

Florida Atlantic University  
Dorothy F. Schmidt College of Arts and Letters  
Department of Music  
Post Tenure Review Guidelines (2023)

The PTR process and procedures will follow the Provost guidance and memorandum. The following document only addresses the unit level criteria.

**University Policy**

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.

PTR is intended to accomplish the following:

- a) Ensure continued high standards of quality and productivity among the University's tenured faculty.
- b) Determine whether a faculty member is meeting the responsibilities and expectations associated with assigned duties in research, teaching and service, including compliance with state laws, Board of Governors (BOG) regulations, and University regulations and policies, including approved accreditation standards.
- c) Recognize and honor exceptional achievement and provide incentives and support for professional growth, development, and retention.
- d) When appropriate, develop and implement corrective action plans, and refocus academic and professional efforts and take appropriate employment action pursuant to applicable University regulations and policies, and in accordance with applicable provisions of the CBA.

## **Timing and Eligibility**

As designated by the Provost memo, each tenured faculty member will have a comprehensive post-tenure review of five years of performance in the fifth year following the last promotion or the last comprehensive post-tenure review, whichever is later. For faculty hired with tenure, the hire date will constitute the date of the last promotion.

Tenured faculty in administrative roles (chairs, directors or higher with an administrative role of .50 FTE or greater) will be reviewed annually by their supervisors. Upon returning to a 0.51 or greater FTE non-administrative role, these faculty will undergo post-tenure review in the fifth year following a return to a predominantly non-administrative faculty appointment.

Exceptions to the timing of the comprehensive post-tenure review may be granted by the provost for extenuating or unforeseen circumstances, including but not limited to, faculty participating in the transition-to-retirement program, faculty with a set resignation date within the same academic year as the review, and faculty spending more than 160 hours on approved leave during one semester within the five-year period of review. Any exceptions granted to tenured faculty members will be disclosed in the provost's report to the president and Board of Trustees on the outcomes of the comprehensive post-tenure review.

## **Review Requirements**

The PTR will be conducted based on a file containing a summary of the faculty member's activities, and history of professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities to the University and its students during the entire five-year Review Period.

The review shall not consider or otherwise discriminate based on faculty members' political or ideological viewpoints.

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. The faculty member in the 2-page narrative may also provide explanations in relation to substantiated noncompliance with relevant laws, regulations, and policies.

## **Process and Requirements**

### **Process**

1. Applicant will be notified by Unit Head/University of the applicable due dates and open dossier.
2. Applicant will submit dossier in accordance with unit-approved timeline
3. PTR Advisory Committee will have a minimum of one week to review completed dossier, convene, create report which shall include a recommended Performance Rating. This report will be forwarded to the Unit Head for review.

4. Unit Head will review the completed dossier, and the tenured faculty member's disciplinary file to provide a brief written assessment of the level and quality of achievement as well as any concerns and a recommended performance rating.
5. Applicant will have 5 (five) business days to review and respond to any portion of the review.
6. The assessment will be added to the dossier and forwarded to the Dean.
7. The Dean of the college will add to the packet a brief letter assessing the level and quality of achievement. This assessment will include a recommended Performance rating.
8. Applicant will have 5 (five) business days to review and respond to any portion of the review.
9. Packet will be sent forward to Provost. The Provost has final decisions upon Performance Rating and compensation/action.

## **Participation/ Faculty Responsibility**

Eligible Faculty Members shall prepare and submit their completed PTR file, based on the aforementioned Criteria and reporting requirements of the five-year Review Period defined above, to the Unit Head by the date and via Interfolio or the method specified by the University.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure the information in the dossier is complete, up-to-date, and accurate.

The Dossier will include the following relevant to the faculty member's tenure-granting unit for the five-year review period:

- a current curriculum vita that clearly highlights accomplishments in instruction; scholarship, research, and/or other creative activity; and assigned service and/or administrative activity,
- a brief (2 page) narrative from the faculty member,
- Final report of sabbatical activities if one was taken during the review period,
- Student Perception of Teaching Comments for all applicable courses taught during the five-year review period,
- copies of the faculty member's last five annual assignments and annual evaluations with supplements including any attached written rebuttals by a faculty member under review,
- a copy of the report of the previous SPE, PTR, and/or last promotion letter as available,
- a copy of the published criteria from the faculty member's academic unit (see Articulation of Unit Expectations below),
- other relevant measures of faculty conduct as appropriate.
- Supportive supplemental materials
- Annual Assignment Summary Chart (sample below)

### **Annual Assignment Summary (Sample)**

| Year | Teaching Rating | Research/Creative Rating | Service Rating | Overall |
|------|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------|
|      |                 |                          |                |         |
|      |                 |                          |                |         |

### **PTR Advisory Committee**

The Unit Head will convene a PTR Advisory Committee consisting of a minimum of five professors in the Eligible Faculty Member's Unit. The Unit Head will assign a committee chair.

For the review of associate professors, the Committee shall consist of all in-unit, tenured faculty members.

For the review of professors, the committee shall consist of all professors in the unit. Should there be less than the adequate number of professors in the unit at the required rank, the Unit Head and the Unit professors will select professors within the college at the appropriate rank so there are a minimum of five professors serving on the committee.

The PTR Advisory Committee will review each PTR file and prepare a report for each Eligible Faculty Member based on the Criteria and Report Requirements of the five-year Review Period defined above. The committee shall vote on the recommended rating by a secret ballot.

The Unit Head's PTR Advisory Committee's report shall include a recommended Performance Rating. The PTR Advisory Committee will affix their reports to the PTR files and return them to the Unit Head. The PTR Advisory Committee's report shall not be binding upon the Unit Head, the Dean, or the Provost.

## **Unit Head Responsibilities**

The faculty member's department/school level unit head will review:

- the completed dossier,
- PTR Advisory Committee Report and Performance Rating,
- Personnel file, records of accomplishments and awards, annual evaluations, and faculty responses,
- 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 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.

Using a university-provided template, the faculty member's department/school level unit head will provide a report for the faculty member based in the aforementioned Criteria and Report requirements define and affix the reports to the PRT files. The Unit Head's report shall include a brief written assessment of the level and quality of achievement and will certify that the letter includes, if applicable, any concerns regarding professional conduct, academic responsibilities, or performance of assigned duties during the period under review. The unit head's report shall include recommended Performance Rating and shall not be binding upon the Dean or the Provost.

After the unit head's review, the faculty member receive access to the complete PTR file, including all reports and will have a period of five (5) business days to review and respond to the chair's assessment. After five days, the faculty member's department/school level unit head will forward the packet (dossier and disciplinary records), including all relevant records and the unit head's letter, to the appropriate college dean for review.

### **Dean Responsibilities**

Using a university-provided template, the dean of the college will add to the packet a brief letter assessing the level and quality of achievement during the period under review. The dean's letter will include any concerns regarding professional conduct, academic responsibilities, or performance. The letter will also include the dean's recommended performance rating using the rating scale above. The dean shall take into consideration the FTE in each area of assignment when recommending a performance rating.

### **Applicant Review**

After the dean's review, the faculty member receive access to the complete PTR file, including all reports and will have a period of five (5) business days to review and respond to the chair's assessment and the dean's evaluation. Any rebuttal will be included in the PTR file. After five days, the packet will move to the provost for review.

## Outcomes

For each tenured faculty member who receives a final performance rating of “**exceeds expectations**” or “**meets expectations**,” the appropriate college dean, in consultation with the faculty member’s unit head, will recommend to the provost appropriate recognition and/or compensation in accordance with the faculty member’s performance and university regulations and policies. The provost will make the final determination regarding recognition and/or compensation.

For each tenured faculty member who receives a final performance rating of “**does not meet expectations**,” the appropriate college dean, in consultation with the faculty member’s unit head and the faculty member, will propose a performance improvement plan to the provost.

- The plan must include a deadline for the faculty member to achieve the requirements of the performance improvement plan. The deadline may not extend more than 12 months past the date the faculty member receives the performance improvement plan.
- The plan will indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member’s performance will be remedied.
- The plan must list specific deficiencies and outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes, set timelines for achieving goals and outcomes and indicate the criteria for assessment.
- The provost will make final decisions regarding the requirements of each performance improvement plan.

Each tenured faculty member who fails to meet the requirements of a performance improvement plan by the established deadline will receive a notice of termination from the provost for incompetence or misconduct, as applicable pursuant to the applicable university processes.

Each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of “**unsatisfactory**” will receive a notice of termination from the provost for incompetence or misconduct, as applicable pursuant to the university processes.

Final decisions regarding post-tenure review may be appealed under university regulations or collective bargaining agreements, as applicable to the employee.

## Academic Performance Criteria

Each academic unit that does annual evaluations shall clearly define criteria for PTR among its tenured faculty in the areas of instruction; scholarship, research, and/or other creative activity; and assigned service and/or administrative activity. These written criteria shall reflect the customs and practices of the academic unit, the professional discipline(s) of its faculty, and its overall mission as part of the University.

In view of the various kinds of contributions faculty members make during the course of their careers, unit criteria must also be sufficiently flexible to embrace the variability of faculty interests, activities, and strengths.

Since PTR explicitly considers the annual assignments of each faculty member, unit criteria should weigh appropriately the full range of assignments a tenured faculty member may receive.



## Instruction

### Exceeds Expectations

- Received a rating in the top two categories (Exceptional and Outstanding) for teaching in four (4) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
- Evidence of commitment to teaching excellence, as evidenced by at least 2 of the following:
  - SPOT evaluations that are consistently better than the departmental mean.
  - Received a rating in the top two categories (Exceptional and Outstanding) for teaching in four (4) of the last five (5) annual evaluations
  - Two positive internal peer-evaluations of teaching from the final two years prior to promotion application
  - AND evidence of commitment to teaching excellence, as evidenced by at least 2 (two) Instruction category A achievements.

### Meets Expectations

- Received a rating in the top three (Exceptional, Outstanding, and Good) categories for teaching in four (4) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
- Demonstrated a commitment to teaching excellence, as evidenced by any of the following:
  - SPOT evaluations that are consistent with the departmental mean.
  - Received a rating in the top three (Exceptional, Outstanding, and Good) categories for teaching in four (4) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
  - Two positive internal peer-evaluations of teaching from the final two years prior to promotion application
  - AND demonstrated a commitment to teaching excellence, as evidenced by any of the instructional achievements

### Fails to Meet Expectations

- Faculty member has failed to meet expectations in any of the following ways
  - Received a rating in the bottom two categories (Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory) 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 and*
    - SPOT scores are significantly worse than the college mean.
    - 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

- 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 teaching.
  - Documented incompetence or misconduct, as defined in applicable University regulations and policies, or applicable CBA provisions.

## INSTRUCTIONAL MERIT CATEGORIES

| Category A  | Category B   |
|---|--|
| Commitment to student engagement (availability to students, advising, mentoring, providing academic guidance, Undergraduate Research/ RI Courses, etc.).              | Positive classroom peer review by faculty chosen by the department chair in consultation with the candidate. |
| New innovative teaching practices or curricula that are documented and included in the portfolio.   | Curricular and program development through course review, revision, and update as needed.                    |
| Recipient of national or international recognition for teaching excellence.   | Adjudication of local or regional competitions or Festivals  |
| 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 Undergraduate Research Intensive, service learning, or community engagement. |  |
| Festival and Competition coordination   |  |
| Adjudication of national or international competitions or Festivals   |  |

*A candidate may accomplish, and therefore count, one of these achievements more than one time. Additionally, a remarkable singular achievement may be counted twice at the discretion of the candidate and committee.*

*The department also acknowledges the list above should not be considered all-inclusive. A candidate may have achievements which can be considered. In all cases, it is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate the quality of the achievement.*

## **Research/ Scholarship/ Creative Activity**

### Exceeds Expectations

- Received a rating in the top two categories (Exceptional or Outstanding) for research in four (4) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
- Demonstrated a record of consistent and original contributions indicative of research/scholarly/creative excellence, as evidenced by at least 9 (nine) category A, 2 (two) category B achievements, and significant achievements in category C.

### Meets Expectations

- Received a rating in the top three categories (Exceptional, Outstanding, or Good) for research in four (4) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
- Demonstrated a record of consistent and original contributions indicative of research/scholarly/creative excellence, as evidenced by at least 6 (six) Category A, 2 (two) Category B achievements, and significant achievements in category C.

### Fails to Meet Expectations

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

- 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 research.
  - Documented incompetence or misconduct, as defined in applicable University regulations and policies, or applicable CBA provisions.

## SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH, AND CREATIVE MERIT CATEGORIES

| Category A  | Category B   | Category C   |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refereed monograph, chapter, article, or method/textbook</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-refereed monograph, chapter, article, method/textbook</li> <li>• Refereed media, or concert review</li> <li>• High citation index</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non refereed review of a book, media, or concert</li> <li>• Program or Liner notes</li> <li>• Medium citation index</li> </ul>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance, presentation, clinic, masterclass/workshop, conducting, etc. at an international or national event or conference or performance with an ensemble or professional organization of international or national significance.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance, presentation, clinic, masterclass/workshop, conducting, etc. at a Southern regional event or conference or performance with an ensemble or professional organization of regional significance.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance, presentation, clinic, masterclass/workshop, conducting, etc. at a state or local event or conference or performance with an ensemble or professional organization of local significance.</li> </ul>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recipient of an international/national award/prize or nomination to one of great significance</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Award or prize received (composition, research, performance) at the regional, state or local level</li> <li>• Nomination/Finalist of an award</li> <li>• Recipient of an internal sabbatical award</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recipient of an internal research award/grant (SOTA, Creative, Seed grant)</li> <li>• Recipient of an internal university merit award (Advising, Talon Leadership, etc.)</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Awarded external grant in support of scholarly or creative activity of \$15,000 or more</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Awarded external grant in support of scholarly or creative activity of under \$14,999</li> <li>• Awarded infrastructure/internal grant of \$80,000 or more</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Awarded infrastructure/internal grant of under \$79,999</li> <li>• Application to an external grant</li> </ul>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commissioned composition or arrangement by an ensemble, artist, or professional organization of international or national significance.</li> <li>• Performance or broadcast of a composition or arrangement by an ensemble or professional organization of international or national significance.</li> <li>• Publication or recording of a composition or arrangement by an ensemble or professional organization of international or national significance.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The composition or arrangement of a work of extended scope</li> <li>• Commissioned composition or arrangement by an ensemble or professional organization of regional significance</li> <li>• Performance or broadcast of a composition or arrangement by an ensemble or professional organization of regional significance</li> <li>• Publication or recording of a composition or arrangement by an ensemble or professional organization of regional significance</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The composition or arrangement of a work of minor scope</li> <li>• Commissioned composition or arrangement by an ensemble or professional organization of local significance</li> <li>• Performance or broadcast of a composition or arrangement by an ensemble or professional organization of local significance</li> <li>• Publication or recording of a composition or arrangement by an ensemble or professional organization of local significance</li> </ul> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct a K-12 state, regional, or national ensemble</li> <li>• Touring performer with an international or national organization</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct a K-12 district-level ensemble</li> <li>• Performer at a local or regional performance of a touring organization</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Solo or conducting engagement with community ensemble or organization</li> <li>• Section player/ chorus member in a regional ensemble</li> </ul>  |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section player/ chorus member in an ensemble of international or national significance</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Single regional performance with national commercial group</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On-campus or other local performance less than a full-length recital</li> </ul>                                 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commercially available recording or video production with a credited or multi-media production role, or in conjunction with a renowned artist, or those that have received positive review.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commercially available recording released with a credited or multi-media production role, that has not received notable recognition</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Musical or technical contribution to multidisciplinary performances or exhibitions at a local level.</li> </ul> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emerging media with a recognized publication, organization or of high impact in the field</li> </ul>   |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emerging media publication</li> </ul>   |

*A candidate may accomplish, and therefore count, one of these achievements more than one time. Additionally, a remarkable singular achievement may be counted twice at the discretion of the candidate and committee.*

*The department also acknowledges the list above should not be considered all-inclusive. A candidate may have achievements which can be considered. In all cases, it is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate the quality of the achievement.*

## Service

### Exceeds Expectations

- Received a rating in the top two categories (Exceptional or Outstanding) for service in four (4) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
- And demonstrated a consistent and meaningful commitment to service excellence, as evidenced by four (4) Category A Achievements

### Meets Expectations

- Received a rating in the top three categories (Exceptional, Outstanding, or Good) for Service in four (4) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
- And demonstrated a consistent and meaningful commitment to service excellence, as evidenced by at least 2 (two) Category A or B Achievements.

### Fails to Meet Expectations

- Faculty member has not met expectations in any of the following ways
  - Received a rating in the bottom two categories for services in at least two (2) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.
  - *Failure to meet the requirements of either Meets or Exceeds Expectations and*
    - 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

- 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

## Service Merit Categories

| <b>Category A</b>   | <b>Category B</b>  |
|---|--|
| 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. | Active membership on and contribution to departmental, college, and/or university committees/initiatives.  |
| Has made documented leadership contributions to their department, college, university, and/or discipline through their service.   | Advising to on-campus student organizations  |
| Has received national or international recognition for their service to the university or professional community.   | Professional service   |
| Has collaborated with or contributed to community-based and/or government organizations   | Participation in departmental, college, university events as appropriate (e.g. Graduation, Recruitment Events, Department Meetings, Community Engagement, Faculty Governance). |
| Fundraising endeavors and scholarship acquisition   |  |
| Has conducted community-engaged curricular work   |  |
| Has contributed to student service-learning activities and mentoring internships; and conducting creative or public scholarship (e.g., blogs, podcasts, documentaries).                           |  |
| Has served as an officer or advisor in state, national or international professional organizations, boards, and committees.   |  |

*A candidate may accomplish, and therefore count, one of these achievements more than one time. Additionally, a remarkable singular achievement may be counted twice at the discretion of the candidate and committee.*

*The department also acknowledges the list above should not be considered all-inclusive. A candidate may have achievements which can be considered. In all cases, it is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate the quality of the achievement.*

## Overall Ratings

- An overall rating of **Exceeds Expectations** requires an Exceeds Expectations in 2 categories *and* at least a Meets Expectations in the third.
- An overall rating of **Meets Expectations** requires at least a Meets Expectations in all 3 categories, but does not meet the requirements for Exceeds Expectations.
- An overall rating of **Fails to Meet Expectations** results from a rating of Fails to Meet Expectation in any category.
- An overall rating of **Unsatisfactory** results from a rating of Unsatisfactory in any category.

### PTR Advisory Committee Rating Summary

| Teaching Rating | Research/Creative Rating | Service Rating | Overall |
|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------|
|                 |                          |                |         |

### 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 rating.

The faculty member may include a response to the letters and ratings. In that letter, they may choose to address the additional documents alleging substantiated noncompliance with relevant laws, regulations, and policies.