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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. 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.

# Process

The Dean’s office shall notify eligible faculty members of their upcoming PTR no less than six months in advance of the due date for the evaluation file.

The Department Chair will, after consultation with tenured faculty, appoint a standing Department PTR Advisory Committee (PTRAC). Membership of the PTRAC consists of tenured faculty that, at minimum, must contain the following:

* For the review of associate professors, the PTRAC shall consist of all professors of at least associate rank in the Department.
* For the review of full professors, the committee shall consist of all full professors in the Department.
  + Should there be fewer than three professors in the Department at the required rank, the Department Chair and the DEPARTMENT 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 review each PTR file and prepare a report for each faculty member based on the criteria identified herein. The PTRAC’s report is submitted to the Department Chair and shall include a recommended Performance Rating.

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 Department’s PTR Advisory Committee, the Department’s Chair, 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, Department Chair, 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 PTE 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 brief (2-page) narrative from the faculty member
* 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.

**Review Report Requirements**

The PTR Advisory Committee must adhere to the following:

• The report must include an assessment of the eligible faculty member’s performance and

conduct for the five-year review period based on the evaluation criteria.

• The report must state whether the faculty member’s performance and conduct “Exceeds

Expectations, Meets Expectations, Fails to Meet Expectations, or is Unsatisfactory” and

provide specific reasons to support the determination.

• In reaching a criteria-based performance rating, the responsible party must consider the

written criteria of the university and the Political Science Department.

The Department Chair will review the following for each faculty member being considered for PTR:

* The faculty member’s PTR file, including the Department’s 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, consistently unapproved absences during the five-year review period.
* Any disciplinary action issued by the University during the entire five-year review period.

After the five-calendar day response period, the Department Chair will forward the PTR files to the College Dean

# PTR Evaluation Criteria

PTR reports shall be based on the three categories of assessment on the annual evaluation: 1) research, 2) teaching, and 3) service.

Consistency of annual evaluation shall be based on the following points: each annual evaluation rating of Exceptional = 5 points; rating of Outstanding = 4 points; Good = 3 points; Needs Improvement = 2 points; Unsatisfactory = 1 point encompasses a range from 5 to 25.

Both the review process and the PTR Report may only consider professional production and shall not consider or otherwise discriminate based on faculty members’ political or ideological viewpoints, nor on personalized subjective evaluations of the faculty member under review.

**Research**

**Exceeds Expectations Criteria – Research**

* A rating of the annual evaluation of research with a total score from 23 to 25 during the five-year review period.

**Meets Expectations Criteria – Research**

* A rating of the annual evaluation of research with a total score from 15 to 22 during the five-year review period.

**Fails to Meet Expectations Criteria – Research**

* A rating of the annual evaluation of research with a total score from 10 to 14 during the five-year review period.
* *Faculty member has not met expectations in any of the following ways*
  + *Received a rating in the bottom two categories for research (i.e., Needs Improvements and Unsatisfactory) in at least two (2) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.*
  + *Failure to meet the requirements of either Meets or Exceeds Expectations in research for the five-year period and*
  + *Has had Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) for teaching during the period with no improvement, and there is documented evidence that the faculty member is not putting effort toward meeting the PIP goals.*

**Unsatisfactory Criteria – Research**

* A rating of the annual evaluation of research with a total score from 5 to 9 during the five-year review period.
* *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 consistent 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.*

**Teaching**

**Exceeds Expectations Criteria – Teaching**

* A rating of the annual evaluation of research with a total score from 23 to 25 during the five-year review period.

**Meets Expectations Criteria – Teaching**

* A rating of the annual evaluation of research with a total score from 15 to 22 during the five-year review period.

**Fails to Meet Expectations Criteria – Teaching**

* A rating of the annual evaluation of research with a total score from 10 to 14 during the five-year review period.
* *Faculty member has not met expectations in any of the following ways*
  + *Received a rating in the bottom two categories for teaching (i.e., Needs Improvements and Unsatisfactory) in at least two (2) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.*
  + *Failure to meet the requirements of either Meets or Exceeds Expectations in teaching for the five-year period and*
  + *Has had Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) for teaching during the period with no improvement, and there is documented evidence that the faculty member is not putting effort toward meeting the PIP goals.*

**Unsatisfactory Criteria – Teaching**

* A rating of the annual evaluation of research with a total score from 5 to 9 during the five-year review period.
* *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 consistent 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.*

**Service**

**Exceeds Expectations Criteria – Service**

* A rating of the annual evaluation of research with a total score from 23 to 25 during the five-year review period.

**Meets Expectations Criteria – Service**

* A rating of the annual evaluation of research with a total score from 15 to 22 during the five-year review period.

**Fails to Meet Expectations Criteria – Service**

* A rating of the annual evaluation of research with a total score from 10 to 14 during the five-year review period.
* *Faculty member has not met expectations in any of the following ways*
  + *Received a rating in the bottom two categories for service (i.e., Needs Improvements and Unsatisfactory) in at least two (2) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.*
  + *Failure to meet the requirements of either Meets or Exceeds Expectations in service for the five-year period and*
  + *Has had Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) for teaching during the period with no improvement, and there is documented evidence that the faculty member is not putting effort toward meeting the PIP goals.*

**Unsatisfactory Criteria – Service**

* A rating of the annual evaluation of research with a total score from 5 to 9 during the five-year review period.
* *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 consistent 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

The overall rating of a faculty member’s performance is determined by cumulatively adding the evaluation scores from the three areas - research, teaching, and service - over the five-year evaluation period.

**Exceeds Expectations Criteria – Overall**

* Combined score from the three areas of research, teaching, and service evaluation from 69 to 75 during the five-year review period.

**Meets Expectations Criteria – Overall**

* Combined score from the three areas of research, teaching, and service evaluation from 45 to 68 during the five-year review period.

**Fails to Meet Expectations Criteria – Overall**

* Combined score from the three areas of research, teaching, and service evaluation from 30 to 44 during the five-year review period.
* *Faculty member has not met expectations in any of the following ways*
  + *Received a rating in the bottom two categories for overall rating (i.e., Needs Improvements and Unsatisfactory) in at least two (2) of the last five (5) annual evaluations.*
  + *Failure to meet the requirements of either Meets or Exceeds Expectations overall for the five-year period and*
  + *Has had Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) for teaching during the period with no improvement, and there is documented evidence that the faculty member is not putting effort toward meeting the PIP goals.*

**Unsatisfactory Criteria – Overall**

* Combined score from the three areas of research, teaching, and service evaluation from 15 to 19 during the five-year review period.
* *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 consistent 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.*