service shall be rated Excellent, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, or Below Satisfactory based on consideration of their total time and effort devoted to service-related activities during the period under review in accordance with the system outlined below.

*Excellent:* service as chair or other high officer on one or more major university committees, including university, college, and/or department committees, councils, assemblies, and/or senates of recognized importance to university governance, operation or work environment; service as a journal editor or editorial board; and/or service on a conference, association, community, and/or government board, committee, or equivalent.

*Above Satisfactory:* service on one or more major university/college/department committees, service on a one-day conference/association/community/government committees, and/or significant community outreach such as giving talks on research to community organizations.

*Satisfactory:* service on one or more minor university committees, and/or evidence of community outreach.

*Below Satisfactory:* no participation in assigned committee service.

The rating derived here may be modified by evidence of university, public or professional
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service by evidence of accomplishment in student advising, service to the university community, the community at large, etc.