

**DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY**

POST TENURE REVIEW GUIDELINES

Post Tenure Review (PTR) is a periodic assessment of tenured faculty that evaluates faculty accomplishments over a period of multiple years.

General Information

The University requires that tenured faculty members receive a Post Tenure Review on a five-year cycle post tenure. The major objectives of this evaluation are to:

- Document performance during the previous five (5) years of assigned duties
- Recognize and reward sustained excellence in teaching, research, and/or service
- Identify and address performance that fails to meet expectations in teaching, research, and/or service

Post Tenure Review File

The faculty member undergoing PTR assembles a PTR file consisting of the following

- A current curriculum vitae that clearly highlights accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service during the period under review;
- Copies of the faculty member's last five annual assignments and annual reports, including faculty response(s);
- A copy of the report of the previous PTR, if available;
- A brief (2 page) narrative from the faculty member.

The contents of each PTR portfolio are to be kept confidential throughout the evaluation process.

Evaluation Process at the Department Level

1. The overall PTR process follows the strictures, guidelines, and processes laid out in the Office of the Provost's guidance documents as well as College of Arts and Letters' policies.
2. The PTR Advisory Committee in the Department of Anthropology will consist of the Associate and Full Professors. This committee will select its own chair. For the review of associate professors, the committee shall consist of faculty members of at least associate rank in the department. For the review of full professors, the committee shall

consist of all full professors in the unit. Should there be less than three faculty to constitute a committee, the chair and full professors in anthropology will select professors within the college at the appropriate rank to serve in the role.

3. The PTR Advisory Committee will meet, review the contents of the submitted documents, and holistically review the faculty member's performance over the five-year review period. Voting, if needed and as determined by the committee, will be by secret ballot.
4. The chair of the PTR Advisory Committee will write a concise memorandum to the department chair, outlining the committee's recommendation for the evaluation and PTR performance of the faculty member under review.
5. The department chair shall independently review the faculty member's PTR file, the PTR Advisory Committee's recommendation, and take into account any additional information within the faculty member's personnel file (e.g., findings of a completed and substantiated non-compliance with pertinent laws or university regulations; substantiated, excessive unapproved absences that impact performance; disciplinary actions by the university).
6. The chair will provide a PTR report and recommended performance rating for the faculty member. This report/recommendation is added to the PTR file and a copy is provided to the faculty member. The chair's report must include any additional personnel information (as outlined in number 5 above) utilized in the overall recommended performance rating.
7. The faculty member may respond to, or rebut, the PTR recommendations provided by the chair within five business days. Such response is not required, but if one is provided it is included PTR file. The PTR file is subsequently sent to the Dean's office.
8. After five business days, the PTR file is sent to the College Dean's office.

Articulation of Departmental Criteria for Evaluation

The PTR performance evaluation recommendations focus on **three core areas**: Teaching and other instructional activities; Research, scholarship, and creative accomplishment; and Service. The Department PTR Advisory Committee offers an independent evaluation based on information provided in the CV, prior assignments and evaluations over the review period, and the faculty narrative. In general, the PTR process is focused on providing a recommended rating of the faculty member's performance over the prior five-year period in Teaching, Research, and Service. Below are the most generally important elements to be evaluated in the PTR process.

1. Teaching

Teaching is evaluated holistically and may involve a variety of instruction-based activities and indicators. In addition to Student Perception of Teaching (SPOT) scores, overall teaching

evaluation may include the following:

- Directed independent studies (DIS)
- Undergraduate research curricular instruction
- Internship supervision
- Graduate and undergraduate thesis supervision
- Dissertation supervision
- Thesis committee participation
- Dissertation committee participation
- New course preparation
- Field and/or laboratory-based instructional activities
- Community engaged curricular instruction

2. Research

Research may include the following:

- Scholarly publications: books, articles in peer-reviewed journals, chapters in scholarly books
- Internal grants
- External grants
- Ongoing field and laboratory work
- Creative work such as museum exhibitions
- Conference presentations
- Undergraduate research supervision
- Community engaged research

3. Service

Service may take various forms and involve a number of assigned and voluntary activities within the university, profession, local community and K-12 and other educational environments.

University service may include:

- Chair or other officer on university/college/department committees, councils, assemblies and/or senates of recognized importance to university governance and operation
- Member on university/college/department committees, councils, assemblies and/or senates of recognized importance to university governance and operation
- Undergraduate research activities that address the mission and strategic goals of the university

Professional service may include:

- Appointed or elected to high office in a national or international scholarly or professional association
- Editor or book review editor for a scholarly journal
- Serving on the editorial board of a scholarly journal
- External reviewer for a manuscript or grant
- Editor or book review editor for a scholarly journal
- External program reviewer

Community service may include:

- Serving as an officer or member of a government or organizational board
- Giving presentations/talks to community organizations and K-12 and other educational environments
- Undergraduate research activities that address the community's needs, or the mission and strategic goals of the community

Performance Rating

A PTR score for a faculty member shall be computed according to a scale derived from the annual evaluations over the previous five years, modified as deemed appropriate through its holistic evaluative review by the PTR Advisory Committee. The scale assigns point values to overall annual evaluation scores in the following manner: Exceptional – 5, Outstanding – 4, Good – 3, Needs Improvement – 2, and Unsatisfactory – 1.

The additive, five-year PTR scale ranges from 5 to 25 points. The PTR performance score is apportioned as follows: Exceeds Expectations – 22 and above, Meets Expectations – 15-21, Does Not Meet Expectations – 8-14, Unsatisfactory – less than 8.

1. Performance Exceeding Expectations

In order to receive a rating of “Exceeds Expectations,” a faculty member must have received an overall score of 22 or more points. Exceeds Expectations may not include any annual evaluations of Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory during the five-year period under review.

2. Performance Meeting Expectations

In order to receive a rating of “Meets Expectations,” a faculty member must have received an overall score in the 15-21 point range over the five-year period. This score may not include two or more annual evaluations at the Needs Improvement level or one or more Unsatisfactory level during the five-year period under review.

3. Performance Does Not Meet Expectations

In order to receive a rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations,” a faculty member must have received an overall score of 8-14 points on the PTR scale. This score is the equivalent of receiving less than an average rating of Good for evaluations over the five-year period under review. In this category, performance overall does not meet the standard for “Meets Expectations.” For example, a completed and reviewed Performance Improvement Plan might show no progress.

4. Unsatisfactory Performance

Unsatisfactory for the Post Tenure Review process is assessed as a score of less than 8 on the PTR scale. Such a score indicates consistent, substantiated difficulty, over the review period, in carrying out one or more of the basic duties associated with teaching, research, and/or service. Performance reflects disregard or failure to follow prior Performance Improvement Plans or there is documented and substantiated incompetence or misconduct, as defined in applicable university regulations and policies, or applicable CBA provisions.

