

Integrated Medical Science Department Criteria for Sustained Performance Evaluations

As described in the Provost's memorandum of October 3, 2016, the Sustained Performance Evaluation (SPE) is a periodic review of tenured faculty designed to foster sustained excellence and professional development, and to recognize and reward outstanding achievement. The SPE is distinct from the annual review and other evaluations in that it will focus on long-term accomplishments over a seven-year cycle. A peer review SPE Committee, consisting of at least three faculty members who are Associate or full tenured Professors, appointed according to the Charles E. Schmidt College of Medicine Sustained Performance Evaluation Guidelines, will 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 will 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 SPE will be conducted based on a file containing a brief summary of the faculty member's activities during the entire seven-year period under review. The file will contain:

- a current curriculum vita that clearly highlights accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarship, clinical care, and service during the period under review,
- 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, 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. The Department will store the original SPE files and copies will be sent to the College Faculty Affairs office.

Following the review, the Committee will provide a brief report summarizing their recommended assessment of each faculty member's performance during the evaluation period to be added to the SPE file. This 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. Expectations will address faculty performance in teaching, research, scholarship, clinical care, and service. However, patterns of performance over time in each category of assignment will also be taken into consideration. The final outcome will be determined after the Dean's administrative review. As with annual reviews, departmental expectations in each category will be weighted according to the assigned effort in each year.

Criteria for these performance categories are aligned with those articulated in the Integrated Medical Science Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and annual evaluation criteria, as applied to the seven-year review period, and are as follows:

EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS

There can be no annual evaluations with an overall rating of Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory in any of the prior seven years for an evaluation of Exceeds Expectations.

Any tenured faculty member who achieves one or more of the following:

1. Sustained overall annual evaluations of Exceptional or Outstanding in at least four or more of the preceding seven years

OR

2. Exemplary achievement in research, scholarship, teaching, clinical care or service, in addition to sustained overall annual evaluations of Good or better in each category in each prior year. Examples of exceptional achievements include but are not limited to one or more of the following:

- Exemplary performance in Teaching, which is supported by one or more of the following:
 - Exceptional or Outstanding ratings in Teaching in a majority of annual evaluations of the preceding seven years
 - Receiving the Distinguished Teacher of the Year Award, the FAU Excellence and Innovation in Teaching Award, or multiple College level teaching awards during one or more of the preceding seven years
 - Major contributions to the successful development, revision and implementation of curriculum, core courses or novel teaching materials and methods as evidenced by publications, production of texts or teaching software, etc.
 - Adoption of teaching materials and methods by other institutions, presentations in prestigious education meetings, or invited training sessions for teaching by other institutions
- Exemplary performance in Research or Scholarship, which is supported by the following data:
 - Exceptional or Outstanding ratings in Research or Scholarship in a majority of annual evaluations of the preceding seven years
 - Sustained extramural funding in at least four of the previous seven years
 - Receiving a National or International Award recognizing significant contributions to science or scholarship, or the FAU Scholar or Researcher of the Year Award during one or more of the preceding seven years
 - A sustained publication record over seven years that includes an average of at least one publication a year
 - Receiving a major extramural Program Grant as PI/Director (PPG, U grants, Center grants etc.)
 - Service as an editor or coauthor for a published textbook during the seven-year period, or as an editor-in-chief or section/associate, or equivalent editor for a peer reviewed journal
- Exemplary performance in Clinical Care, which is supported by the following data:
 - Exceptional or Outstanding ratings in Clinical Care in a majority of annual evaluations of the preceding seven years
 - Local or National awards for clinical excellence during one or more of the preceding seven years
 - Recognition as an outstanding clinician as evidenced by a state-wide pattern of clinical referrals and/or reputation for clinical excellence, by ratings in the top quartile

in reputable clinical assessment systems, or by leadership in selective clinical professional organizations

- Exemplary performance in Service, which are supported by the following data:
 - Exceptional or Outstanding ratings in Service in most annual evaluations of the preceding seven years
 - Receiving the FAU President's Leadership Award or any other applicable FAU service award during one or more of the preceding seven years
 - Service as a scientific advisor/board member for a National or International Foundation or Academy, or as President/Head of a National or International Scientific or Scholastic Society
 - Service to a federal or state agency on an Advisory Board or Policy Council, etc. (not grant review)
 - Through philanthropic work or community engagement, attainment of a major financial donation that has a significant positive impact on the reputation/prestige of the University, College, or Department

MEETS EXPECTATIONS

Any tenured faculty member who has achieved overall annual evaluations of Good or better in at least five or more of the last seven years.

- In addition to the number of annual evaluations of Good or better, consideration will be given to the pattern of evaluations over time, in the different categories of assignment.
- Consideration also will be given to the evaluation categories, recognizing that Needs Improvement and "Unsatisfactory" do not carry the same weight in terms of performance outcomes.

FAILS TO MEET EXPECTATIONS

Any tenured faculty member who has failed to receive an overall annual evaluation of Good or better during in five or more of the preceding seven years.

- In addition to the number of annual evaluations that fall short of Good, consideration will be given to the pattern of evaluations over time, in the different categories of assignment.
- Consideration also will be given to the evaluation categories, recognizing that "Needs Improvement and Unsatisfactory do not carry the same weight in terms of performance outcomes.

Dean approved 7/13/2017
Provost approved 7/25/2017