

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROCESS
(Approved 3 December 2007)

CONTENTS

PREAMBLE	1
1 DEFINITIONS	1
2 SCOPE	3
2.1 PURPOSE	3
2.2 STATUS	4
2.3 ADOPTION & REVISION	4
2.4 APPLICABILITY	5
2.5 NOTICES	5
2.6 ACCESS TO RECORDS	6
2.7 RIGHT TO APPEND WRITTEN STATEMENT	6
2.8 DEFAULT FORMAT OF DOCUMENTATION	6
2.9 REMEDIATION ASSIGNMENTS	6
3 EVALUATION / PROCESS	7
3.1 ANNUAL EVALUATION	7
3.2 CMYA EXTENSION EVALUATION	10
3.3 PIC REMEDIATION EVALUATION	13
3.4 FMYA RE-APPOINTMENT EVALUATION	17
3.5 PROMOTION EVALUATION	19
3.6 SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION /CMYA	22
3.7 SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION / TENURE	25
3.8 PERFORMANCE RECOGNITION PROGRAMS	27
3.9 APPEALS	28
3.10 ROLE OF THE PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE	28
4 EVALUATION / CRITERIA	28
4.1 STANDARDS	29
4.2 CRITERIA	32
4.3 OVERALL EVALUATION RATING	42
4.4 PROMOTION CRITERIA	43
5 DOCUMENTATION	49
5.1 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN	49
5.2 ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REPORT	50
5.3 PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT CONTRACT	51
6 TEMPLATES FOR DOCUMENTATION	52

PREAMBLE

The College of Arts and Sciences of Florida Gulf Coast University recognizes that its primary mission is to deliver quality educational services in a professional academic setting that supports opportunities and demands responsibilities on the part of faculty. Opportunities include the exercise of academic freedom in research, publication, and classroom activities, the expectation to work in a diverse, collegial, and collaborative environment free from discrimination, and the right to be evaluated equitably according to reasonable performance standards. In return, faculty accept responsibilities including being active and informed contributors to the FGCU community and their chosen disciplines, maintaining a commitment to intellectual growth and professional development, honoring all facets of academic integrity, and achieving balanced productivity in teaching, service, and scholarship. This document, the PECAP, presents the formal procedure by which Arts and Sciences faculty shall be measured in fulfilling these multiple responsibilities. Faculty members are expected to manage their own professional career development, and to be familiar with appropriate evaluation criteria and processes.

The content of the PECAP has been influenced by factors both without and within the direct control of the College of Arts and Sciences. First, the PECAP must harmonize with rules codified at the university level in both the Faculty Performance and Evaluation Document and any concomitant Collective Bargaining Agreement. Additionally, it must accommodate the special needs and attributes of the college with the greatest diversity of disciplines and most philosophically comprehensive mission. Finally, it must be sufficiently appealing both in its challenge for excellence and its assurance for fairness that both the faculty and administration of the College of Arts and Sciences will regard it as the proper measure for success.

1 DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this document, the following terms and abbreviations apply:

APDR – the **Annual Professional Development Report** submitted by faculty to supervisor, see §5 for format and content.

BOT - the **Board of Trustees** of FGCU.

CBA - the **Collective Bargaining Agreement**, if any, existing during the period of applicability of the PECAP, or its successor document in force, which constitutes the formal contract between the FGCU BOT and any union duly authorized to act on behalf of faculty at FGCU, and regulates the terms of employment for FGCU faculty.

CGT – the **College Governance Team**, or its functional successor within CAS.

CMYA - **Continuing Multi-year Appointment**, an employment contract of three-year duration with an automatic renewal provision contingent upon performance criteria being met.

Essential Portfolio - tangible materials that provide evidence of progress toward performance goals stated for a limited time period, typically one evaluation year.

Evaluation Conference - face-to-face meeting between supervisor or other evaluator and faculty member under review to discuss draft evaluation documents.

Evaluation Year - the arbitrary year corresponding to the evaluation cycle which runs from May 1st to April 30th.

FAR - Faculty Activity Report, a pre-formatted summary time sheet for faculty required each semester by the State of Florida.

FMYA - Fixed Multi-Year Appointment, an employment contract of specific duration with no automatic renewal provision.

FPED - the Faculty Performance Evaluation Document, or such other university-wide document of like purpose and current force upon which the PECAP is based.

Good Standing - under contract as a full-time faculty member with no probationary status resulting from an unfavorable performance evaluation that withstands any appeal.

Supervisor - the chair of the CAS Department to which the faculty member belongs.

In-unit - under contract in a faculty position governed by any CBA in force; unless noted otherwise, the term *faculty* shall mean *in-unit faculty*.

PDP – the **Professional Development Plan**, see §5 for format and content.

PECAP - the **Performance Evaluation Criteria and Process** document specific to the CAS.

PET - Peer Evaluation of Teaching, broadly defined as an activity that relies on the input and critical feedback of colleagues to improve one's teaching effectiveness and may include (but is not limited to) the use of teaching cells, teaching squares, peer coaching, evaluation of a classroom visit, etc.

PIC - Performance Improvement Contract, a remediation measure associated with substandard performance under the terms of a CMYA, specifically in response to an “*overall unsatisfactory*” evaluation; the PIC is not an employment contract, but a binding version of a PIP which controls the offer of a contract extension.

PIP - Performance Improvement Plan, a remediation measure associated with substandard performance under the terms of any appointment contract other than a CMYA, and which is expressed as a modification of a subsequent PDP; it is not binding in the sense of the PIC.

PRC - Peer Review Committee, a standing committee within the CAS that participates in all faculty performance reviews except annual reviews and sustained performance evaluations.

PRR - Performance Review Report submitted by supervisor to faculty, see §5 for format and content.

PRE - Peer Review Evaluation - report by the Peer Review Committee to the Dean containing a recommendation for or against extension of a CMYA.

Remediation Year - the evaluation year following the evaluation year for which a finding of “*overall unsatisfactory*” has been recorded; performance during a remediation year governs the outcome of a PIC.

Service Year - a full year of service consists of two semesters of full time employment as Faculty; such semesters not necessarily in sequence, summer terms excluded.

Summer Term - the period of time between the last day of the spring term and the first day of a subsequent fall term during one calendar year. The official dates are those approved for a given academic year by the Faculty Senate.

SPE - Sustained Performance Evaluation, a longer term performance review for either tenured or CMYA faculty. CMYA faculty undergo a reappointment evaluation instead.

SPE - CMYA - Sustained Performance Evaluation for faculty on CMYAs.

SPE - T - Sustained Performance Evaluation for tenured faculty.

VPAA - Vice-President, Academic Affairs, the chief academic officer of the University.

Note: in the event that the FPED is revised such that there is a change in names for any of the above definitions, the new name shall take precedence over the old.

2 SCOPE

2.1 PURPOSE

This document shall govern all aspects of the scheduling, participation, conduct, standards used, criteria applied, outcomes determined, administrative actions taken, and formal records generated regarding certain faculty performance evaluation events. Administrative actions taken specifically includes disposition of any probationary status resulting from such evaluation events or appeals thereof. Evaluation events are structured performance reviews, which require a coordinated exchange of documents and in-person discussion between faculty members and

administrators or other designated evaluators. The types of evaluation events and their respective requirements for action by faculty members or administrators or other evaluators are described in §3. Standards for evaluation, criteria for meeting those standards, and representative professional activities fulfilling those standards to the degrees noted are presented in §4. Requirements for the minimum content and acceptable format for all documentation that is required to be submitted hereunder are specified in §5.

2.2 STATUS

CAS recognizes that the master document, which governs faculty performance evaluation at the University level, is the FPED. The FPED authorizes an extension of itself, the PECAP, specific to each College. The CAS PECAP, hereinafter “PECAP” shall elaborate and clarify the faculty evaluation process with regard to the special needs and attributes of CAS in a manner consistent with the FPED and CBA. The FPED and its extension, the PECAP, with due regard for any CBA which may be in force concomitantly, shall constitute the *entire description* of formal process for faculty performance evaluation.

2.2.1 LIMITATIONS

In the event that any provision of the PECAP is determined to be inconsistent with that of the underlying FPED, the FPED shall take precedence. In the event that any provision of the PECAP or FPED is inconsistent with any CBA that may be in force concomitantly, the CBA shall take precedence. In the event that the FPED is silent or unspecific on any matter addressed by the PECAP, the authority of the PECAP on the matter shall not be restricted thereby.

2.3 ADOPTION & REVISION

Provided that the FPED authorizing the PECAP has been approved at the University level, the PECAP itself shall be submitted to a confirmatory vote by secret ballot among all CAS faculty that are deemed eligible for this purpose by the CGT. Voting shall be conducted in a suitable format by the CGT. A quorum for this vote shall be at least 50% of eligible faculty. The PECAP shall be considered approved if a majority of a quorum of eligible faculty vote for acceptance. In the event that the PECAP is not approved by faculty vote, it may be revised and re-submitted for approval. The PECAP in effect, if any, at the time of such an approval vote, shall remain in effect until the approval vote for a revised PECAP is certified by the CGT.

Revision of any or all of the PECAP in force can be solicited at any time by any faculty member governed by the PECAP by petitioning the CGT in writing. The CGT may determine in its sole discretion whether a proposed revision constitutes a substantive revision. A proposed revision which is deemed non-substantive may be made to the PECAP by the CGT without a faculty vote provided a majority of CGT members approve the revision. Revisions deemed substantive by a majority vote of the CGT shall be submitted to a faculty vote according to the procedure above. Any substantive revision to the FPED approved by faculty at the University level or the CBA

shall entail a review of the PECAP by CGT for consistency and compliance with the FPED and CBA.

Any substantive revision to the PECAP shall take effect on May 1st after the faculty vote to ratify the change, in order to provide stability and consistency of the PECAP during the evaluation year.

2.4 APPLICABILITY

The PECAP shall apply to all faculty who occupy bargaining unit positions under the CBA. More specifically, it shall apply to all non-administrative faculty who hold tenure or tenure-track positions, FMYA contracts, or CMYA contracts, with or without modifications including, but not limited to, visiting or provisional appointments. Specific evaluation events for a particular faculty member shall be determined by contract status, promotion status, probationary status, tenure status, and/or similar factors.

2.4.1 EXCEPTIONS

Faculty who may perform administrative functions, which do not account for more than 50% of their FAR hours in any evaluation year, are not exempt from §2.4. Such faculty may be identified by titles subsidiary to division or department chair. Division or department chairs are specifically exempt from §2.4.

2.5 NOTICES

Subject to §2.5.1 hereof, all notices required by this document shall be considered delivered:

- (a) To a faculty member on the date such notice is either placed in his/her campus mailbox, or on the date such notice is mailed to his/her address, such address being the most current address in the faculty member's personnel file.
- (b) To an administrator on the date such notice is either placed in his/her campus mailbox, or on the date such notice is mailed to his/her campus address.
- (c) To the PRC on the date such notice is either placed in the PRC chair's campus mailbox, or on the date such notice is mailed to his/her campus address.

Responsibility for confirmation of delivery rests with the sending party. All notices shall be treated as confidential correspondence.

2.5.1 TEMPORARY ADDRESS

The address for notices hereunder to be delivered to a faculty member during the summer term shall be that specified in §2.5 (a), unless the faculty member declares in writing a temporary summer address to his/her supervisor. This temporary summer address may be modified by further written notice by the faculty member to the supervisor at any time during the summer term.

Should a faculty member declare a temporary summer address, and not respond to a notice delivered to an address other than the then current declared temporary summer address, the faculty member will be deemed not to have been sent such notice. In any case, the faculty member shall retain the right to respond to any such notice without penalty or administrative prejudice.

2.6 ACCESS TO RECORDS

All records and reports which may be prescribed for any purpose by this document shall be retained in such form by FGCU that they may be examined and/or copied by the faculty member to whom they apply. Access to such records and reports shall be granted during normal business hours upon prior written request. In the event that a faculty member chooses to exercise this right, such exercise shall not prejudice any subsequent evaluation of that faculty member.

2.7 RIGHT TO APPEND WRITTEN STATEMENTS

Faculty members retain the right to append a written statement to any report pursuant to any evaluation process authorized by the PECAP prior to the report being submitted to the intended reviewing or decision-making person or committee. This presupposes that the faculty member shall be given a draft copy of the report to be submitted. The statement must be tendered within two (2) working days of notification to the faculty member that the final report is to be issued. Such written statement, if any, shall be maintained as an inseparable part of such report.

2.8 DEFAULT FORMAT OF DOCUMENTATION

In the event that §5 hereof does not specify the content and/or format of any document generated under the authority and application of the PECAP, the document may be styled in any manner acceptable for its intended purpose and/or recipient(s).

2.9 REMEDIATION ASSIGNMENTS

If a faculty member is rated “*overall unsatisfactory*” as a result of an evaluation specified by the PECAP, and the faculty member makes a written commitment by the mechanisms provided herein to remedy the deficiencies underlying that evaluation, then the faculty member shall be considered the subject of rehabilitative and not disciplinary action. Moreover, any remediation assignments undertaken by the faculty member must be compatible with a forty-hour work week.

3 EVALUATION / PROCESS

There are eight types of evaluation events, each corresponding to a faculty review for different, although interrelated, purposes. Each event involves an interchange of documentation between a faculty member and his/her supervisor according to a fixed time frame that is coordinated with the faculty member's employment contract with the university. In addition to documentation, each evaluation event requires at least one evaluation conference, which is an in-person discussion between faculty member and supervisor to clarify evaluation in progress or to review a final evaluation report. Additional evaluation conferences may be agreed to by the parties at their discretion. In certain cases involving more intensive review, or where the faculty member seeks guidance in preparing documentation, the PRC may conduct its own discussion directly with the faculty member. Also, in cases where evaluation outcomes are in dispute between faculty member and supervisor, the PRC may attempt to resolve any conflict.

The types of evaluation events authorized are set forth below. If a faculty member must schedule an evaluation conference for more than one type of evaluation event for a given evaluation year, it shall be his/her right to choose whether to combine those events into a single conference. If a faculty member advises his/her supervisor in writing by March 31st of a given evaluation year that he/she does not intend to teach during the summer period, then the supervisor shall make a good faith effort to expedite all evaluation activities, specifically an evaluation conference, to release the faculty member from obligations under this document during the summer term.

As of the beginning of the evaluation year May 1st, 2003, there are no longer any tenure-line faculty in the CAS, and accordingly, the PECAP does not address tenure review, however there are tenured faculty who are subject to post-tenure sustained performance reviews, which are addressed by the PECAP. In the event that FGCU subsequently chooses to authorize tenure-line positions, the performance review associated with transition to tenure may be restored as an amendment to the PECAP.

3.1 ANNUAL EVALUATION

All faculty with FMYA appointments are subject to a performance review covering a period of one evaluation year, or part thereof for which the faculty member was under contract.

3.1.1 PARTICIPANTS

The annual evaluation shall be a review of a faculty member's performance for one evaluation year by his/her supervisor. Upon prior mutual agreement with the faculty member, the supervisor may solicit evaluative information from other CAS faculty for this purpose. The faculty member shall have the right to engage another CAS faculty member as an advisor for the review process, and that advisor shall be permitted, upon prior written authorization by the faculty member under review, to examine all documents submitted by the faculty member under review and to observe all meetings and discussions pursuant to the review as a passive participant.

3.1.2 TIMELINE

For a given evaluation year beginning May 1st and ending the following April 30th, the sequence of required actions by a faculty member and his/her supervisor is as follows:

By May 6th the faculty member shall submit to the supervisor a draft PDP for the new evaluation year, and by September 30th a final PDP, incorporating any amendments mutually agreed to by the faculty member and supervisor. An APDR for the current evaluation year shall be submitted by the faculty member to the supervisor by March 31st, however additional documentation relating to performance beyond this date may be submitted until April 23rd. The supervisor shall complete the corresponding evaluation and submit a draft PRR to the faculty member by April 30th.

For a given evaluation year the sequence of required actions by faculty member and supervisor during the *following evaluation year* are as follows:

By May 31st an evaluation conference between faculty member and supervisor regarding the PRR draft for the concluding evaluation year and PDP draft for the new evaluation year shall be completed. Within one week from the date of the evaluation conference, the supervisor shall submit a final PRR to the faculty member. The faculty member shall acknowledge receipt of the final PRR to the supervisor within one week of its receipt by returning a signed copy of the final PRR. This acknowledgement shall not constitute agreement with the report, in whole or in part, and shall not prejudice any subsequent appeal or remedy sought by the faculty member due to violation or alleged violation of the CBA. Receipt of such statement, if any, by the supervisor shall be acknowledged within one week by the return of a signed copy to the faculty member, and the statement shall be appended to the final PRR and regarded as part of the final PRR for any subsequent purpose. No formal appeal by a faculty member with regard to a PRR shall commence before June 1st following the evaluation year at issue.

3.1.3 REQUIRED SUBMITTALS

The forms listed in the following subsections are required submittals.

3.1.3.1 BY FACULTY

Each faculty member should refer to §5 for required content and recommended format of the PDP and APDR. A faculty member under review shall submit to his/her supervisor the following documents for performance evaluation in the current evaluation year:

- (a) Up-to-date curriculum vitae by March 31st.
- (b) APDR, including amendments to the PDP and a statement of self-assessment, by March 31st.
- (c) Essential portfolio materials by March 31st.

- (d) Relevant supporting documents.—Faculty may add to the portfolio any supporting documents related to spring performance, that were unavailable by March 31st. These documents may be added to the portfolio until April 30th. Any documents not available to the faculty member by April 30th and which subsequently do become available shall not affect the current evaluation, but shall be considered evaluative information for the immediately following evaluation year.
- (e) Draft PDP for next academic year by May 6th and final PDP by September 30th.

3.1.3.2 BY SUPERVISOR

The supervisor shall submit to the faculty member under review the following documents:

- (a) Draft PRR by April 30th.
- (b) Final PRR depending on the scheduling of the evaluation conference, but in no case later than June 7th of the following evaluation year.

At the time of the evaluation conference, the supervisor shall make available (and provide copies on request) to the faculty member the following documents:

- (a) Prior PRRs relating to the current appointment.
- (b) Any evaluative materials, solicited in accordance with §3.1.1 or not, received as of April 30th by the supervisor.

3.1.4 RESULTS

Following completion of the evaluation conference, the supervisor shall issue a final PRR to the faculty member under review in accordance with §3.1.3.2. This report shall present the results of the supervisor's assessment of the faculty member with regard to the evaluation standards and criteria established in §4 and shall conform to the content and format requirements of §5 hereof.

3.1.5 DEFICIENCIES

Any deficiencies in the faculty member's performance according to the evaluation standards and criteria in §4, which are noted by the supervisor in the PRR, shall be addressed by an appropriate PIP. See §5 for the required content and format of the PIP. The PIP shall be developed jointly by the faculty member and supervisor within thirty days of the issuance of the final PRR establishing the deficiencies, and shall be appended to the faculty member's PDP for the subsequent evaluation year. The remediation measures outlined in the PIP, acknowledged by the supervisor via written acceptance of the corresponding PDP, shall be automatically deemed sufficient by the supervisor to repair the deficiencies noted in the PRR.

3.1.6 APPEALS

§3.9 shall govern the appeal process for this evaluation.

3.2 CMYA EXTENSION EVALUATION

All faculty with a CMYA are subject to a performance review covering a period of one evaluation year, or part thereof for which the faculty member was under contract.

3.2.1 PARTICIPANTS

The CMYA evaluation shall be a review of a faculty member's performance for one evaluation year by his/her supervisor. Upon prior mutual agreement with the faculty member, the supervisor may solicit evaluative information from other CAS faculty for this purpose. The faculty member shall have the right to engage another CAS faculty member as an advisor for the review process, and that advisor shall be permitted, upon prior written authorization by the faculty member under review, to examine all documents submitted by the faculty member under review and to observe all meetings and discussions pursuant to the review as a passive participant.

3.2.2 TIMELINE

For a given evaluation year beginning May 1st and ending the following April 30th, the sequence of required actions by a faculty member and his/her supervisor is as follows:

By May 6th the faculty member shall submit to the supervisor a draft PDP for the new evaluation year, and by September 30th a final PDP, incorporating any amendments mutually agreed to by the faculty member and supervisor. An APDR for the current evaluation year shall be submitted by the faculty member to the supervisor by March 31st, however additional documentation relating to performance beyond this date may be submitted until April 23rd. The supervisor shall complete the corresponding evaluation and submit a draft PRR to the faculty member by April 30th.

For a given evaluation year the sequence of required actions by faculty member and supervisor during the *following evaluation year* are as follows:

By May 31st an evaluation conference between faculty member and supervisor regarding the PRR draft for the concluding evaluation year and PDP draft for the new evaluation year shall be completed. Within one week from the date of the evaluation conference, the supervisor shall submit a final PRR to the faculty member. The faculty member shall acknowledge receipt of the final PRR to the supervisor within one week of its receipt by returning a signed copy of the final PRR. This acknowledgment shall not constitute agreement with the report, in whole or in part, and shall not prejudice any subsequent appeal or remedy sought by the faculty member due to violation or alleged violation of the CBA. Receipt of such statement, if any, by the supervisor shall be acknowledged within one week by the return of a signed copy to the faculty member, and the statement shall be appended to the final PRR and regarded as part of the final PRR for any

subsequent purpose. No formal appeal by a faculty member with regard to a PRR shall commence before June 1st following the evaluation year at issue.

3.2.3 REQUIRED SUBMITTALS

The forms listed in the following subsections are required submittals.

3.2.3.1 BY FACULTY

Each faculty member should refer to §5 for required content and recommended format of the PDP and APDR. A faculty member under review shall submit to his/her supervisor the following documents for performance evaluation in the current evaluation year:

- (a) Up-to-date curriculum vitae by March 31st.
- (b) APDR, including amendments to the PDP and a statement of self-assessment, by March 31st.
- (c) Essential portfolio materials by March 31st.
- (d) Relevant supporting documents—Faculty may add to the portfolio any supporting documents related to spring performance, that were unavailable by March 31st. These documents may be added to the portfolio until April 30th. Any documents not available to the faculty member by April 30th and which subsequently do become available shall not affect the current evaluation, but shall be considered evaluative information for the immediately following evaluation year.
- (e) Draft PDP for next academic year by May 6th and final PDP by September 30th.

3.2.3.2 BY SUPERVISOR

The supervisor shall submit to the faculty member under review the following documents:

- (a) Draft PRR by April 30th.
- (b) Final PRR depending on the scheduling of the evaluation conference, but in no case later than June 7th of the following evaluation year.

At the time of the evaluation conference, the supervisor shall make available (and provide copies on request) to the faculty member the following documents:

- (a) Prior PRRs relating to the current appointment.
- (b) Any evaluative materials, solicited in accordance with §3.1.1 or not, received as of April 30th by the supervisor.

3.2.4 RESULTS

Following completion of the evaluation conference, the supervisor shall issue a final PRR to the faculty member under review in accordance with §3.2.3.2. This report shall present the results of the supervisor's assessment of the faculty member with regard to the evaluation standards and criteria established in §4 and shall conform to the content and format requirements of §5 hereof.

3.2.5 DEFICIENCIES

Performance deficiencies with respect to a CMYA are either minor or major.

3.2.5.1 MINOR DEFICIENCIES

If a faculty member receives an overall “*satisfactory*” evaluation in the PRR, then any performance deficiencies noted therein by the supervisor are automatically considered minor. Minor deficiencies shall be addressed by amending the faculty member's PDP for the subsequent evaluation year in a manner deemed mutually acceptable by the faculty member and supervisor. The corresponding remediation measures acknowledged by the supervisor via written acceptance of the amended PDP shall be automatically deemed sufficient by the supervisor to repair the deficiencies noted in the PRR. The faculty member shall be considered in *good standing* for the following evaluation year.

3.2.5.2 MAJOR DEFICIENCIES

If a faculty member receives an overall “*unsatisfactory*” evaluation in the PRR, then any performance deficiencies noted therein by the supervisor are to be considered major. Unless reversed on appeal (see §3.9), the finding of major deficiencies requires initiation of a PIC, which modifies the faculty member's CMYA in accordance with §3.2.6. The faculty member is considered *not in good standing* for the following evaluation year as of May 1st of that year, regardless of the date of issuance of the final PRR.

3.2.6 EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT RAMIFICATIONS

3.2.6.1 GOOD STANDING

Faculty members in good standing as of May 1st of a given evaluation year shall receive the offer of an employment contract on at least as favorable terms as his/her existing contract extending three years from that May 1st. Upon acceptance by the faculty member, this contract shall supersede the existing employment contract.

3.2.6.2 NOT IN GOOD STANDING (PROBATIONARY STATUS)

Faculty members not in good standing as of May 1st of a given evaluation year shall not receive the offer in §3.2.6.1, but rather they shall receive the offer of a remediation contract, the PIC.

3.2.6.3 PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT CONTRACT (PIC)

The PIC provides an avenue of contractual rehabilitation for faculty members having CMYAs and who have been evaluated as overall “*unsatisfactory*”. Refer to §5 for required format and content. Responsibility for the preparation of a PIC rests with the faculty member in consultation with his/her supervisor. The faculty member has the right to request assistance from the PRC to develop an acceptable PIC. In any case, the PRC is the final arbiter of the acceptability of a PIC, and the faculty member shall sign and deliver a copy of his/her PIC to the PRC. Satisfactory performance of the obligations of a PIC automatically entitle a faculty member to regain good standing at the expiration of the PIC, which coincides with the end of the evaluation year on April 30th. Unsatisfactory performance of the obligations of a PIC result in no change from probationary status to good standing, and no offer of a successive PIC. Satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance of the obligations of a PIC shall be determined by a separate evaluation event for this purpose (see § 3.3).

3.2.7 APPEALS

§3.9 shall govern the appeal process for this evaluation.

3.2.8 PRELIMINARY REVIEW BY PRC

The FPED provides for a structured Continuing Multiyear Appointment Preliminary Peer Review. This is an *informational review only* and, unlike the eight types of review described herein, has no binding effect on the faculty member’s contractual relationship with the university.

Each faculty member has a right to request a preliminary review of this nature to clarify his/her probable status upon official review for promotion or sustained performance under a CMYA. Preliminary PRC reviews shall be governed by the existing language of the FPED, insofar as conduct, scheduling, participants, documentation, and results. Preliminary PRC reviews are not appealable.

3.3 PIC REMEDIATION EVALUATION

Any faculty member who accepts the offer of a PIC pursuant to §3.2.6.2 shall be subject to a PIC remediation evaluation at the conclusion of the PIC term, which coincides with the evaluation year following the evaluation year that resulted in probationary status.

3.3.1 PARTICIPANTS

The PIC remediation evaluation shall be a review of a faculty member’s performance for one evaluation year by his/her supervisor and the PRC. Evaluation criteria for a CMYA are replaced by parallel criteria established by the PIC. Upon prior mutual agreement with the faculty member, the supervisor and/or PRC may solicit evaluative information from other CAS faculty for this purpose. The faculty member shall have the right to engage another CAS faculty

member as an advisor for the review process, and that advisor shall be permitted, upon prior written authorization by the faculty member under review, to examine all documents submitted by the faculty member under review and to observe all meetings and discussions pursuant to the review as a passive participant. The Dean of CAS shall communicate the final decision regarding extension or non-extension of the CMYA.

3.3.2 TIMELINE

The faculty member who is placed on probationary status as of May 1st of a given evaluation year due to an overall “*unsatisfactory*” evaluation under the terms of a CMYA must jointly inform his/her supervisor and the PRC of the intention to accept the offer of a PIC by May 15th of that evaluation year, whether or not the evaluation giving rise to probationary status is appealed under the rules set forth in §3.9. In the event that the faculty member does not accept the offer of a PIC, either by written declaration or default, and any appeal under the rules of §3.9 hereof or any legal challenge outside the framework of this document does not reverse the finding of overall “*unsatisfactory*”, the faculty member’s employment contract shall not be renewed and the faculty member will be evaluated in the penultimate and final years of his/her employment contract by the mechanism of the annual evaluation (see §3.1). Failure to either accept the offer of a PIC or enter an appeal of the overall “*unsatisfactory*” evaluation within the time periods specified herein constitutes acknowledgment by the faculty member that his/her employment contract shall not be renewed.

In the event that the faculty member accepts the offer of a PIC by May 15th subsequent to the evaluation year giving rise to probationary status, the sequence of required actions by a faculty member, his/her supervisor, and the PRC during the *remediation year* (see §1) is as follows:

By May 31st of the remediation year, the faculty member shall submit to the supervisor a draft PIC and by September 30th a final PIC, incorporating any amendments mutually agreed to by the faculty member and supervisor. By March 15th of the remediation year, the faculty member will complete an interim evaluation conference with his/her supervisor to discuss progress regarding the terms of the PIC. At the time of this interim evaluation conference, the faculty member will submit to the supervisor documentation supporting fulfillment of the PIC in progress. This documentation shall take the form of an APDR-PIC for the available period of the remediation year (see §6). By March 31st the supervisor shall submit an administrative report regarding fulfillment of the PIC requirements to the PRC. The faculty member has the right to schedule an evaluation conference to be informed of the content of the supervisor’s evaluation report prior to its submittal to the PRC. By April 30th, the PRC shall submit a PRE to the Dean of CAS. The faculty member has the right to schedule a conference with the PRC to be informed of the content of the PRE prior to its submittal to the Dean of CAS.

For the evaluation year *following the remediation year*, the sequence of actions required by the faculty member, his/her supervisor, and the Dean of CAS is as follows:

Based on the PRE submitted by the PRC, the Dean shall provide by May 6th written notice of renewal or nonrenewal of the CMYA to the faculty member. By June 15th the faculty member shall submit a draft PDP for the then current evaluation year, and a final PDP by September 30th. In the event no PDP is received by the supervisor by June 20th, the supervisor shall provide the faculty member with a letter of assignment. It is presumed that this latter situation would apply to nonrenewals, in which case the letter of assignment would describe faculty duties for the final year of the employment contract. If the finding of the Dean is for renewal, then the employment status of the faculty member is restored to *good standing* as of May 1st of the evaluation year following the remediation year, and the faculty member shall receive the offer of a three-year duration CMYA effective that date. In this case, actions required by faculty member and supervisor subsequent to submittal of a final PDP on September 30th shall be the same as that required in §3.2.2.

The Dean of CAS shall furnish a written report regarding the decision to renew or not renew the faculty member's CMYA to the VPAA by June 1st. The faculty member has the right to schedule a conference with the Dean to be informed of the content of the Dean's report prior to its submittal to the VPAA. Any appeal by the faculty member of the Dean's decision must be directed to the VPAA at this time and in this form.

3.3.3 REQUIRED SUBMITTALS

The forms listed in the following subsections are required submittals.

3.3.3.1 BY FACULTY

A faculty member under PIC remediation review shall submit to his/her supervisor the following documents for performance evaluation in the current evaluation (remediation) year:

- (a) Letter accepting the offer of a PIC by May 15th.
- (b) Draft PIC by May 31st and final PIC by September 30th.
- (c) APDR-PIC, as amended, including a statement of self-assessment, by March 15th.
- (d) Up-to-date curriculum vitae by March 15th.
- (e) Essential portfolio materials by March 15th.

Unavailability of required materials by March 15th to the faculty member through no fault of the faculty member shall not adversely reflect on the faculty member's compliance with the PIC remediation evaluation. Materials that may become available subsequently shall be admissible at the discretion of the faculty member to support his/her case for contract renewal up until the final decision by the Dean or VPAA.

3.3.3.2 BY SUPERVISOR

The supervisor shall submit to the faculty member under review the following documents:

- (a) Prior PRRs relating to the current appointment.
- (b) Statement of progress toward PIC requirements by January 15th as part of interim evaluation conference.

The supervisor shall submit to the PRC the following document:

- (a) Administrative summary of fulfillment of PIC by March 30th.

3.3.3.3 BY PRC

The PRC shall submit to the Dean of CAS the following document:

- (a) Peer Review Evaluation of fulfillment of PIC by March 30th.

3.3.3.4 BY DEAN OF CAS

The Dean of CAS shall submit to the VPAA the following document:

- (a) Report justifying the decision to renew or not renew the faculty member's CMYA.

3.3.4 RESULTS

If a faculty member is advised of nonrenewal, and this finding is upheld through any appeal or legal action, then he/she shall remain *not in good standing* for the duration of the employment contract in effect, and no contract extension shall be offered. The informal appeal mechanisms of §3.91 shall be unavailable to faculty members in this instance, since they are replaced by the right of direct appeal to the VPAA. Legal rights arising from the provisions of the CBA or those outside the administrative structure of the university may be exercised should informal appeal be unsatisfactory.

In the event that the finding by the Dean is for renewal, then the employment status of the faculty member is restored to *good standing* as of May 1st of the evaluation year following the remediation year, and the faculty member shall receive the offer of a three year duration CMYA effective that date. The faculty member's subsequent evaluations shall not be prejudiced by the fact that a PIC has been successfully discharged. A maximum of two PICS are permitted within the period of one SPE (see §3.6). All records relating to the probationary status of the faculty member shall be expunged from the personnel files containing them after the faculty member has completed an SPE satisfactorily.

3.3.5 RIGHT OF DISSENT BY DEAN

In the event that the finding of the Dean of CAS with regard to the renewal or nonrenewal of a faculty member's CMYA differs from that of the PRC, the Dean shall submit a dissenting report to the VPAA together with the Peer Review Evaluation. The VPAA shall then render the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal.

3.3.6 APPEALS

§3.9 shall govern the appeal process for this evaluation.

3.4 FMYA RE-APPOINTMENT EVALUATION

All faculty with a FMYA and who intend to seek re-appointment are subject to a performance review for this purpose. The period covered by the review is as follows:

- (a) For the first re-appointment review, the period shall be from the inception of the current contract to the end of the penultimate year of that contract.
- (b) For any subsequent re-appointment review, the period shall be from the previous re-appointment review to the end of the penultimate year of that contract.
- (c) A faculty member with at least one full year of service may, in his/her sole discretion, elect to accelerate the schedule of re-appointment evaluation by requesting his/her supervisor to conduct the evaluation at the end of an evaluation year prior to a penultimate year.

3.4.1 PARTICIPANTS

The FMYA re-appointment evaluation shall be a review of a faculty member's performance for one of the periods in §3.4 (a), (b), or (c) by his/her supervisor and the PRC. Upon prior mutual agreement with the faculty member, the supervisor and/or PRC may solicit evaluative information from other CAS faculty for this purpose. The faculty member shall have the right to engage another CAS faculty member as an advisor for the review process, and that advisor shall be permitted, upon prior written authorization by the faculty member under review, to examine all documents submitted by the faculty member under review and to observe all meetings and discussions pursuant to the review as a passive participant.

3.4.2 TIMELINE

For a given evaluation period, the sequence of required actions by a faculty member, his/her supervisor, the PRC, the Dean of CAS, and the VPAA is as follows:

By January 6th of the evaluation year established for the evaluation, the VPAA shall submit to the faculty member a notice to declare intent to renew, such declaration to be made by the faculty member not later than January 16th. The faculty member must submit the documentation package supporting renewal to his/her supervisor by January 30th. The PRC shall submit its recommendation to the supervisor on or before March

30th. The supervisor shall prepare a draft PRR in view of the PRC recommendation and schedule an evaluation conference with the faculty member by April 7th. The faculty member shall acknowledge reading the final PRR by signing it. This acknowledgment shall not constitute agreement with the report, in whole or in part, and shall not prejudice any subsequent appeal or remedy sought by the faculty member due to violation or alleged violation of the CBA. The Dean shall receive the recommendation based on the PRR from the supervisor by April 10th and make a renewal recommendation from CAS to the VPAA on or before April 15th. By April 30th the VPAA shall inform the faculty member of the final renewal or non-renewal decision. At the option of either the faculty member or the PRC, an evaluation conference may be scheduled after January 30th, but in any case prior to March 23rd, to permit a joint discussion of the documentation submitted in support of the renewal.

3.4.3 REQUIRED SUBMITTALS

The forms listed in the following subsections are required submittals.

3.4.3.1 BY FACULTY

Each faculty member should refer to §5 for required content and recommended format of the PDP and APDR. A faculty member under review shall submit the following documents in support of a FMYA renewal:

- (a) Notice of intent to seek renewal by January 16th.
- (b) Up-to-date curriculum vitae by January 30th.
- (c) Copies of all documents, including essential portfolio materials, submitted pursuant to annual evaluations since the previous re-appointment review, by January 30th.
- (d) Preliminary annual evaluation package consisting of information available for the current evaluation year, enumerated in §3.2.3.1, by January 30th.
- (e) Peer assessment of teaching by January 30th.
- (f) Review of service by January 30th.

3.4.3.2 BY ADMINISTRATION

The following documents shall be submitted by the administrator(s) noted to or on behalf of the faculty member under review:

- (a) Notice by VPAA to declare intent to renew by January 6th.
- (b) PRC recommendation to supervisor by March 30th.
- (c) Supervisor sends PRR with recommendation to CAS Dean by April 10th.
- (d) CAS Dean sends PRR and recommendation to VPAA by April 15th.
- (e) VPAA decision regarding renewal to faculty member by April 30th.

3.4.4 RESULTS

Following completion of the evaluation conference to review the draft PRR, the supervisor shall prepare a final PRR containing a self-assessment by the faculty member, an assessment by the supervisor, and an assessment by the PRC. This report shall accompany the recommendations for renewal or nonrenewal from supervisor to Dean and Dean to VPAA. Moreover, it shall present the results of the supervisor's assessment of the faculty member with regard to the evaluation standards and criteria established in §4 and shall conform to the content and format requirements of §5 hereof. An overall “*satisfactory*” evaluation by any evaluator (supervisor, PRC, or Dean) in the sequence requires that the corresponding recommendation given by that evaluator be in favor of renewal.

3.4.5 APPEALS

§3.9 shall govern the appeal process for this evaluation.

3.5 PROMOTION EVALUATION

All faculty on FMYA, CMYA, or tenure-line contracts who formally request promotion from assistant professor to associate professor, or associate professor to full professor are subject to a performance review covering their entire period of employment at FGCU and whatever prior periods of employment have been credited to their employment status at FGCU at the time of their hiring.

3.5.1 IN-RANK REQUIREMENT

Any faculty member requesting promotion shall have completed at least eight (8) semesters of full time teaching experience at current rank, *of which* at least two (2) semesters shall have been completed at FGCU, at the time the formal request for promotion is made. A faculty member not meeting this condition may request a waiver of the requirement based on exceptional circumstances by petitioning his/her supervisor.

3.5.2 PARTICIPANTS

The promotion evaluation shall be a comprehensive review of a faculty member's performance by his/her supervisor, the PRC, the Dean of CAS, selected senior faculty members, and, in cases where contributions by external evaluators may enhance the assessment of scholarship in a particular area, non-FGCU reviewers. The faculty member shall have the right to engage another CAS faculty member as an advisor for the review process, and that advisor shall be permitted, upon prior written authorization by the faculty member under review, to examine all documents submitted by the faculty member under review and to observe any meetings between the faculty member under review and his/her supervisor, the Dean of CAS, or the PRC as a passive participant. The faculty member and advisor, if any, are not direct participants in the deliberations of the PRC.

3.5.3 TIMELINE

Promotion evaluations shall be done during the spring semester of a given evaluation year, and all promotions shall take effect on May 1st to coincide with the beginning of the subsequent evaluation year, so that faculty maintain fixed rank during the period covered by annual evaluation and to which PDPs apply. A faculty member must submit a declaration to seek promotion to the VPAA by January 16th. This document constitutes the formal application for promotion, and must be supported by additional materials generated by and on behalf of the candidate. By January 30th the faculty member must submit all material supporting the promotion application to his/her supervisor, who shall notify the PRC that such materials are assembled for review and consideration. The faculty member reserves the right to prior consultation with the PRC on an informal basis to appraise the suitability and completeness of the application package.

By February 28th the Dean of Planning and Evaluation or his/her designate shall provide the results of a peer faculty poll to the faculty member's supervisor. The peer faculty poll shall be conducted among the associate and full professors in the CAS. Both associate and full professors shall be polled regarding a faculty member's request for promotion from assistant to associate professor and full professors shall be polled regarding a faculty member's request for promotion from associate to full professor. The result of any peer faculty poll shall be valid if participation by eligible faculty is less than full, however the faculty member under review reserves the right to an additional poll if participation by eligible faculty is not full for any such poll. If an admissible poll cannot be rendered by the deadline above, this component of the evaluation process is waived. Also by February 28th the PRC shall submit its recommendation regarding promotion to the faculty member's supervisor. By March 8th the supervisor shall inform the Dean of CAS of the recommendation made by the PRC, the supervisor's own recommendation, and the result, as available, of the peer faculty poll. The preceding results shall be summarized in a PRR prepared by the supervisor, which expressly shall contain the faculty member's self-assessment. The faculty member has the right to see and discuss a draft of this PRR with the supervisor as part of an evaluation conference prior to its submittal to the Dean of CAS. The faculty member shall acknowledge reading this report by signing it. This acknowledgment shall not constitute agreement with the report, in whole or in part, and shall not prejudice any subsequent appeal or remedy sought by the faculty member due to violation or alleged violation of the CBA. By March 15th the Dean of CAS shall make a recommendation to the VPAA regarding promotion of the faculty member. By March 30th the VPAA shall make a decision regarding promotion and advise the faculty member.

3.5.4 REQUIRED SUBMITTALS

The forms listed in the following subsections are required submittals.

3.5.4.1 BY FACULTY

A faculty member under review shall submit the following documents in support of promotion:

- (a) Up-to-date curriculum vitae by January 30th.
- (b) Copies of all documents, including essential portfolio materials, submitted pursuant to annual evaluations since the date of hiring by January 30th.
- (c) Preliminary annual evaluation package consisting of information available for the current evaluation year, enumerated in §3.2.3.1, by January 30th.
- (d) Peer assessment of teaching by January 30th.
- (e) Review of service by January 30th.
- (f) Documentation of previous years of service credited toward promotion by Dean of CAS, if applicable.

The faculty member's supervisor shall notify the PRC once the above materials have been received and are available for review.

3.5.4.2 BY PRC

The following document shall be submitted by the PRC to the faculty member's supervisor:

- (a) Recommendation for or against promotion to supervisor by February 28th.

3.5.4.3 BY SUPERVISOR

The following documents shall be submitted by the faculty member's supervisor:

- (a) Promotion application support materials to the PRC by January 30th.
- (b) PRC recommendation for or against promotion to the Dean of CAS by March 8th.
- (c) PRR containing the faculty member's self-assessment and a recommendation for or against promotion to the Dean of CAS by March 8th.

3.5.4.4 BY DEANS

The following documents shall be submitted by the respective Deans:

- (a) Dean of Planning & Evaluation sends faculty poll to supervisor by February 28th.
- (b) Dean of CAS sends recommendation for/against promotion to VPAA by March 15th.

3.5.5 RESULTS

If the faculty member's performance over the time period under consideration exceeds stated objectives, or in the absence of stated objectives exceeds reasonable expectations, according to the criteria set forth in §4 hereof, then the supervisor's PRR shall contain a recommendation in favor of promotion, and promotion shall not be unreasonably denied

If the faculty member's performance over the time period under consideration does not exceed stated objectives, or in the absence of stated objectives does not exceed reasonable expectations, according to the criteria set forth in §4 hereof, then the supervisor's PRR shall contain a recommendation to deny promotion. No prejudice shall attach to any future application for promotion by the faculty member or any other evaluation hereunder by such a result.

There shall be no restriction on the number of successive times that a faculty member may apply for promotion.

3.5.6 APPEALS

§3.9 shall govern the appeal process for this evaluation.

3.6 SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION / CMYA

All faculty on CMYA contracts are subject to an initial SPE in the seventh year of their continuous employment on a CMYA basis, and every seventh year of continuous employment on a CMYA basis thereafter. The period covered by the evaluation is six (6) years for the initial SPE, and seven (7) years for all subsequent SPEs.

3.6.1 PARTICIPANTS

The SPE - CMYA shall be a review of a faculty member's performance over an extended period as defined in §3.6 by his/her supervisor, the PRC, and the Dean of CAS. Upon prior mutual agreement with the faculty member, the supervisor, PRC, and/or Dean may solicit evaluative information from other CAS faculty for this purpose. The faculty member shall have the right to engage another CAS faculty member as an advisor for the review process, and that advisor shall be permitted, upon prior written authorization by the faculty member under review, to examine all documents submitted by the faculty member under review and to observe all meetings and discussions pursuant to the review as a passive participant. The faculty member and advisor, if any, are not direct participants in the deliberations of the PRC.

3.6.2 TIMELINE

By October 1st of the SPE year the faculty member shall submit to his/her supervisor the documentation package required for the SPE. By October 15th the supervisor sends a preliminary assessment of the faculty member's sustained performance for the period under review to the PRC. The faculty member reserves the right to review this preliminary assessment prior to its submittal to the PRC, and to append a statement thereto in accordance with §2.7, provided such statement is tendered within five (5) working days of the date of notification by the supervisor that the assessment report is complete. The faculty member shall acknowledge reading the assessment report by signing it. This acknowledgment shall not constitute agreement with the report, in whole or in part, and shall not prejudice any subsequent appeal or remedy sought by the faculty member due to violation or alleged violation of the CBA. By November 15th the PRC

considers the documentation package and the supervisor's assessment and submits its own final SPE report to the Dean of CAS with copies to the faculty member and supervisor. The faculty member shall acknowledge reading the final PRC report by signing it. This acknowledgment shall not constitute agreement with the report, in whole or in part, and shall not prejudice any subsequent appeal or remedy sought by the faculty member due to violation or alleged violation of the CBA. If the Dean of CAS concurs with the PRC assessment, favorable or not, then, pending appeal of an unfavorable outcome by the faculty member, the SPE process terminates and the faculty member's personnel file is updated with the final PRC report. In the event that the Dean of CAS does not concur with the findings of the PRC, then the PRC assessment and the Dean's contradictory assessment are submitted to the VPAA by December 15th. By January 15th the VPAA renders a final decision regarding the faculty member's satisfactory or unsatisfactory sustained performance and the faculty member's personnel file is updated accordingly.

3.6.3 REQUIRED SUBMITTALS

The forms listed in the following subsections are required submittals.

3.6.3.1 BY FACULTY

A faculty member under review shall submit the following documents *all by October 1st*:

- (a) Up-to-date curriculum vitae.
- (b) ADPRs for the period under review (this may be either six or seven years).
- (c) Supervisor's PRRs for the period under review (this may be either six or seven years).
- (d) PIC(s), if any, discharged during the period under review.
- (e) Self-assessment narrative for the period under review.
- (f) Essential portfolio materials.
- (g) Secondary portfolio materials, including, but not limited to, letters of support from students, colleagues, community members, and similar.

3.6.3.2 BY SUPERVISOR

The following documents shall be submitted by the faculty member's supervisor:

- (a) Preliminary assessment of the faculty member's sustained performance for the period under review to the PRC by October 15th.
- (b) Any supporting documentation obtained pursuant to §3.6.1, with notification to the faculty member.

3.6.3.3 BY PRC

The following document shall be submitted by the PRC to the Dean of CAS:

- (a) Final SPE report to the Dean of CAS by November 15th.

3.6.3.4 BY DEAN OF CAS

In the event that the Dean of CAS disagrees with the findings of the PRC regarding acceptability of the faculty member's sustained performance, then the following documents shall be submitted by the Dean of CAS to the VPAA:

- (a) Final SPE report to the Dean of CAS by December 15th.
- (b) Dean's assessment of faculty member's sustained performance by December 15th.

3.6.4 RESULTS

Regarding the supervisor's assessment for the extended review period, if the CMYA extension evaluations in each year of the review period conclude with an overall "*satisfactory*" finding, then the supervisor must conclude that the sustained performance over that period has been overall "*satisfactory*". This report shall address the standards set forth in §4 hereof and contain a recommendation regarding extension of the faculty member's CMYA.

Regarding the PRC's final SPE report, recommendations that may assist the faculty member in improving performance, including, but not limited to, those addressing allocation of university resources or modifications to assignment, shall be provided. Such recommendations shall be incorporated in the subsequent PDPs of the faculty member. The PRC report shall contain a statement characterizing the suitability of any faculty member to be promoted. The following two conditions apply only to a faculty member with a CMYA at the rank of assistant:

- (a) Substantial progress towards promotion to associate shall be made before the first SPE-CMYA.
- (b) Promotion to associate shall have been achieved before the second SPE-CMYA.

If *either* of these conditions is unfulfilled, then the faculty member's employment contract is subject to termination at the end of the evaluation year following the evaluation year in which the SPE was made.

3.6.5 RIGHT OF DISSENT BY DEAN

In the event that the finding of the Dean of CAS with regard to the faculty member's sustained performance is at variance with that of the PRC, the Dean shall submit a dissenting report to the VPAA together with the PRC report. The VPAA shall then render the final decision regarding adequacy of sustained performance.

3.6.6 APPEALS

§3.9 shall govern the appeal process for this evaluation.

3.7 SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION / POST-TENURE

All tenured faculty are subject to a SPE-T in the seventh year after receipt of tenure, promotion, or advancement, and every seventh year thereafter. The period covered by the evaluation is six (6) years for the initial SPE-T, and seven (7) years for all those subsequent. In the event that a faculty member has been evaluated as overall “*satisfactory*” during each year of the extended evaluation period according to §3.1, then he/she shall be subject to a *short* SPE-T. Otherwise the faculty member shall be subject to an *extended* SPE-T.

3.7.1 PARTICIPANTS ~ SHORT SPE -T

The short SPE - T shall be a review of a faculty member’s performance over an extended period by his/her supervisor and the Dean of CAS. Upon prior mutual agreement with the faculty member, the supervisor and/or Dean may solicit evaluative information from other CAS faculty for this purpose. The faculty member shall have the right to engage another CAS faculty member as an advisor for the review process, and that advisor shall be permitted, upon prior written authorization by the faculty member under review, to examine all documents submitted.

3.7.2 PARTICIPANTS ~ EXTENDED SPE -T

The extended SPE - T shall be a review of a faculty member’s performance over an extended period by his/her supervisor, the PRC, and the Dean of CAS. Upon prior mutual agreement with the faculty member, the supervisor and/or Dean may solicit evaluative information from other CAS faculty for this purpose. The faculty member shall have the right to engage another CAS faculty member as an advisor for the review process, and that advisor shall be permitted, upon prior written authorization by the faculty member under review, to examine all documents submitted.

3.7.3 TIMELINE

By January 6th of the SPE-T year, the Dean of CAS shall notify all tenured faculty subject to the review. By January 30th the faculty member shall submit to his/her supervisor the documentation package required for the SPE-T. If the faculty member qualifies for a short SPE-T by §3.7, then by February 28th the supervisor shall submit a report to the Dean of CAS confirming an overall “*satisfactory*” for the SPE-T. If the faculty member is subject to an extended SPE-T by §3.7, then the supervisor shall make available to the PRC the documentation package submitted by the faculty member, and the PRC shall make a formal written assessment of the sustained performance of the faculty member and submit this report to the supervisor by February 21st. Then by February 28th the supervisor will prepare a final sustained performance evaluation based on his/her own assessment and the PRC report and forward it to the Dean of CAS. The faculty member has the right to view a draft of this report prior to its submittal and to discuss the findings in an evaluation conference. The faculty member shall acknowledge reading the final

PRC report by signing it. This acknowledgment shall not constitute agreement with the report, in whole or in part, and shall not prejudice any subsequent appeal or remedy sought by the faculty member due to violation or alleged violation of the CBA. By March 15th the Dean of CAS shall make a report based on the supervisor's report and his/her own assessment to the VPAA stating whether the faculty member's sustained performance has been overall "satisfactory" or overall "unsatisfactory". By March 30th the VPAA shall inform the faculty member of the preceding decision.

3.7.4 REQUIRED SUBMITTALS

The forms listed in the following subsections are required submittals.

3.7.4.1 BY FACULTY

A faculty member under review shall submit the following to his/her supervisor by January 30th:

For short or extended SPE-Ts:

- (a) Up-to-date curriculum vitae .
- (b) ADPRs for the period under review (this may be either six or seven years).
- (c) Supervisor's PRRs for the period under review (this may be either six or seven years).
- (d) Essential portfolio materials for the period under review.

For extended SPE-Ts only:

- (e) Annual review documentation package per §3.1.3.1 for the SPE-T year.
- (f) Self-assessment of sustained performance.

3.7.4.2 BY SUPERVISOR

The supervisor shall submit to the Dean of CAS a SPE report by February 28th, the content of which shall be determined by whether the SPE-T is short or extended. In the latter instance the independent evaluation of sustained faculty performance by the PRC shall be subsumed by the supervisor's report.

3.7.4.3 BY PRC

The PRC shall submit to the supervisor an independent written and signed assessment of the faculty member's sustained performance on a sufficiently timely basis to allow the submittal by the supervisor in §3.7.4.2.

3.7.4.4 BY DEAN OF CAS

The Dean of CAS shall submit to the VPAA a SPE-T report by March 15th, the content of which shall represent the combined judgment of the supervisor and Dean of CAS, together with the PRC if the SPE-T was extended.

3.7.5 RESULTS

If the final SPE-T finding is overall “*satisfactory*”, the Dean’s report to the VPAA shall become a permanent part of the employee’s personnel file. If the finding is overall “*unsatisfactory*”, then a PIP is formulated jointly by the faculty member and supervisor to address any deficiencies noted.

3.7.6 DEFICIENCIES

With regard to mitigation of the deficiencies noted in §3.7.5, the PIP shall be of sufficient specificity, the time frame for its implementation sufficiently practical, and sufficient resources of the university placed at the disposal of the faculty member to ensure a reasonable opportunity for success. The President of the university or his/her designate shall review the PIP before its implementation and shall provide written authorization therefore in accordance with the CBA. The supervisor shall update the faculty member’s personnel file at six-month intervals during the term of the PIP with written assessments of progress or non-progress toward the goals of the PIP.

3.7.7 APPEALS

§3.9 shall govern the appeal process for this evaluation.

3.8 PERFORMANCE RECOGNITION PROGRAMS

These include, but are not limited to, Teaching Incentive Program (TIP), Professorial Excellence Program (PEP), and merit pay adjustments

3.8.1 MANAGEMENT

Responsibility for evaluations whose essential character is recognition within the university of superior performance leading to one-time pay adjustments or non-financial awards shall be vested in the faculty committees or administrative bodies that are empowered to make the award(s). The PECAP defers to such committees or administrative bodies with regard to all aspects of these evaluations. However, the evaluative instruments mandated by the PECAP may be used as a basis for such adjustments or awards with the prior consent of the faculty member being considered.

3.9 APPEALS

Faculty members retain the right to appeal the results of a PRR. Appeals may be informal or formal.

3.9.1 INFORMAL

The right to initiate an informal appeal expires on September 30th of the evaluation year following the year covered by the PRR at issue. An informal appeal shall be considered to have been initiated whenever the faculty member notifies the PRC of such intent in writing. The PRC shall function as arbiter in all cases of informal appeal of the results of a PRR, and shall conduct a prompt hearing to attempt to resolve the issues at hand. The decision of the PRC is final with regard to an informal appeal, and such decision shall be communicated in writing to the Dean of the CAS with copies to the faculty member and supervisor.

3.9.2 FORMAL

The outcome of any informal appeal does not affect the right of any faculty member to make a formal appeal within the bargaining unit structure governed by the CBA or to seek relief from the court outside of that structure.

3.10 ROLE OF THE PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE

The PRC has three functions:

- (a) To review an application for promotion or contract extension and render an opinion to the Dean.
- (b) To judge informal appeals by faculty of PRRs.
- (c) To advise and mentor faculty regarding the promotion process, portfolio development, and related issues.

4 EVALUATION/ CRITERIA

The PECAP draws a distinction between standards and the criteria used to determine whether those standards have been met to an acceptable degree. Standards are the professional values of the CAS, while criteria are indicators of adherence to those values. The three fundamental areas of professional activity in which ranked faculty shall be evaluated are *teaching, service, and scholarship*, broadly defined. The fundamental area of professional activity in which instructors shall be initially evaluated is in *teaching*, and upon promotion also in *service* and *scholarship* as contracted, all broadly defined. The three fundamental areas of professional activity in which academic advisors shall be evaluated are *advising, service, and professional development*, broadly defined. This section sets forth the standards established for each of these fundamental areas and then discusses the criteria by which performance with regard to those standards may be assessed.

Any evaluation document that is intended to establish a framework for assessing the activities of faculty in widely diverse disciplines is necessarily going to be general and rely heavily on subjective judgments by both faculty in stating objectives and administrators in gauging the degree of success in achieving them. Moreover, the collective view of some aspects of the PECAP by faculty may change over time, and a reasonable degree of flexibility, up to the point of an explicit amendment, should be provided. Accordingly, in discussing standards and criteria, an effort has been made to provide an objective floor above which more subjective elements can be elaborated that are suited to the faculty member's unique engagement with his/her discipline, professional aspirations, and career momentum.

The PECAP adopts the consistent terminology of the FPED with regard to rating the outcome of assessment with respect to criteria. The terms "*satisfactory*" and "*unsatisfactory*" are reserved for *overall* performance with respect to teaching, service, and scholarship collectively in an evaluation year or other assessment time frame. The terms "*exceeds*", "*meets*", and "*does not meet*" are reserved for assessments with respect to teaching, service, and scholarship individually in an evaluation year, and it is understood that what is being exceeded, met, or not, as the case may be, are the *objectives* stated by the faculty with regard to evaluation criteria in a PDP.

4.1 STANDARDS

4.1.1 TEACHING

Teaching is the most important of the three areas of professional activity, and is broadly defined to include activities that impart knowledge both inside and outside the normal classroom setting. These activities include, but are not limited to, mentoring or advising students, supervising scholarly work by others, and developing or maintaining systems to deliver distance learning or to supplement the classroom experience.

The standards that may be used to indicate teaching effectiveness are:

- (a) Discipline competence - an effective teacher is identified by a sufficient command of his/her discipline(s) that he/she may impart knowledge to students with measurable results and sufficient command of pedagogical methods to do so in varied settings with measurable performance.
- (b) Interdisciplinarity - effective teaching is evidenced by pedagogical involvement and expression in fields, which connect to the faculty member's basic discipline.
- (c) Innovation - effective teaching is identified, to the extent appropriate for the discipline involved, active experimentation to improve instructional methods.
- (d) Reflection - an effective teacher is a student of his/her own teaching experience, and use examination of that experience for improvement of instructional methods.

- (e) Stewardship - the goals of an effective teacher coincide with the broader goals of the CAS, specifically, the health, renewal, and development of the learning enterprise it embodies as a living institution.

4.1.2 SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship is considered synonymous with scholarly activity for the purposes of the PECAP.

Although the inspiration for and outcome of scholarship may interrelate to a greater or lesser extent with teaching, its primary manifestation is expanding the limits within a discipline of what is known, what has been created, or what has been performed. With full recognition of its necessarily personalized nature, scholarship should nevertheless transcend personal interests and serve a broader purpose. To the extent that the products of scholarship can be appreciated by a community wider than the immediate discipline, they should be disseminated. While the intensity of scholarly activity may ebb and flow for a particular scholar depending on the cycle of competing professional demands, it is understood that a continuous career-long commitment to scholarship is essential for professors of any rank.

The standards that may be used to indicate scholarly activity are:

- (a) Discipline focus - an effective scholar contributes to the advancement of his/her discipline(s) by creating expressions of scholarship in forms that are generally recognized as appropriate for the discipline(s).
- (b) Interdisciplinarity - effective scholarship cultivates intellectual breadth by seeking connections with disciplines that have a natural relevance to the scholar's specialty discipline(s).
- (c) Pedagogy - effective scholarship shall examine and promote effective pedagogy for its own sake.
- (d) Mentorship - effective scholars make an effort to structure scholarly activities to allow and encourage the meaningful participation of students or junior colleagues.
- (e) Stewardship - wherever possible, effective scholars align the objectives of their scholarly activity with those of the CAS, specifically to support and enhance the visibility, reputation, resources, and institutional aspirations of the learning enterprise it represents.

4.1.3 SERVICE

Service by faculty includes service to the university or any of its parts, service to the faculty member's profession, and service to the community-at-large which derives either from the

faculty member's association with the university or his/her profession. Activities qualifying as service shall be verifiable with respect to a faculty member's individual participation and productivity. It is understood that no remuneration beyond faculty salary other than nominal honoraria or reimbursement of expenses shall attach to any qualifying service activity.

The standards that may be used to indicate service are:

- (a) Discipline benefit - effective service contributes to the health and development of programs sustaining the faculty member's discipline(s) within the university and those professional associations dedicated to advancing the discipline(s) in the broader academic community.
- (b) Outreach - effective service promotes professional dialogue, cooperation, and accomplishment with communities beyond the university.
- (c) Learning Enrichment - effective service pushes the learning enterprise beyond its role in the conventional instructional mission.
- (d) Stewardship - effective service embraces participation in the governance of the university and its parts, including definition of policies, management of programs, and coordination of university operations.

4.1.4 ADVISING BY ACADEMIC ADVISORS

Academic advising is the most important of the three areas of professional activity for an academic advisor, and is broadly defined to include activities that impart knowledge both inside and outside the normal advisory setting.

The standards that may be used to indicate advising effectiveness are:

- (b) Advising competence - an effective advisor is identified by a sufficient command of his/her discipline(s) that he/she may professionally advise students with sufficient command of advisory methods, and to do so in varied settings.
- (b) Interdisciplinarity - effective advising is evident to adapt to and enable a student's own interdisciplinary interests as well as meeting interdisciplinary goals stated in university-wide and college-wide learning outcomes.
- (c) Innovation - effective advising is identified, to the extent appropriate for the students involved, active experimentation to improve advising methods.

- (d) Reflection - an effective advisor is a student of his/her own advising and instructional experience, and examines that experience for improvement of advising and instructional methods.
- (e) Stewardship - the goals of an effective advisor coincide with the broader goals of the CAS.

4.1.5 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR ACADEMIC ADVISORS

With full recognition of its necessarily personalized nature, professional development of an academic advisor should nevertheless transcend personal interests and serve a broader purpose. While the intensity of professional development activity may ebb and flow for a particular advisor depending on the cycle of competing professional demands, it is understood that a continuous career-long commitment to professional development is essential for advisors of any level.

The standards that may be used to indicate professional development activity are:

- (a) Discipline focus - an effective advisor undertakes professional development activities that are generally recognized as appropriate for the discipline of advising.
- (b) Interdisciplinarity - effective professional development cultivates intellectual breadth by seeking connections with disciplines represented in the CAS.
- (c) Pedagogy - effective professional development shall examine and promote effective pedagogy or best advising practices for its own sake.
- (d) Mentorship - effective professional development activities allow and encourage the meaningful involvement of students or colleagues.
- (e) Stewardship - wherever possible, effective professional development activities are aligned with objectives that support the mission of the CAS, specifically to support and enhance the visibility, reputation, resources, and institutional aspirations of the learning enterprise it represents.

4.2 CRITERIA

Criteria serve as the yardsticks for measuring how effectively standards are met. While all standards are relevant to the discharge of professional duties, some criteria may not be applicable in every situation, and the PECAP allows for judgment on this point. Criteria may also overlap in the sense that they measure two or more aspects of the same activity.

A faculty member shall state objectives with regard to all applicable criteria as part of his/her PDP at the beginning of the evaluation year. At the end of the evaluation year, the faculty member shall substantiate performance with respect to all applicable criteria by adducing evidence in some form that is acceptable by prior agreement to his/her supervisor. The ratings of “*exceeds*”, “*meets*”, and “*does not meet*” may be used to characterize performance with respect to individual criteria as well as overall performance with respect to teaching, scholarship, and service. Professorial rank shall be considered in assigning ratings.

4.2.1 TEACHING

The criteria to be used for measuring effective teaching, and which address the standards of §4.1.1 are:

- (a) Competence in teaching (reported by students) as measured by standardized university evaluation forms, and if applicable, any additional course-based student evaluation tools.*
 - (i) Competence in teaching the standard subject matter of the faculty member’s discipline(s).*
 - (ii) Competence in teaching interdisciplinary subject matter, if applicable.*
- (b) Competence in teaching (reported by peers) as measured by peer evaluation tools or by involvement in peer teaching development activities (such as, but not limited to, teaching cells, teaching squares, peer coaching, mentoring, teaching workshops, teaching breakfasts, classroom observations, etc.).*
- (c) Competence in developing and applying innovative instructional methods, if applicable as measured by development of specific courses and syllabi, whether new courses or repeated courses taught; and / or as measured by evidence of active learning techniques, including, but not limited to, alternative delivery methods inside and / or outside the classroom, integration of appropriate technology, service learning, team teaching, participation in professional seminars, workshops, or conferences on innovative teaching; and / or as measured by other course-related materials or activities.*
- (d) Competence in applying the results of self-assessment of prior teaching to sustaining or improving instructional effectiveness as measured by reports in the PDP and Annual Review and by applications in the classroom, which may include, but not limited to, the identification of existing teaching strengths and areas for development, creation of strategies for improvement and continual effectiveness, incorporation of feedback from peers and students, and appropriate revision of course syllabi and teaching methods.*
- (e) Competence in advancing the teaching mission of CAS, to the extent that the faculty member and supervisor mutually agree upon in advance as measured by*

contributions to general education, interdisciplinary studies, intercultural perspectives, service learning, ecological perspectives, civic engagement, or any other identified teaching mission.

The following factors may be considered when assessing the above criteria:

- (a) Class size
- (b) Course classification
 - (i) General education or upper division
 - (ii) Required or elective
 - (iii) Lab or lecture
- (c) Attrition rate
- (d) Final grade distribution
- (e) Comparison of student evaluation of teaching with that of like courses
- (f) Effects of team teaching
- (g) New course preparation

4.2.2 SCHOLARSHIP

Any or all of the following criteria, which address the standards of §4.1.2, may be used for measuring effective scholarship:

- (a) Level of productive involvement in adding substantively to the body of knowledge or work that characterizes a discipline.*
- (b) Scope and results of the review of scholarly output by peers.*
- (c) Extent that scholarship supports interdisciplinarity.*
- (d) Level of productive involvement in adding to the pedagogical resources that benefit a discipline.*
- (e) Extent that scholarship incorporates mentoring relationships.*
- (f) Extent that scholarship contributes to the visibility and reputation of the university as a center for scientific, literary, and artistic endeavor, or garners tangible resources to operate or improve the university's scholarly infrastructure*

The preceding criteria apply equally to scholarship that results in a tangible work product and that which is essentially intangible and ephemeral, and in all likelihood irreproducible, such as an artistic performance. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to describe to his/her supervisor how scholarly activities projected for an evaluation year bear on the standards for scholarship articulated in §4.1.2. Moreover, at the conclusion of the evaluation year, the faculty member is

responsible for clarifying to his/her supervisor how scholarly activities completed during the period achieved, in whole or in part, previously stated objectives.

A list is presented below which is a *guide only* to the spectrum of activities that would support, to varying degrees, a favorable evaluation in the area of scholarship. ***The five main categories have equal stature.*** Specific activities within each category may be differentiated in importance according to the general principles immediately following. As a general rule, the PECAP takes the view that scholarship should be defined broadly, in the sense of Boyer/Carnegie Foundation for Higher Education.

1) Scholarly Contributions / Technically-oriented

- Technical books based on original research
- Research monographs
- Book chapters
- Translations of technical books/articles
- Articles and essays
- Patents
- Licensable computer programs
- Technological innovations
- Journal problem solutions
- Publication of case study analyses
- Metastudies
- Other

2) Scholarly Contributions / Creatively-Oriented

- Book length works of a substantially creative nature
- Works of art
- Articles, essays, poems
- Theatrical productions
- Musical compositions
- Performances of theatrical or musical works
- Readings of original works
- Translations of creative works
- Curating exhibits or collections
- Other

3) Scholarly Contributions / Pedagogically-Oriented

- Textbooks
- Expository articles
- Synthetic anthologies
- Research on educational topics
- Commentary on curricular issues
- Commentary on teaching methodologies
- Development of teaching technologies

Development of instructional aids
Other

4) Scholarly Contributions / Review

Editorial management of academic publications
Editorial oversight of academic publications
Referee for journals
Referee for grant proposals-external
Referee for grant proposals-FGCU
Reviewer / juror
Other

5) Scholarly Contributions / Resource Development

Peer-reviewed grant proposals
Non-competitive grant proposals
Contracted support of scholarly activities
Other

There are single factors, all else being equal, which allow qualitative rankings within the five general categories above. These are contained in the following general principles for ranking scholarly activities:

- (a) Original research is assigned a higher relative rank than derivative research.
- (b) More rigorous critical review is assigned a higher relative rank than less rigorous.
- (c) Wider audience for dissemination is assigned a higher relative rank than narrower.
- (d) Active management is assigned a higher relative rank than passive.
- (e) Work that is published (resp. submitted for publication) is assigned a higher relative rank than work that is not.

- (f) Grants obtained are assigned a higher relative rank than those pending, and those pending are of higher rank than those in preparation.
- (g) Creative activities are assigned a higher relative rank than non-creative.
- (h) Student or junior faculty mentorship discounted, first or sole authorship is assigned a higher relative rank than otherwise when appropriate based on the norms of the academic discipline.

4.2.3 SERVICE

Any or all of the following criteria, which address the standards of §4.1.3, may be used for measuring effective service:

- (a) *Level of productive involvement that benefits a discipline*
 - (i) *within the CAS.*
 - (ii) *externally via professional organizations.*

(b) Level of productive involvement with constituencies external to FGCU.

(c) Level of productive involvement with extension of the learning enterprise beyond its normal role within FGCU.

(d) Level of productive involvement with university governance and non-instructional operation.

It is incumbent upon the faculty member to describe to his/her supervisor how service activities projected for an evaluation year bear on the standards for service articulated in §4.1.3. Moreover, at the conclusion of the evaluation year, the faculty member is responsible for clarifying to his/her supervisor how service activities completed during the period achieved, in whole or in part, previously stated objectives.

A list is presented below which is a **guide only** to the spectrum of activities that would support, to varying degrees, a favorable evaluation in the area of service. **The three main categories have equal stature.** Specific activities within each category may be differentiated in importance according to the general principles immediately following.

1) Service / University

- Faculty Senate
- Standing committee / university or CAS
- Ad hoc committee / university or CAS
- Advisory board
- Event management
- Student organization

2) Service / Discipline

- Conference
- Professional association

3) Service / Community

- Community organization
- Community event
- Public schools
- Expert contact / consultant

There are single factors, all else being equal, which allow qualitative rankings within the three general categories above. These are contained in the following general principles for ranking service activities:

a) Leadership of committee/board/organization is assigned a higher relative rank than simple participation.

- (b) Substantive contribution to the work of a committee is assigned a higher relative rank than perfunctory.
- (c) Ongoing, regular participation is assigned a higher relative rank than sporadic or one-time.
- (d) National is assigned a higher relative rank than state, state is assigned a higher relative rank than regional, regional is assigned a higher relative rank than local participation.
- (e) More important mission of a committee is assigned a higher relative rank than less important.

4.2.4 CRITERIA FOR ACADEMIC ADVISORS

Academic Advising is an integral form of instruction and education, and academic advisors are expected to demonstrate professional competencies in the areas of advising, professional development, and service.

An academic advisor shall state objectives with regard to all applicable criteria as part of his/her PDP at the beginning of the evaluation year. At the end of the evaluation year, the academic advisor shall substantiate performance with respect to all applicable criteria by adducing evidence in some form that is acceptable by prior agreement to his/her supervisor. The ratings of “*exceeds*”, “*meets*”, and “*does not meet*” may be used to characterize performance with respect to individual criteria as well as overall performance with respect to advising, professional development, and service. Advisor level shall be considered in assigning ratings.

4.2.4.1 ADVISING

The criteria to be used for measuring effective advising, and which address the standards of §4.1.4 are:

- (a) Competence in advising (reported by students or other clients) as measured by student evaluation tools.*
- (b) Competence in advising (reported by peers) as measured by peer evaluation tools or by involvement in peer advising development activities (such as, but not limited to, advising cells, advising squares, peer coaching, mentoring, advising workshops, advising breakfasts, observations, etc.).*
- (c) Competence in developing and applying innovative instructional and advising methods, if applicable as measured by development of specific procedures and programs and policies; and / or as measured by evidence of active learning techniques, including, but not limited to, alternative delivery methods inside and / or outside the advising setting, integration of appropriate technology, service learning, team advising; and / or as measured by other advising-related materials or activities.*

- (d) Competence in applying the results of self-assessment of prior advising to sustaining or improving instructional and advising effectiveness as measured by reports in the PDP and Annual Review and by applications in advising sessions, which may include, but not limited to, the identification of existing advising strengths and areas for development, creation of strategies for improvement and continual effectiveness, incorporation of feedback from peers and students, and appropriate revision of advising programs, policies, and materials and advising methods*
- (e) Competence in advancing the teaching mission of CAS, to the extent that the advising and supervisor mutually agree upon in advance as measured by contributions to general education, interdisciplinary studies, intercultural perspectives, service learning, ecological perspectives, civic engagement, or any other identified teaching mission.*

The following factors may be considered when assessing the above criteria:

- (a) Student assignment load
- (b) Additional workload due to new programs or program revisions
- (c) Effects of university resources available for advising

4.2.4.2 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Any or all of the following criteria, which address the standards of §4.1.5, may be used for measuring effective professional development of an academic advisor:

- (a) Level of productive involvement in adding substantively to the ability to advise students.*
- (b) Level of productive involvement in adding to the pedagogical and programmatic resources that benefit advising services within the CAS.*
- (c) Extent that professional development activities incorporate peer mentoring relationships.*
- (d) Extent that professional development contributes to the visibility and reputation of the university as a center for scientific, literary, and artistic endeavor.*

It is incumbent upon the advisor to describe to his/her supervisor how professional development activities projected for an evaluation year bear on the standards for scholarship articulated in §4.1.5. Moreover, at the conclusion of the evaluation year, the advisor is responsible for

clarifying to his/her supervisor how professional development activities completed during the period achieved, in whole or in part, previously stated objectives.

A list is presented below which is a *guide only* to the spectrum of activities that would support, to varying degrees, a favorable evaluation in the area of professional development. ***The three main categories have equal stature.*** Specific activities within each category may be differentiated in importance according to the general principles immediately following. As a general rule, the PECAP takes the view that scholarship should be defined broadly, in the sense of Boyer/Carnegie Foundation for Higher Education.

1) Post-baccalaureate coursework

- Courses, conferences, workshops, or retreats directly related to student advising
- Courses in education, counseling, and administration
- Courses in any discipline in the CAS
- Graduate coursework directed to a masters degree
- Completion of a masters degree in education, advising, counseling, administration, or in a discipline supported by the CAS

2) Publications and presentations related to advising or a CAS discipline

- any item or activity listed in §4.2.2
- any formal presentation related to advising to the university constituency, within and outside the university itself

3) Contributions to and production of advising, program, and policy materials adopted by the advising services of the CAS.

There are single factors, all else being equal, which allow qualitative rankings within the three general categories above. These are contained in the following general principles for ranking professional development activities:

- (a) Original research is assigned a higher relative rank than derivative research.
- (b) More rigorous critical review is assigned a higher relative rank than less rigorous.
- (c) Wider audience for dissemination is assigned a higher relative rank than narrower.
- (d) Work that is published is assigned a higher relative rank than work that is not.
- (e) Programmatic, procedural, or policy materials adopted by the advising services of CAS are ranked higher than materials produced but not adopted.
- (f) Successful completion of coursework is assigned a higher relative rank than coursework in progress.

4.2.4.3 SERVICE

Any or all of the following criteria, which address the standards of §4.1.3, may be used for measuring effective service:

- (a) Level of productive involvement that benefits academic advising*
 - (i) within the CAS.*
 - (ii) externally via professional organizations.*
- (b) Level of productive involvement with constituencies external to FGCU.*
- (c) Level of productive involvement with extension of the learning enterprise beyond its normal role within FGCU.*
- (d) Level of productive involvement with university governance and non-instructional operation.*

It is incumbent upon the academic advisor to describe to his/her supervisor how service activities projected for an evaluation year bear on the standards for service articulated in §4.1.3. Moreover, at the conclusion of the evaluation year, the advisor is responsible for clarifying to his/her supervisor how service activities completed during the period achieved, in whole or in part, previously stated objectives.

A list is presented below which is a **guide only** to the spectrum of activities that would support, to varying degrees, a favorable evaluation in the area of service. **The three main categories have equal stature.** Specific activities within each category may be differentiated in importance according to the general principles immediately following.

1) Service / University

- Standing committee / university or CAS
- Ad hoc committee / university or CAS
- Advisory board
- Event management; i.e., Eagle Expo, Commencement, etc.
- Student organization

2) Service / Discipline

- Conference
- Professional association

3) Service / Community

- Community organization
- Community event
- Public schools
- Expert contact / consultant

There are single factors, all else being equal, which allow qualitative rankings within the three general categories above. These are contained in the following general principles for ranking service activities:

- (a) Substantive contribution to the work of a committee is assigned a higher relative rank than perfunctory.
- (b) Ongoing, regular participation is assigned a higher relative rank than sporadic or one-time.
- (c) National is assigned a higher relative rank than state, state is assigned a higher relative rank than regional, regional is assigned a higher relative rank than local participation.
- (d) More important mission of a committee is assigned a higher relative rank than less important.

4.3 OVERALL EVALUATION RATING

This section delineates how an overall evaluation rating of “*satisfactory*” or “*unsatisfactory*” shall be obtained from the “*exceeds*”, “*meets*”, or “*does not meet*” ratings which apply to the individual areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

The following system is based on several realizations:

- (a) Individual faculty divide their time among teaching, scholarship, and service in significantly different proportions, depending on their contractual arrangements with the university (e.g. if they have bought out of teaching with grant funds).
- (b) Scheduling exigencies may force some faculty to carry overloads.
- (c) Some disciplines admit research activity more readily than others due to capital constraints and the presence or absence of personpower in the form of graduate research assistants (e.g. analytical chemistry is more infrastructure intensive than mathematics).
- (d) Some disciplines are more promotive of service relationships than others (e.g. environmental consulting to the local community is more in demand than astronomical).

Accordingly, it would be unreasonable to expect each faculty member to split his/her time among teaching, scholarship, and service in a standard proportion across the entire college and consequently inequitable to expect the faculty member to commit to such a proportion in a PDP. The PECAP uses the PDP, as amended throughout its term of applicability, as the source document for providing relative weights of importance for teaching, scholarship, and service, –as negotiated by the faculty member and his/her supervisor, in individual cases. The weighted average of the supervisor's specific evaluations in the three areas of professional responsibility shall be the measure of whether an overall evaluation is “*satisfactory*” or “*unsatisfactory*”.

A rating of “*does not meet*” has value 0, a rating of “*meets*” has value 1, and a rating of “*exceeds*” has value 2. The numerical score for an overall rating is computed as follows: take the weighted average of ratings in each of teaching, scholarship, and service, where the weights are the percentages of time committed to each of teaching, scholarship, and service in the PDP. The result is the numerical overall rating for an evaluation year. If the numerical rating is less than 0.95, the overall rating is “*unsatisfactory*”. If the numerical rating is 0.95 or more, the overall rating is “*satisfactory*”.

EXAMPLE: Suppose Prof. X is evaluated by his supervisor as “meets” in teaching, “exceeds” in scholarship, and “does not meet” in service. From Prof. X’s PDP for the year in question, he committed to spending 75% of his time on teaching, 15% on research, and 10% on service. Then his annual numerical rating would be $((1)(75) + (2)(15) + (0)(10))/100 = 1.05 > 0.95$, hence Prof. X would achieve an overall “satisfactory” rating for the year.

Since the majority of faculty governed by the PECAP necessarily spend greater than 50% of their time teaching, it would be unlikely to receive a “does not meet” in teaching and yet an overall “satisfactory”. Moreover, since a PDP for a ranked professor would have some time devoted to either research or governance activities, a “does not meet” rating in both of these for one evaluation year would probably trigger an overall “unsatisfactory” rating if the corresponding teaching rating were “meets”.

All performance evaluations except those expressly designed to assess sustained performance for a period of more than one year shall admit evaluation data only for the evaluation year in question. The evaluative finding of overall “*unsatisfactory*” shall apply to evaluation periods of one year only.

The overall evaluation rating formula deals directly with difficult cases, hence there is no need to individually address potentially problematic combinations of “*exceeds*”, “*meets*”, and “*does not meet*”.

4.4 PROMOTION CRITERIA

Separate criteria for promotion are necessitated by the provision of the CBA, which requires that promotion decisions be based on “*potential for growth and scholarly contribution as well as past meritorious performance*”. Past meritorious performance is not totally characterized by past annual evaluations, because the sum is greater than the parts. Overlaid on annual evaluations are a set of normative expectations for the various ranks and levels. Promotion decisions first use past evaluation data to assess performance with respect to the set of expectations for current rank or level, and then assess probable performance with respect to the set of expectations for promoted rank or level.

4.4.1 PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS BY RANK AND LEVEL

4.4.1.1 INSTRUCTOR LEVEL I

Level I instructors are assumed to have limited experience as faculty members, hence expectations for their teaching performance are confined to basic competencies. As level I instructors develop experience, it is assumed that they will engage in reflective self-assessment of teaching style and methods to ensure consistently effective instructional performance. For service expectations, Level I instructors are expected to engage primarily in teaching-based service activities, those which involve curricula or program development.

4.4.1.2 INSTRUCTOR LEVEL II

Level II instructors are typically experienced faculty members who have established credentials as consistently effective teachers. They are expected to approach pedagogy with a spirit of innovation and reflection. In addition, a level II instructor may be expected to take on an additional plan of scholarship and service in exchange for a reduction in teaching load.

A level II instructor is expected to embrace one of the CAS standards for scholarship and begin to develop a record of scholarly activity or professional development. Service expectations for level II instructors are dependent on their interests and abilities, as well as familiarity with the constituencies they may engage. It is reasonable to assume that they would initially express their service commitment in their discipline, then move on to the university and community-at-large.

4.4.1.3 INSTRUCTOR LEVEL III

Level III instructors are typically faculty whose careers have gained momentum for sustained productivity and effectiveness. They should serve as teaching mentors for junior faculty and assume leadership roles in curriculum design and program development. In addition, a level III instructor may be expected to take on additional roles of scholarship and service in exchange for a reduction in teaching load. A level III instructor is expected to embrace one or more of the CAS standards for scholarship and develop a record of scholarly activity or professional development. Service expectations for level III instructors are dependent on their interests and abilities, as well as familiarity with the constituencies they may engage, with one service activity representing a long-term commitment.

4.4.1.4 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Assistant professors are assumed to have limited experience as faculty members, hence expectations for their teaching performance are confined to basic competencies. As assistant professors develop experience, it is assumed that they will engage in reflective self-assessment of teaching style and methods to ensure consistently effective instructional performance. Once this process is underway, an assistant professor is expected to embrace one or more of the CAS standards for scholarship and begin to develop a record of scholarly activity. Service expectations for assistant professors are dependent on their interests and abilities, as well as on their familiarity with the constituencies they may engage. It is reasonable to assume that they

would initially express their service commitment in their discipline, then move on to the university and community-at-large.

4.4.1.5 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Associate professors are typically experienced faculty members who have established credentials as consistently effective teachers, but who have also developed records of ongoing scholarly activity and service contributions. They are expected to approach pedagogy with a spirit of innovation and reflection. It is assumed that they remain current with the core of their discipline, and that they participate in curriculum development and management. Their performance as scholars should subsume that of assistant professors, for whom they should provide mentorship. In any event, they should engage the scholarly community at a higher level. Associate professors should embrace their service requirement in several areas, one of which should represent a long-term commitment.

4.4.1.6 FULL PROFESSOR

Full professors are typically faculty whose careers have gained momentum for sustained productivity and effectiveness. They should serve as mentors for junior faculty, assume leadership roles in curriculum design and program assessment, and exhibit broad and current knowledge of their core specialty. Full professors should exceed the scholarly activity deemed appropriate for an associate professor, particularly with regard to peer reviewed output, and function as leaders in their chosen field. Likewise, the service obligation of full professors should subsume that of associate professors, and involve a long-term commitment in multiple areas.

4.4.1.7 LEVEL I ACADEMIC ADVISOR

Level I advisors are assumed to have limited experience as advisors, hence expectations for their advising performance are confined to basic competencies. As level I advisors develop experience, it is assumed that they will engage in reflective self-assessment of advising style and methods to ensure consistently effective instructional performance. A level I advisor is to take on initial service duties to meet the needs of advising services. Level I advisors should also seek out initial professional development opportunities, be it coursework, workshops, or conferences.

4.4.1.8 LEVEL II ACADEMIC ADVISOR

Level II advisors are typically experienced advisors who have established records as consistently effective advisors. They are expected to approach advising as a teaching activity, addressing their work with a spirit of innovation and reflection. In addition, a level II advisor is to take an active role in service, first to meet the needs of advising services and then to the larger university

community as needed. In terms of professional development, a level II advisor should routinely be engaged in program and policy development, should actively be participating in post-baccalaureate coursework, workshops, or conferences, and should demonstrate consistent reliability in leading advising presentations or workshops to constituents of the university community.

4.4.1.9 LEVEL III ACADEMIC ADVISOR

Level III advisors have established careers that have gained momentum for sustained productivity and effectiveness. They should serve as advising mentors and assume leadership roles in program and policy development. A level III advisor will have a masters degree in advising, education, counseling, administration, or related field, or a masters degree from a discipline supported by the CAS. As for service, a level III advisor should embrace service duties, and as called upon, take on leadership roles in service as appropriate and which fulfill personal interests and talents.

4.4.2 PROMOTION CRITERIA

This section addresses six promotion scenarios: level I instructor to level II; level II instructor to level III; assistant professor to associate; associate professor to full; level I academic advisor to level II; level II academic advisor to level III.

4.4.2.1 GENERAL CRITERIA

General criteria for promotion are as follows:

- (a) Annual evaluations must consistently demonstrate that the faculty member applying for promotion exceeds the performance norms for his/her rank or level in §4.4.1 in teaching, and also in either scholarship or service as applicable to the rank or level. Annual evaluations must consistently demonstrate that the academic advisor applying for promotion exceeds the performance norms for his/her level in §4.4.1 in advising, and also in either professional development or service as applicable to the level.*

- (b) The faculty member applying for promotion must show an overall record of significant accomplishment, a pattern of increasing success, and recognition by peers for that success.*

4.4.2.2 SPECIFIC CRITERIA

The following are examples of criteria that may be used as indicators of promotability:

4.4.2.2.1 LEVEL I INSTRUCTOR TO LEVEL II

- (a) Consistently strong record of teaching evaluations from students, peers, and supervisors*
- (b) Demonstrated commitment to ongoing improvement of pedagogical skills*
- (c) Demonstrated commitment to curriculum and program development*
- (d) Consistent record of service activity in at least one area, and an upward trend in level of substantive contribution*

4.4.2.2.2 LEVEL II INSTRUCTOR TO LEVEL III

- (a) Consistently strong record of teaching evaluations from students, peers, and supervisors*
- (b) Demonstrated commitment to ongoing improvement of pedagogical skills*
- (c) Demonstrated commitment to curriculum and program development*
- (d) Demonstrated commitment to ongoing improvement of mentoring skills*
- (e) Tangible evidence of a program to generate scholarly work, broadly defined, and to submit that work to peer criticism and/or public dissemination*
- (f) Consistent record of service activity in at least one area , and an upward trend in level of substantive contribution*

4.4.2.2.3 ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE

- (a) Consistently strong record of teaching evaluations from students, peers, and supervisors.*
- (b) Demonstrated commitment to ongoing improvement of pedagogical skills.*

- (c) Demonstrated commitment to ongoing improvement of mentoring skills.*
- (d) Experience with interdisciplinary teaching.*
- (e) Tangible evidence of a program to generate scholarly work, broadly defined, and to submit that work to peer criticism and/or public dissemination.*
- (f) Demonstrated capacity for independent work beyond that required for a terminal degree in the discipline.*
- (g) Record of substantive participation at professional meetings.*
- (h) Consistent record of service activity in several areas, at least one of which is long-term, and an upward trend in level of substantive contribution.*

4.4.2.2.4 ASSOCIATE TO FULL

- (a) Consistently strong record of teaching evaluations from students, peers, and supervisors.*
- (b) Record of peer-reviewed pedagogically-related scholarship.*
- (c) Demonstrated effort to secure external support for pedagogical and scholarly activities.*
- (d) Dissemination of innovative course content outside the university.*
- (e) Record of effective mentoring of junior faculty.*
- (f) Evidence of an established program of peer-reviewed research and/or creative activity*
- (g) Evidence of substantial interaction with the professional community.*
- (h) Demonstrated involvement in long-term service activities in several areas, plus short-term service activities over the evaluation period.*
- (i) Recognition by peers, professional societies, and/or community groups for exemplary service activities.*

4.4.2.2.5 LEVEL I TO LEVEL II ADVISOR

- (a) Consistently strong record of advising evaluations from students, peers, and supervisors*
- (b) Demonstrated commitment to ongoing improvement of advising skills*
- (e) Demonstrated commitment to policy and program development*
- (d) Consistent record of service activity*

4.4.2.2.6 LEVEL II TO LEVEL III ADVISOR

- (a) Consistently strong record of advising evaluations from students, peers, and supervisors*
- (b) Demonstrated commitment to ongoing improvement of advising skills*
- (c) Demonstrated commitment to policy and program development*
- (d) Demonstrated commitment to ongoing improvement of mentoring skills*
- (e) Completion of a masters degree in advising, counseling, education, administration, or a discipline supported by the College of Arts and Sciences*
- (f) Consistent record of service activity in at least one area, and an upward trend in level of substantive contribution*

5 DOCUMENTATION

Documentation required for the evaluation process may be divided into that which addresses proposed performance or that which records actual performance. Further classification may be based on short or long term time frames. Any documents that are prescribed by the PECAP and not expressly defined in this section with regard to minimum content or format may be submitted in any reasonable form.

5.1 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

5.1.1 PURPOSE

The PDP is a formal statement in writing made by a faculty member to his/her supervisor specifying short and long term objectives for performance in teaching, service, and scholarship. It is the basic document for faculty evaluation, individually for the short term, and cumulatively for the long term.

5.1.2 FORMAT

The format for a PDP shall follow, as closely as practical, the template given in §6.1 hereof.

5.1.3 REQUIRED CONTENT

A PDP shall be written with goals to achieve a rating of “meets expectations”. For individuals desiring to document those objectives signifying “exceeds expectations”, an additional section shall be included at the end of the PDP establishing those objectives.

Since quality of work is as important as quantity, some objectives may require evaluation of the finished work by the supervisor to assess quality before an appropriate rating is assigned to the work.

Minimum content requirements for a PDP are summarized in the template given in §6.1 hereof.

5.1.4 ENDORSEMENT

Upon receipt of a PDP, the supervisor shall review and endorse the document by returning a signed copy to the faculty member, such endorsement not to be delayed or unreasonably withheld. In the event the supervisor finds the submitted PDP deficient with regard to the requirements given herein, he/she shall identify the deficiencies in writing to the faculty member, who shall submit a revised PDP.

5.1.5 EXEMPTION FOR NEW HIRES

Faculty hired on any contract basis on or after August 1st of a given evaluation year shall be permitted an extra sixty (60) days to prepare their final PDPs for that year only.

5.2 ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REPORT

5.2.1 PURPOSE

The Annual Professional Development Report is prepared at the end of an evaluation cycle and submitted by the faculty member to his/her supervisor. The ADPR recaps progress made during the evaluation year toward the objectives established by the PDP for that year.

5.2.2 FORMAT

The format for an APDR shall follow, as closely as practical, the template given in §6.2 hereof.

5.2.3 REQUIRED CONTENT

An APDR shall be written in a manner that addresses every significant objective set as part of the motivating PDP. Since amendments to the PDP may be offered and accepted throughout the evaluation year, and unforeseen developments may hamper good faith efforts to achieve objectives stated in the PDP, the ADPR should provide a narrative summary and justification of any departures from the PDP.

Minimum content requirements for an APDR are summarized in the template given in §6.2 hereof.

5.2.4 ENDORSEMENT

Upon receipt of an APDR, the supervisor shall review and endorse the document by returning a signed copy to the faculty member, such endorsement not to be delayed or unreasonably withheld. In the event the supervisor finds the submitted APDR deficient with regard to the requirements given herein, he/she shall identify the deficiencies in writing to the faculty member, who shall submit a revised APDR.

5.3 PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT CONTRACT

5.3.1 PURPOSE

The PIC is an agreement between a faculty member and the university to correct deficiencies in the discharge of professional obligations that come to light in the course of performance evaluation for a CMYA. If a faculty member is rated overall “*unsatisfactory*” during the first year of a three-year CMYA contract, the PIC replaces the faculty member’s PDP for the second year of that contract term.

5.3.2 FORMAT

The format for a PIC shall follow, as closely as practical, the template given in §6.3 hereof.

5.3.3 REQUIRED CONTENT

Since a PIC replaces a PDP, it shall reflect the short-term elements required for a PDP. Additionally, it shall introduce the remediation measures designed to mitigate whatever deficiencies have triggered the unfavorable evaluation and it shall provide a framework for the

faculty member and supervisor to manage the process of professional rehabilitation. Due to the necessarily short-term focus of the PIC, long term objectives need not be emphasized.

Minimum content requirements for a PIC are summarized in the template given in §6.3 hereof.

5.3.4 ENDORSEMENT

Upon receipt of an APDR, the supervisor shall review and endorse the document by returning a signed copy to the faculty member

6 TEMPLATES FOR DOCUMENTATION

6.1 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (PDP)

1) Introduction

General statement of short- and long-term objectives, including **percentage of time allocated to teaching, scholarly activity and service**. Short-term is defined as the evaluation year for which the PDP is being created. Long-term is defined as a 3-year period for individuals on continuing contracts and as the length of the contract for individuals on fixed multi-year contracts.

2) Teaching

- (a) Classes taught each semester.
- (b) Short-term objectives and relation to long-term objectives, including time and resources required to achieve the objectives.
- (c) Specific activities planned to achieve the objectives.
- (d) Evidence for evaluating achievement of the objectives. This must include self, peer, and student evaluations.

3) Scholarly Activity

- (a) Short-term objectives and relation to long-term objectives, including the time and resources required to achieve the objectives.
- (b) Evidence for evaluating the achievement of objectives (e.g. publications, drafts, participation in workshops or seminars).

4) Service

- (a) Short-term objectives and relation to long-term objectives.
- (b) Specific activities planned to achieve the objectives.
- (c) Evidence for evaluating the achievement of the objectives. This must include a list of chairs for committees served on, contact people for other types of service activities.

5) Special Circumstances

Additional information needs to be included for the following situations:

- (a) Individuals wanting to document criteria for “*exceeds*” stated objectives.
- (b) Individuals who have received a rating of “*unsatisfactory*” in teaching, scholarship or service on the previous year’s annual review.
- (c) Individuals who anticipate application for promotion within the next two years.
- (d) Unanticipated changes in assignments or activities that have interfered with completion of objectives presented in the PDP.
- (e) Additional activities performed which were not originally documented in the PDP.

6) Information for “*exceeds*” stated objectives

- (a) Short-term objectives and relation to long-term objectives.
- (b) Specific activities planned to achieve these objectives.
- (c) Evidence for evaluation the achievement of the objectives.

7) Information for remediation of prior year “*does not meet*”

- (a) A list of constructive activities to be undertaken in the next successive academic year developed jointly by the faculty member and their supervisor.
- (b) The list will include specific performance targets to be achieved in order to remedy the unsatisfactory evaluation, as well as any resources or assistance needed to facilitate improvement.
- (c) If a faculty member requests its participation, the Peer review Committee will assist the faculty member and their supervisor in developing the list.

8) Individuals anticipating application for promotion within two years

A statement containing this information for the supervisor’s preliminary review of the faculty member’s objectives for the coming year.

6.2 ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REPORT (APDR)

1) Introduction

All ADPRs will be written to show the level of attainment of the objectives stated in the corresponding PDP. The ADPR shall recap the short and long term goals of the PDP, and show the percentages of time allocated to teaching, scholarship, and service. The percentage of time allocated to each area should match the percentages given in the FARs for the evaluation period. Short term is defined as the evaluation period covered by the PDP. Long-term is defined as the length of contract for individuals on either FMYAs or CMYAs. Any changes not reflected in the PDP shall be documented as amendments and discussed in a separate section of the ADPR.

2) Teaching

- (a) Classes taught each semester.
- (b) Short-term objectives and relation to long-term objectives, including time and resources required to achieve the objectives.
- (c) Specific activities planned to achieve the objectives.
- (d) Evidence for evaluating achievement of the objectives. This must include self, peer, and student evaluations.

3) Scholarly Activity

- (a) Short-term objectives and relation to long-term objectives, including the time and resources required to achieve the objectives.
- (b) Evidence for evaluating the achievement of objectives (e.g. publications, drafts, participation in workshops or seminars).

4) Service

- (a) Short-term objectives and relation to long-term objectives.
- (b) Specific activities planned to achieve the objectives.
- (c) Evidence for evaluating the achievement of the objectives. This must include a list of chairs for committees served on, contact people for other types of service activities.

5) Information for “exceeds” stated objectives

- (a) Short-term objectives and relation to long-term objectives.
- (b) Specific activities planned to achieve these objectives.
- (c) Evidence for evaluation the achievement of the objectives.

6) Unanticipated Changes

An explanation of unforeseen circumstances that have interfered with completion of objectives stated in the PDP.

7) PDP Amendment

A recap of professional activities not originally included in the PDP, which may have contributed favorably to the evaluation.

- (a) A list of these activities and their relation to long-term objectives.
- (b) Evidence for completion of the activities.

6.3 PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT CONTRACT (PIC)

1) Introduction

This document replaces the PDP for faculty placed on probation in the second year of a three-year Continuing Multiyear Appointment contract. As such, it requires the elements of a PDP that apply to objectives for the evaluation year covered. The nature of the PIC is short-term and rehabilitative, and accordingly, long term objectives and objectives

structured to generate “*exceeds*” stated objectives are inappropriate. The PIC should contain a general statement of short-term objectives, including percentage of time allocated to teaching, scholarly activity and service. Short-term is defined as the evaluation year for which the PDP is being created. The section that identifies the deficiencies giving rise to probationary status is critical to the PIC. These deficiencies should be described in sufficient detail so that no ambiguity exists regarding the condition of their mitigation or outright removal. Moreover, each deficiency enumerated must be accompanied by a well-specified and realistic strategy for correction within the period of the PIC.

(PDP-like Section)

2) Teaching

- (a) Classes taught each semester.
- (b) Short-term objectives, including time and resources required to achieve the objectives.
- (c) Specific activities planned to achieve the objectives.
- (d) Evidence for evaluating achievement of the objectives. This must include self, peer, and student evaluations.

3) Scholarly Activity

- (a) Short-term objectives, including the time and resources required to achieve the objectives.
- (b) Evidence for evaluating the achievement of objectives (e.g. publications, drafts, participation in workshops or seminars).

4) Service

- (a) Short-term objectives.
- (b) Specific activities planned to achieve the objectives.
- (c) Evidence for evaluating the achievement of the objectives. This must include a list of chairs for committees served on, contact people for other types of service activities.

5) Unanticipated changes

A list of unanticipated changes and responsibilities will be documented, and a statement of the way in which the objectives of the PDP have been met will be included and considered when evaluating the individual’s performance.

6) Additional activities performed, not originally documented on the PDP.

- (a) A list of these activities and their relation to short-term objectives.
- (b) Evidence for completion of the activities.

(PIC-like Section)

7) Information specific to PIC remediation due to prior year “*overall unsatisfactory*”

- (a) A list of constructive activities to be undertaken in the next successive academic year developed jointly by the faculty member and his/her supervisor.
- (b) The list will include specific performance targets to be achieved in order to remedy the unsatisfactory evaluation, as well as any resources or assistance needed to facilitate improvement.
- (c) If a faculty member requests its participation, the Peer review Committee will assist the faculty member and their supervisor in developing the list.
- (d) A schedule of interim evaluation conferences to track progress in achieving the objectives of the PIC shall be part of the PIC.