

Charles E. Schmidt College of Medicine: Sustained Performance Evaluation Guidelines

Developed by the College of Medicine Ad Hoc Sustained Performance Evaluation Policy Committee (COMSPEPC)* - Jan 31, 2017

An excellent faculty is essential to the core teaching, research, scholarship, clinical and service missions of the College of Medicine at Florida Atlantic University. The Sustained Performance Evaluation (SPE) is a periodic review of tenured faculty that is designed to foster sustained excellence and professional development, and to recognize and reward outstanding achievement.

The SPE is separate and distinct from annual and other employee evaluations in that the evaluation will focus on long-term accomplishments over a period of multiple years. Its main objectives are to:

- recognize and reward sustained excellence in scholarship, research, teaching, public service, or academic leadership; and
- identify and address unsatisfactory performance in these areas.

Most importantly, the SPE process has been designed to uphold the University's fundamental principles of tenure, academic freedom, due process, and confidentiality in personnel matters.

No College policy may conflict with a University or Provost's policy. Accordingly, the Provost must approve the College policy prior to its implementation or amendment. The Provost may either approve the College policy or send it back to the College SPE Policy Committee with instructions to modify it.

- year cycle. If such an application is unsuccessful, then upon request of the applicant the University Provost may, at his or her discretion, add one extra year to the faculty member's SPE cycle.

- copies of the faculty member's last seven annual assignments and annual evaluations,
- a copy of the report of the previous SPE, if available,
- a copy of the published performance expectations from the faculty member's department (see Articulation of Department Expectations below), and
- a brief (2 page) narrative from the faculty member.

The contents of each SPE file are to be kept confidential throughout the Evaluation process.

C. Peer Evaluation Process

The faculty member shall deliver his or her SPE file to the Chair of the department that conducts his or her annual evaluation by a date fixed by the College. The Chair will pass all collected SPE files from the department to a Department Peer SPE Committee appointed according to the following guidelines:

- Members shall consist of Associate or Full tenured Professors
- The Department Peer SPE Committee shall be composed of at least three faculty members
- In all cases, any person with a plausible, perceived conflict of interest in evaluating a particular faculty member cannot serve on the Department Peer SPE Committee in the year of that faculty member's SPE

The Department Peer SPE Committees shall review each SPE file in light of the department's published performance expectations, and assess whether those expectations have been met. In doing so, the Committee should consider:

- that faculty members have varying responsibilities within their departments, as reflected in their annual assignments,
- that faculty can make essential contributions to the University's mission in various ways,
- that the nature of an individual's contributions may vary over time,
- that innovative scholarly work may take time to bear fruit, and may sometimes fail,
- that unusual or unpopular scholarship, teaching, and service are not by themselves sufficient cause for a negative evaluation, and
- that faculty are evaluated annually on their annual assignment

The Department Peer SPE Committees shall prepare brief reports, to be added to the SPE file, summarizing their recommended assessments of each faculty member's performance during the evaluation period. The Committee's report will indicate whether the faculty member's performance Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, or Fails to Meet Expectations, and cite specific reasons and evidence to support their conclusion.

The Committee will return all SPE files to the Chair by a date fixed by the College.

D. Administrative Review and Appeals of Outcomes

The Chair will review the SPE files of all faculty members along with the Department Peer SPE Committee reports. In case of disagreement about the recommendation, the Chair shall meet with the Department Peer SPE Committee to discuss the case and attempt to reach a shared recommendation. If a shared recommendation cannot be reached, the Chair shall add a letter to the SPE file citing specific reasons for his/her recommendation. The Chair will pass all SPE files to the Dean by a date fixed by the College.

The Dean of the College of Medicine will also review the SPE files of all faculty members along with the Department Peer SPE Committee reports and the Chair's recommendation. If the Dean concurs with the shared recommendation of the Department Peer SPE Committee and Chair, the decision will be final.

In case of disagreement about the recommendation, the Dean shall meet with the Department Peer SPE Committee and the Chair to discuss the case and attempt to reach a shared recommendation. If a shared recommendation cannot be reached, the Dean shall add a letter to the SPE file citing specific reasons for his/her recommendation and final decision.

The faculty member may appeal the final decision to the University Provost. The faculty member will be allowed one week after receiving the Dean's written decision to prepare a written response to it. After reviewing the SPE file, the Provost (or his or her designee) will meet with the faculty member; the Chair, Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs (if requested), and the Dean of the College to discuss the outcome of the SPE. The Provost will prepare a written decision, which is not subject to further appeal. The faculty member shall receive a copy of this written decision.

Regardless of the outcome of the SPE process, the Chair will meet with each reviewed faculty member to discuss the final outcome. The discussion should center on the faculty member's future professional development, with the goal of enhancing meritorious work and/or improving performance in areas identified by the Evaluation. The faculty member shall receive copies (paper or electronic) of the Committee's report and the letter from the Dean regarding the outcome of the SPE at or before this meeting.

E. Performance Exceeding Expectations

Any faculty member whose performance Exceeds Expectations in the judgment of both the Department Peer SPE Committee and the Dean of the College shall receive a 3% performance increase to his or her base salary. This concludes the SPE.

F. Performance Meeting Expectations

Any faculty member whose performance Meets Expectations in the judgment of both the Department Peer SPE Committee and the Dean of the College shall receive a 1.5%

I. Articulation of Department Expectations

Each department that conducts annual evaluations shall define expectations for sustained performance among its tenured faculty in the areas of teaching, research, scholarship, clinical care, and service. These expectations should reflect the customs and practices of the department, 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, department expectations must also be sufficiently flexible to embrace the variability of faculty interests, activities, and strengths.

Since the SPE explicitly considers the annual assignments of each faculty member, department expectations should weigh appropriately the full range of assignments a tenured faculty member may receive.

As with other policies for faculty evaluation, the department's expectations for sustained performance must be approved by the Dean of the College of Medicine. Once approved by the Dean, each department's sustained performance expectations will be submitted to the University Provost for final approval. The Provost or designee may either approve the expectations or send it back with instructions to modify it. Once final, the Provost will publish the department expectations on a central website.

*** COMSPEPC Members: Keith Brew, Kathleen Guthrie, Xupei Huang, Morton Levitt (Chair),**