

# **THE SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE CRITERIA FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW (PTR)**

## **1. PURPOSE**

The PTR process and procedures will follow the Provost guidance and memorandum. The following document only addresses the unit level criteria. 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. The record is to be evaluated in keeping with the appropriate approved criteria and is to include consideration of annual assignments and performance evaluations. 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.

## **2. ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE CRITERIA**

The following performance criteria is based on Annual Evaluations over the last five years.

### **2.1 TEACHING**

#### **EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS**

Receiving a rating of Exceptional or Outstanding in all of the last five years.

Demonstrated a commitment to teaching excellence, as evidenced by at least three of the following:

- SPOT evaluations that are consistently better than the departmental mean.
- New innovative teaching practices or curricula that are documented and included in the portfolio.
- Recipient of national or international recognition for teaching excellence.
- Pedagogical publications and/or conference presentations and/or professional pedagogical workshops outside of the normal research area(s).
- Recognition of teaching, such as departmental, college, or university nominations or awards or grants for teaching or curriculum development.
- Demonstrated commitment to undergraduate research through mentorship or participation in OURI, service learning, or community engagement.

#### **MEETS EXPECTATIONS**

Receiving a rating of Exceptional, Outstanding, or Good in four of the last five years.

Demonstrated a commitment to teaching excellence, as evidenced by:

- 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.
- Curricular and program development through course review, revision, and update as needed.

### **DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS**

Receiving a rating of Needs Improvement in two of the last five years.

Faculty member has failed to meet expectations in any of the following ways:

- Failure to meet the requirements of “Meets Expectations.”
- SPOT scores are significantly worse than the mean of full-time faculty with the School of Architecture.
- 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.

### **UNSATISFACTORY**

Receiving a rating of Needs Improvement in two consecutive years or three of the last five years or receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory in any of the last five years.

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 Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) to improve teaching.
- Documented incompetence or misconduct, as defined in applicable University regulations and policies, or applicable CBA provisions.

## **2.2 RESEARCH**

### **EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS**

Receiving a rating of Outstanding or Exceptional in all of the last five years.

Demonstrated a record of consistent and original contributions indicative of research/scholarly excellence, as evidenced by at least 3 of the following:

Note: Remarkable productivity in a category may be counted more than once at the discretion of the committee,

- Has an active and productive research agenda, with a new peer-reviewed scholarly book in press or in print.
- At least five peer-reviewed works in press or in print in the period under review: journal articles, book chapters, edited works, exhibitions etc.
- Has received a significant extramural grant(s) as PI or Co-PI.
- Has given an invited lecture or keynote address at another university or significant association or academic group.
- Has received national or international recognition (such as awards or honors) for their research activity or creative activity.

### **MEETS EXPECTATIONS**

Receiving a rating of Good, Outstanding, or Exceptional in four of the last five years.

Demonstrated a record of scholarly contributions, as evidenced by some of the following:

- Publication of peer-reviewed scholarship in traditional or electronic form (e.g., monographs, journal articles, book chapters, edited collections, textbooks)
- Awarded research grants as PI or Co-PI.
- Exhibitions or other creative activities in appropriate venues, preferably juried, invited or peer-reviewed.
- Has received recognition (such as awards or honors) for their research activity or creative activity (local/state/regional/national).
- Remains active in their field, presenting their research and/or creative activity at local/regional/national/international conferences on a consistent basis.

### **DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS**

Receiving a rating of Needs Improvement in two of the last five years.

Demonstrated by any of these appropriate to the candidate's discipline:

- Failure to meet the requirements of "Meets 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.

### **UNSATISFACTORY**

Receiving a rating of Needs Improvement in two consecutive years or three of the last five years or receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory in any of the last five years.

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 Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) to improve research.
- Documented incompetence or misconduct, as defined in applicable University regulations and policies, or applicable CBA provisions.

## **2.3 SERVICE**

### **EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS**

Receiving a rating of Outstanding or Exceptional in all of the last five years.

Demonstrated a consistent and meaningful commitment to service excellence, as indicated by at least four of the following:

- Is an active member of departmental/college/university committees/initiatives, discipline-based organizations, and has chaired at least one or more of these committees during the review period.
- 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 or professional community.
- Has collaborated with or contributed to community-based and/or government organizations.
- Has spoken at community events, or presenting one's research or creative activity to non-academic or public audiences.
- Has conducted community-engaged curricular work.
- Has contributed to student service-learning activities and mentoring student internships; and conducting creative or public scholarship.
- Has served as an officer in state, national or international professional organizations/boards.

### **MEETS EXPECTATIONS**

Receiving a rating of Good, Outstanding, or Exceptional in four of the last five years.

Demonstrated a consistent and meaningful commitment to service excellence, as evidenced by some or all of the following:

- Active membership on and contribution to departmental, college, and university committees/initiatives.
- Advising to on-campus student organizations.
- Professional service (membership in and/or leadership positions in professional organizations, peer reviewer for journals, judge/jury for competitions at state and regional levels).

- Participation in departmental/college/university events as appropriate (e.g. Graduation, Recruitment Events, Department Meetings, Community Engagement, Faculty Governance).

### **DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS**

Receiving a rating of Needs Improvement in two of the last five years.

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

- Failure to meet the requirements of “Meets Expectations.”
- 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.

### **UNSATISFACTORY**

Receiving a rating of Needs Improvement in two consecutive years or three of the last five years or receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory in any of the last five years.

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 Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) to improve service.
- Documented incompetence or misconduct, as defined in applicable University regulations and policies, or applicable CBA provisions.

## **2.4 OVERALL RATING**

### **EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS**

Requires Exceeds Expectations in two of the three categories and Meets Expectations in the last category.

### **MEETS EXPECTATIONS**

Requires Meets Expectations in all three categories.

### **DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS**

Requires a Does Not Meet Expectations in one category.

Note: The University makes a distinction between an overall Annual Evaluation and what it means to be in “Good Standing” within the University. Even if an individual receives an overall Annual Evaluation of Good that does not mean they are automatically in Good Standing. If an individual receives a Needs Improvement in at least one category, that means that individual is no longer in Good Standing. Therefore, if a faculty member

receives a Does Not Meet Expectations in just one category, they will receive an overall rating of Does Not Meet Expectations in the Post-Tenure Review.

### **UNSATISFACTORY**

Requires an Unsatisfactory in one category.

It is important to mention that the Overall Rating will be determined based on the peer-reviewed evaluation from a PTR Committee. An individual's Annual Assignments should also be taken into consideration when weighing the three categories. For example, a faculty member with a 10% effort assigned to Research / Creative Activity will have a different expectation than a faculty member with a 70% effort assigned to Research / Creative Activity. In general, the criteria listed above are guidelines for the committee to take into consideration when completing their evaluation.

### **3. NON-ACADEMIC CRITERIA**

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 may include a response to the unit head's letter and ranking. In that letter, they may choose to address the additional documents alleging substantiated noncompliance with relevant laws, regulations, and policies.