

Faculty Performance Evaluation Document FPED

I. PREAMBLE

Principles

Florida Gulf Coast University (FGCU) is a prototype institution of higher education for the new millennium. As such, the university provides an environment of dynamic growth and innovative change, which is reflected in teaching and scholarship, curricula, community service, faculty, administration, staff, and facilities and is based on the *Philosophy for the Selection of Faculty* document adopted by the Faculty Senate in September 1999. **FGCU affirms that student learning is its primary mission; delivery of the highest quality educational services is central to all its endeavors.** The university is committed to the development of an academic environment that fosters the following principles:

- **Collaboration.** The university practices collaboration in governance, operations, and planning to ensure broad commitment to its mission.
- **Civil environment.** The university is committed to maintaining a professional environment based on mutual respect and academic integrity.
- **Academic freedom.** The faculty and administration acknowledge that academic freedom is the foundation for the creation, transmission, and advancement of knowledge. It is understood that the university vigorously protects freedom of inquiry and expression and fosters a climate of openness in which students, faculty, and staff engage in diversity of perspectives, ideologies, and approaches with tolerance and fairness.
- **Diversity.** The university recognizes that diversity throughout all of its constituencies is a source of renewal and vitality.
- **Faculty productivity.** The university endorses the concept that the work of faculty needs to be defined in ways that realistically reflect the full range of academic, professional, and civic responsibilities. FGCU recognizes the importance of effective teaching in a learning-centered university and affirms the value of faculty applying their expertise in service to the community. The university also affirms that scholarly activity needs to be broadly defined to include areas previously undervalued; nonetheless, all forms of scholarly activity require appropriate validation to assure quality.
- **Equity.** As FGCU embraces non-tenure and tenure-track appointments, the evaluation process for all faculty shall not be prejudicial to any individual.
- **Professional development.** Providing a sense of stability and cohesiveness in the diverse atmosphere of multi-year contracts and tenure requires an institution's commitment to the welfare and development of its employees. The administration and individual faculty members share the responsibility for professional growth. The administration provides faculty members with the opportunity and resources to continue their professional development. Individual faculty members, in turn, take the initiative in promoting their own growth as teachers, scholars, and, where appropriate, as practitioners.

Assessment

FGCU affirms with one voice that assessment of all functions is necessary for improvement and continual renewal. Through comprehensive and systematic assessment, the university ensures that it provides the highest quality education, scholarly activity, and service to the community. Assessment is the cornerstone of accountability and is the highest priority for accrediting agencies, including the Southern

Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Consequently, FGCU has developed an Institutional Effectiveness Plan, with full participation of all university constituencies that provides an overall framework and direction for evaluation. Included within this framework are the evaluation of students, the administration, and faculty. The mechanism for faculty evaluation is the Faculty Performance Evaluation Document (FPED).

Context and Purpose

The Interim Faculty Affairs Committee (1996-1997) developed this Faculty Performance Evaluation Document within the context of the precepts, values, and principles described above. The Faculty Affairs Team (1997-1998) revised the document after one year of implementation using input from all constituencies. The purpose and terms of the Document are consistent with and expound upon the terms of the 1998-2001 Collective Bargaining Agreement as amended (hereinafter CBA) between the Board of Regents (BOR), State University System of Florida, and the United Faculty of Florida (UFF). The FPED affirms Article 1.2b of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, which reads: "No new or amended Board or university rule, policy, or resolution shall apply to employees if it conflicts with an express term of the Agreement." The FPED specifies basic policies, procedures, and criteria for the various types of faculty evaluation at FGCU:

- Annual evaluations
- Continuing Multi-year extensions, preliminary peer review, probation and sustained performance review
- Reappointment, tenure, post-tenure, and promotion
- Performance recognition programs such as Teaching Incentive Program (TIP), Professorial Excellence Program (PEP), and merit pay

Florida Gulf Coast University perceives scholarly activity as a broad range of intellectual activities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. It is the responsibility of the individual units to define the scope and range of scholarly activity in their Criteria.

It is expected that all members involved in the evaluation process will act ethically; if, under unusual circumstances, a conflict of interest occurs, faculty members should remove themselves from the proceedings or any participant may refer the situation to the University Faculty Affairs Team.

II. WHO IS COVERED BY THESE POLICIES

The policies in this document apply to all faculty bargaining unit positions that are covered by the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Therefore, all in-unit faculty who hold tenure or tenure-earning positions, or who have multi-year appointments or modified appointments (e.g., visiting, provisional, affiliate, etc.) are included as defined by the rules of the Department of Education, Board of Regents (Chapter 6C-5.910 Recruitment, Selection, Appointment, and Non-reappointment). Consistent with a Memorandum of Agreement between the BOR and UFF, Florida Gulf Coast University chairs are excluded from the bargaining unit and thus not covered by this document. FGCU may use working titles such as "team leader" or "program leaders." If the responsibilities of these positions are such that the employee is performing as an administrator, than the positions should be so classified (CBA, Article 28).

III. THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Foundation of the Professional Development Plan

Evaluation processes and career success are the shared responsibility of all participants--individual faculty members, administrators, peer review committees, and the Faculty Affairs Team. FGCU recognizes and appreciates the diversity of faculty roles and responsibilities within the university. Likewise, the administration and the faculty are committed to a faculty development program that provides opportunities and resources for professional growth and advancement within academe.

Each faculty member at FGCU, must, in collaboration with his or her supervisor, prepare a Professional Development Plan (PDP), which is a public document. The PDP reflects the need for a flexible faculty evaluation system that:

- Accommodates the various types and lengths of faculty appointments at FGCU.
- Places student learning at the forefront of all educational activities.
- Fosters quality, integrity, and the search for knowledge.
- Allows for a broad definition of scholarly activity to include creative works and achievements appropriate to the mission of an institution of higher education.
- Encourages innovative and collegial relationships with regional community organizations, businesses, and professionals in education, health care, social services, etc.
- Encourages collaboration across disciplines, colleges, and units.
- Recognizes each faculty member as a unique individual with interests, talents, and strengths whose professional aspirations and goals are influenced by personal needs, career life stages, and expectations of the profession.
- Mutually respects the professional goals of each faculty member and the missions of the unit, department, college, and/or university in faculty assessment and performance evaluation.
- Provides recognition, incentives, and rewards that take into account the multi-dimensional aspects of the professorate.
- Provides a just and effective evaluation process whereby the knowledge gained is used to enhance faculty achievement and student performance.
- Nurtures collaboration within the university community.

Description of the Professional Development Plan

The Professional Development Plan is the cornerstone of all faculty evaluation processes at FGCU. By September 30, each faculty member must, in collaboration with his or her supervisor, finalize a PDP. While teaching is central to the university's mission, individual faculty members may engage in the activities of teaching, scholarship, and service in different degrees and intensities. The responsibilities and objectives in the PDP will reflect the faculty member's professional goals and objectives as well as the needs of the college, unit, and/or university. **Goals represent long-term aspirations of the individual across the duration of the contract; objectives are specific targeted achievements for the period under annual review.** Each unit is encouraged to have a mechanism for sharing of the PDPs.

The peer review committees (see Section VII) may provide guidance and assistance to faculty members in developing the goals and objectives identified in the PDP and in preparing documentation for performance reviews, if requested. The Faculty Affairs Team strongly recommends that faculty members select a mentor to provide assistance with the development of the PDP and to offer guidance throughout the evaluation process.

Key Components of the Professional Development Plan

The PDP will have a multi-year perspective and serve as the cornerstone for all faculty evaluations at FGCU. The content of the PDP, which includes faculty goals and objectives, will be developed through collaboration between the individual faculty member and the faculty member's supervisor and may include peer input with written consent of the faculty member. Rank, experience, labor and time-intensive activities shall be given appropriate consideration when negotiating goals and objectives. The PDP is intended to be flexible and can be amended as needed; these amendments must be signed by the supervisor and the faculty member and included in the faculty member's personnel file. Faculty members will identify professional goals and objectives. As with the PDP itself, goals will have a multi-year perspective while objectives will serve as intermediate aims that may be attained within a semester or academic year. Long-term goals will contribute to the faculty member's broader professional growth and, should a faculty member request reappointment (appropriate only for faculty on fixed MYAs), tenure, and/or promotion, provide a foundation for evaluating performance across the length of service.

- The PDP will contain a clear statement of the professional activities in which the faculty member will engage to achieve each of his or her professional objectives. Successful completion of these objectives is the responsibility of the individual faculty member.
- The PDP will clearly identify the evidence for evaluating the faculty member's achievement of the agreed-upon professional objectives and progress towards accomplishing goals. (Evaluation criteria will be developed in each academic unit; see Section IV of this Document.)
- The PDP will contain a statement of commitment concerning the allocation of time and other resources necessary for the faculty member to successfully achieve the agreed-upon goals and objectives. It is the administration's responsibility to see that the agreed-upon resources are available.
- The state-mandated Faculty Activity Report (FAR) provides an accounting summary of the faculty member's activities for a semester. The PDP sets forth and defines the faculty member's specific goals, objectives, and planned activities in each category on the FAR.
- If the faculty member received an unsatisfactory annual evaluation the previous year in any of the three areas of Teaching, Scholarship, or Service (or the applicable unit-level categories), the PDP will also contain a list of constructive activities to be undertaken during the next successive academic year developed jointly by the faculty member and his or her supervisor. The list will include specific performance targets that will be achieved in order to remedy the current year's unsatisfactory evaluation, as well as any resources or assistance needed to facilitate improvement. If a faculty member requests its participation, the unit's Peer Review Committee will assist the faculty member and his or her supervisor in developing the list.
- The PDP will include a statement identifying whether the listed objectives are intended to serve as performance targets whose achievement will signal an overall assessment of "meets expectations" or, alternatively, one of "exceeds expectations."
- Should the faculty member anticipate applying for promotion within the next two years, his or her PDP will include a statement to this effect so as to inform the supervisor's preliminary review of the faculty member's proposed objectives for the coming year.
- Unanticipated changes in assignments and responsibilities will be documented as amendments to the PDP and considered when evaluating the individual's performance. These amendments, along with a statement of the way in which the objectives of the PDP have been met, will be included in the Annual Professional Development Report (APDR) submitted to the supervisor for the evaluation process. (CBA Article 9)
- According to Article 9 of the CBA, "Scheduled hours for all employees shall not normally exceed forty (40) hours per week. Time shall be allowed within the normal working day for research, teaching, or other activities required of the employee, when a part of the assigned duties." The objectives listed on the PDP should be achievable in a normal forty-hour workweek.
- Each employee shall be given assignments, which provide equitable opportunities, in relation to other employees in the same department/unit, to meet the required criteria for promotion, tenure, continuing multi-year extension, successive fixed multi-year appointments, and merit salary increases.

IV. EVALUATION CRITERIA

FGCU is a public university that embraces the tripartite responsibility of teaching, scholarship, and service. While teaching is central to the university's mission, individual faculty members may engage in the activities of teaching, scholarship, and service in different degrees and intensities. The expectations in each of these areas will be documented in the Professional Development Plan, and the faculty member will be evaluated in accordance with how well he or she has fulfilled the objectives agreed upon in the Professional Development Plan.

Faculty performance will be evaluated according to the following three-point scale:

- Exceeds Stated Objectives
- Meets Stated Objectives
- Does Not Meet Stated Objectives

In order to assess faculty performance objectively and equitably, criteria for evaluation will be developed in each academic unit. The faculty, in collaboration with the dean, will identify and define specific performance expectations or desired outcomes in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. As described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the criteria will establish a standard for faculty effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service. This standard will describe the extent to which a faculty member met the stated objectives. If all objectives are met in a satisfactory manner, the faculty member should receive a "meets stated objectives."

Activities that are frequently labor and time intensive need to be given full recognition in assessing and rewarding faculty performance. In developing evaluation criteria, the units will consider faculty efforts with respect to team teaching, interdisciplinary and collaborative curricula development, internships, practica, supervised teaching, field experiences incorporated in courses, and structured mentorship activities. Appendix A provides lists of activities and documents associated respectively with teaching, scholarship, and service. The items on these lists are illustrative of the range of faculty responsibilities and will assist the units in establishing evaluation criteria (CBA, Article 10).

One of the linchpins of Florida Gulf Coast University's Continuing Multi-year Appointment System is the annual evaluation of a faculty member's performance as having been either "overall satisfactory" or "overall unsatisfactory." Each unit must have criteria and standards capable of being applied fairly, equitably, and consistently, recognizing the critical role these play in enhancing the unit's pursuit of its mission, its recruitment and retention of high-quality employees, and its faculty members' quest for continuous improvement.

Unit criteria and standards for Continuing Multi-year Appointment Faculty should reflect the following concerns:

- Each unit's annual evaluation criteria and standards must balance the need for clarity and concreteness, on the one hand, and the equally compelling need for generality and adaptability, on the other hand. Addressing the former is a prerequisite for ensuring consistency and equity; addressing the latter is a prerequisite for dealing fairly but flexibly with the diversity of cases likely to confront a unit's faculty members and supervisors. The difficult cases are likely to be those in which a faculty member's annual performance has met or exceeded expectations in one or more assessment categories while falling short of expectations in others, as well as those in which assessment is rendered ambiguous by the extended period needed for a faculty member's long-term projects to advance toward completion. Each unit's criteria and standards must provide guidance to the faculty members and supervisors confronted by such cases.
- A judgment of "overall unsatisfactory," along with the probation and performance improvement contract necessarily linked to this, should be reserved for cases in which a faculty member's underperformance in two or more assessment categories, and/or a faculty member's sustained underperformance in one or more assessment categories over a multi-year period, is materially

significant in light of the unit's performance standards. Supervisors must not use this judgment as a punitive mechanism for addressing relatively minor and/or transient incidents of underperformance in a single assessment category.

- Creativity and intellectual exploration are crucial ingredients in all successful universities. Because of this, units must take care to adopt evaluation criteria and standards that provide incentives for experimentation and innovation, encouraging faculty members to consider projects whose likelihood of long-term success may be initially uncertain.

Approval of each unit's annual evaluation criteria and standards requires confirmation by a majority of a quorum of its in-unit faculty members [CBA 10.3(a)(2)]. Owing to this requirement, developing these criteria and standards should be a collaborative undertaking, with final adoption occurring only after careful deliberation by each unit's faculty.

V. PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

The Review Process

Performance reviews are conducted for the following categories:

- Annual
- Fixed Multi-year Successive Contract
- Continuing Multi-year Appointment Extension
- Continuing Multi-year Appointment Probation Review
- Continuing Multi-year Appointment Preliminary Peer Review
- Promotion
- Tenure
- Sustained Performance (Post-Tenure)
- Continuing Multi-year Appointment Sustained Performance Review

The review process for each of these categories is described in the following pages. The descriptions include information regarding to whom the review applies, when the review will take place, the period covered by the review, participants, required documentation, outcome, and appeal process. All components of and activities related to the performance review process at FGCU should be conducted in full compliance with CBA Article 10 and faculty should be copied on all performance recommendations.

If a faculty member believes that there has been a violation of the CBA, there are a number of formal and informal avenues a faculty member may select. Informally, the faculty member should first seek resolution with the supervisor. In addition, the faculty member may request assistance from the peer review committee. Formally, faculty may avail themselves of the grievance process in accordance with Article 20 in the CBA within 30 calendar days, or file legal action outside the university and bargaining structures.

The review process provides for continuous review and feedback to faculty to ensure professional growth and attainment of faculty and institutional objectives and goals.

Supervisors

The following sections consistently refer to the role of the supervisor in the evaluation process; because the various units in FGCU have adopted different administrative structures, the supervisor for each unit must be clearly defined in the unit criteria document which may reference consultation during the evaluation process with the appropriate chief academic administrator in the unit.

Participation of Colleague

At the time of portfolio submission, a faculty member may request in writing that a colleague participate in the review. This colleague may include his/her mentor or other FGCU colleague (or member of the Peer Review Committee for annual reviews). The colleague with the faculty member's written consent may examine all submitted material and may observe the supervisor's discussion with the faculty member. In the case of continuing multi-year appointment extensions, probation, sustained performance evaluations for continuing multi-year appointment faculty, preliminary review, reappointment, promotion, tenure, or post tenure reviews, the colleague does not participate in the peer review committee's final decision making.

VI. THE PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT CONTRACT FOR CMYA

Foundation of the Performance Improvement Contract

FGCU seeks through the Continuing Multi-year Appointment system to utilize annual evaluations of faculty in a consistent and constructive fashion to foster continuous improvement and accountability. In the event a Continuing Multi-year Appointment faculty member receives an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation, he or she will be placed on a one-year probation, with no contract extension for the duration of the probation period. The faculty member will be afforded a reasonable opportunity for remediation through development of a Performance Improvement Contract (PIC).

Description of the Performance Improvement Contract

A one-year Performance Improvement Contract will be required of any Continuing Multi-year Appointment faculty member receiving an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation ("below stated expectations"). The PIC is designed to help remedy the deficiencies responsible for the overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation and to identify specific performance targets for the following academic year. The PIC must be finalized by September 30.

Key Components of the Performance Improvement Contract

Based on deficiencies identified in the annual evaluation, the faculty member will draft the Performance Improvement Contract. The content of the PIC will be developed through collaboration between the individual faculty member and the faculty member's supervisor. The faculty member has the option of consulting with the unit's Peer Review Committee in developing the PIC. At a minimum, a copy of the signed PIC shall be provided to the Peer Review Committee.

- As is the case for development of a PDP, rank, experience, and labor and time-intensive activities shall be given appropriate consideration when negotiating activities and objectives.
- The PIC will contain a clear statement of the professional activities in which the faculty member will engage to successfully meet agreed-upon performance targets and professional objectives. Successful completion of these activities is the responsibility of the individual faculty member.
- The PIC will clearly identify the evidence for evaluating the faculty member's achievement of the agreed-upon performance targets and professional objectives.
- The PIC will contain a statement of commitment concerning the allocation of time and other resources necessary for the faculty member to successfully achieve the agreed-upon performance targets and professional objectives. It is the supervisor's responsibility to see that the agreed-upon resources are available.
- The activities and objectives listed on the PIC should be achievable in a normal forty-hour workweek.

- The PIC will identify intermediary dates for review and possible modification of the Contract.
- Both the faculty member and the supervisor will sign the PIC.
- The PIC may be adjusted as agreed upon and signed by both parties to indicate completed portions, changes in available resources, etc.

Annual Review

Applies to:	Both fixed multi-year and tenure-line faculty.
Period under review:	Previous academic or contract year (typically fall, spring, and summer semesters).
Timeline:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performed annually. • March 31: Documentation submitted to the supervisor. Faculty may add documents related to spring performance not available until after the due date. • April 30: Evaluation completed. • May 6: Draft PDP for next academic year. • September 30: Final PDP completed and signed
Participants:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty member and supervisor. The supervisor may seek input from the faculty member's peers. • The faculty member may request in writing that a colleague observe the review process. This colleague must be identified to the supervisor in writing as having permission to review all evaluative material. This colleague may be his/her mentor, other FGCU faculty colleague, or member of the peer review committee. The colleague may examine all submitted material and may observe the supervisor's discussion with the faculty member. The mentor serves only as an advisor to the faculty member.
Documentation:	<p><u>Provided by faculty member:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated curriculum vitae. • Professional Development Plan (PDP), which includes faculty objectives. • Annual Professional Development Report (APDR), which includes amendments to the PDP and statements of how the objectives of the PDP have been met. • Essential Portfolio Materials should address only the objectives identified in the PDP and may include: for teaching: syllabi, student evaluations, self-assessment; for scholarship: scholarly documents; for service: list of university and community activities with chairs or contact people. • Recommended Portfolio Materials: for teaching: peer assessment conducted during the period under review. <p><u>Provided by supervisor:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior Performance Review Reports with recommendations for improvements (if any) and supporting documentation. • Faculty Activity Reports which identify assignment of duties and responsibilities for each semester. • Other relevant information such as signed letters from students, colleagues, faculty from other institutions, editors, community members, and practitioners in the field.
Process:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluation process will include two independent assessments: a self-assessment and the supervisor's assessment. • All documentation should be submitted to the supervisor by March 31. • The faculty member should set up an appointment with the supervisor to discuss the evaluation; this evaluation is to be completed by April 30.
Reports:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upon completion of the evaluation, the supervisor prepares a draft Performance Review Report, i.e., a written summary regarding

performance. This evaluation must include a statement regarding progress toward reappointment (if applicable), tenure (if applicable), and/or promotion. The summary is shared with the faculty member, who may elect to meet with the supervisor and discuss the specific findings and recommendations. Subsequently, a final Performance Review Report is prepared, which the faculty member will sign as an indication that he/she has had the opportunity to read the report. Such a signature connotes neither agreement nor disagreement with the report. The faculty member may append a written statement to the report. The report and appended statement, if any, are included in the faculty member's personnel file.

- Should deficiencies be identified, a Performance Improvement Plan listing constructive improvements to be undertaken by the faculty member is developed jointly by the faculty member and the supervisor. The plan will include specific performance targets, any necessary resources or assistance to facilitate improvement, and a timetable for development and periodic supervisory follow-ups. The Performance Improvement Plan and any subsequent information, which shows attainment of goals identified in the plan, will be included with the Performance Review Report in the faculty member's personnel file.

Outcome: An evaluation of the faculty member that states whether he/she "Exceeds," "Meets," "Does Not Meet" expectations as defined by the relevant unit criteria document.

Appeal: If a faculty member believes that there has been a violation of the CBA, there are a number of formal and informal avenues a faculty member may select. Informally, the faculty member should first seek resolution with the supervisor. In addition, the faculty member may request assistance from the peer review committee. Formally, faculty may avail themselves of Article 20 in the CBA, or file legal action outside the university and bargaining structures.

References: CBA Articles 10 and 20, Administrative Codes, Florida Statutes

Fixed Multi-Year Successive Contract Review

- Applies to: Faculty on fixed multi-year contracts.
- Period under review:
- For the first reappointment review, the period from the beginning of the contract to the time of the multi-year reappointment review; for subsequent reappointment reviews, the period from the previous reappointment review.
 - At any point after one year of service and before the reappointment evaluation process (penultimate year of the contract), a faculty member may request that the supervisor conduct an evaluation using the following guidelines.
- Timeline:
- Conducted during the spring semester of the penultimate year of the contract.
 - January 6: Letter of notification of intent to consider for renewal (from VPAA).
 - January 16: Faculty member's letter of response to VPAA.
 - January 30: Faculty submit documentation to the supervisor.
 - March 30: Peer review committee submits recommendation to the supervisor.
 - April 15: Dean makes recommendation to VPAA.
 - April 30: VPAA notifies faculty member of renewal or non-renewal decision. Please note that this timeline differs from the timelines for tenure and promotion evaluations because reappointment decisions do not go beyond the institutional level.
- Participants:
- Faculty member, supervisor, and peer review committee. The supervisor and the peer review committee may seek input from the faculty member's peers.
 - The faculty member may request in writing that a colleague participate in the review process. This colleague may examine all submitted material and make recommendations to the faculty member regarding their documentation and the review process. Neither the faculty member nor the colleague participates in the peer review committee's final decision making.
- Documentation:
- Updated curriculum vitae.
 - Cumulative information from previous annual reviews.
 - Current year information equivalent to that provided for annual reviews.
 - Peer assessment of teaching must be included in the portfolio.
 - Review of service when service is a component of the PDP during that contract; this may include contacting the chairs or contacting people listed on the APDRs.
- Process:
- The evaluation process will include at least three independent assessments: a self-assessment; the peer review committee's assessment; and the supervisor's assessment (including the Dean's assessment).
 - All documentation should be submitted to the supervisor by Jan. 30.
 - The supervisor will notify the peer review committee when the materials are in place for review.
 - Either the peer review committee or the faculty member may request an initial meeting to review the documentation. This meeting will include the faculty member's colleague if one has been formally identified.
 - The peer review committee conducts a review and passes its signed evaluation on to the immediate supervisor (Chair or Dean) by March 30.
 - The supervisor then meets with the faculty member to discuss the draft

Performance Review Report.

- The supervisor (if other than the Dean) makes his/her recommendation to the Dean, who is responsible for making the final recommendation to the vice president for academic affairs by April 15.
- The VPAA notifies faculty member of renewal or non-renewal decision by April 30.

Reports:

- Upon completion of the review, the supervisor prepares a draft Performance Review Report, i.e., a written summary regarding performance that includes the faculty member's self-assessment, the peer review committee's assessment, and the supervisor's assessment. The report will include a statement of support or non-support for reappointment and a written rationale for the recommendation. The summary is shared with the faculty member, who may elect to meet with the supervisor and discuss the specific findings and recommendations. Subsequently, a final Performance Review Report is prepared, which the faculty member will sign as an indication that he/she has had the opportunity to read the report. Such a signature connotes neither agreement nor disagreement with the report. The faculty member may append a written statement to the report. The report and appended statement, if any, are included in the faculty member's personnel file.

Outcome:

A favorable review requires the faculty member to at least meet expectations (stated objectives) as defined by the relevant unit criteria document.

Appeal:

If a faculty member believes that there has been a violation of the CBA, there are a number of formal and informal avenues a faculty member may select. Informally, the faculty member should first seek resolution with the supervisor. In addition, the faculty member may request assistance from the peer review committee. Formally, faculty may avail themselves of Article 20 in the CBA, or file legal action outside the university and bargaining structures.

References: CBA Articles 10 and 20, Administrative Codes, Florida Statutes

Continuing Multi-year Appointment Extension

Applies to:	Faculty on Continuing Multi-year Appointments.
Period under review:	Previous academic or contract year (typically summer, fall, and spring semesters).
Timeline:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performed annually. • March 31: Documentation submitted to the supervisor. Faculty may add documents related to spring performance not available until after the due date. • April 30: Evaluation completed. • May 6: Draft PDP for next academic year. • September 30: Final PDP completed and signed
Participants:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty member and supervisor. The supervisor may seek input from the faculty member's peers. • The faculty member may request in writing that a colleague observe the review process. This colleague must be identified to the supervisor in writing as having permission to review all evaluative material. This colleague may be his/her mentor, other FGCU faculty colleague, or member of the Peer Review Committee. The colleague may examine all submitted material and may observe the supervisor's discussion with the faculty member. The mentor serves only as an advisor to the faculty member.
Documentation:	<p><u>Provided by faculty member:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated curriculum vitae. • Professional Development Plan (PDP), which includes faculty objectives. • Annual Professional Development Report (APDR), which includes amendments to the PDP and statements of how the objectives of the PDP have been met. • Faculty member may include additional relevant materials such as signed letters from students, colleagues, faculty from other institutions, editors, community members, and practitioners in the field. • Essential Portfolio Materials should address the faculty member's objectives identified in the PDP. <p><u>Provided by supervisor:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior Performance Review Reports with recommendations for improvements (if any) and supporting documentation. • Faculty Activity Reports (FAR), which identify assignment of duties and responsibilities for each semester.
Process:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluation process will include two independent assessments: a self-assessment and the supervisor's assessment. • All materials should be submitted to the supervisor by March 31. • The faculty member should set up an appointment with the supervisor to discuss the evaluation; this evaluation is to be completed by April 30.
Reports:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upon completion of the evaluation, the supervisor prepares a draft Performance Review Report, i.e., a written summary regarding performance. This evaluation must include a statement regarding continuing contract extension and/or promotion. The summary is shared with the faculty member, who may elect to meet with the supervisor and discuss the specific findings and recommendations. Subsequently, a final

Performance Review Report is prepared, which the faculty member will sign as an indication that he/she has had the opportunity to read the report. Such a signature connotes neither agreement nor disagreement with the report. The faculty member may append a written statement to the report. The report and appended statement, if any, are included in the faculty member's personnel file.

- If a faculty member receives an unsatisfactory evaluation in any of the three areas of Teaching, Scholarship, or Service (or the applicable unit-level categories), the faculty member and his or her supervisor will jointly develop a list of constructive improvements to be undertaken during the next successive academic year and incorporate this list in the faculty member's Professional Development Plan. The list will include specific performance targets that will be achieved in order to remedy the current year's unsatisfactory evaluation, as well as any resources or assistance needed to facilitate improvement. The faculty member may request the participation of the unit's Peer Review Committee in developing the list.

- Outcome:
- Upon receiving an overall satisfactory annual evaluation, the faculty member will receive a one-year contract extension, thereby maintaining a full three-year continuing contract cycle.
 - Upon receiving an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the faculty member will be placed on a one-year probation, with no contract extension added to his or her appointment for the duration of the probationary period.

Appeal: In the event a continuing multi-year appointment faculty member is assessed "overall unsatisfactory" in his or her annual evaluation and wishes to appeal this, he or she may submit a written request to the academic unit's Peer Review Committee asking it to review the evaluation to ensure that it has been carried out in accordance with the unit's evaluation procedures and criteria. Upon completion of its review, the Peer Review Committee shall submit its findings to the unit's chief academic administrator (e.g. Dean), with copies forwarded to the faculty member and faculty member's supervisor. The final decision with respect to the faculty member's evaluation in this case will be made at this level.

If a faculty member believes that there has been a violation of the CBA, there are a number of formal and informal avenues a faculty member may select. Informally, the faculty member should first seek resolution with the supervisor. In addition, the faculty member may request assistance from the Peer Review Committee. Formally, faculty may avail themselves of Article 20 in the CBA, or file legal action outside the university and bargaining structures.

References: CBA Articles 10 and 20, Administrative Codes, Florida Statutes

Continuing Multi-year Appointment Probation Review

Applies to:	Faculty on Continuing Multi-year Appointments. Performed in place of the normal Continuing Multi-year Appointment Extension process for faculty members placed on probation following the previous year's Continuing Multi-year Appointment Extension Review.
Period under review:	Previous academic or contract year (typically summer, fall, and spring semesters).
Timeline:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September 30 of current academic year: Performance Improvement Contract finalized • March 15: Documentation submitted to the supervisor. • March 31: Supervisor report submitted to Peer Review Committee. • April 30: Peer Review Evaluation submitted to unit's chief academic administrator. • May 6: Notification to faculty member of appointment extension or non-extension, as appropriate. • June 15: Draft PDP for the current academic year. • June 20: Supervisor letter of assignment if no PDP received. • September 30 of following academic year: Final PDP completed and signed.
Participants:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty member, supervisor, and unit Peer Review Committee. • As with the Continuing Multi-year Appointment Extension Review, the faculty member may request in writing that a colleague observe the portion of the review process involving the supervisor. This colleague must be identified to the supervisor in writing as having permission to review all evaluative material. This colleague may be his/her mentor, other FGCU faculty colleague, or member of the peer review committee. The colleague may examine all material submitted to the supervisor and may observe the supervisor's discussion with the faculty member. The mentor serves only as an advisor to the faculty member.
Documentation:	<p><u>Provided by faculty member (as appropriate):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated curriculum vitae. • Performance Improvement Contract (PIC) in lieu of a Professional Development Plan (PDP). • Self-evaluation and relevant supporting documentation to demonstrate fulfillment of the PIC. <p><u>Provided by supervisor:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior Performance Review Reports and supporting documentation. • Faculty Activity Reports which identify assignment of duties and responsibilities for each semester. • Summary document in response to evaluation of PIC performance targets. <p><u>Provided by Peer Review Committee:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final recommendation on probation resolution and contract extension. All relevant documentation will be provided to the unit's chief academic administrator (e.g. Dean) for final decision.
Process:	<p><u>Subject to initiation of a PIC:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The faculty member's supervisor will periodically review with the faculty member his or her progress in meeting the performance targets

agreed upon in the Performance Improvement Contract.

- All materials for final probation review must be submitted to the supervisor no later than the due date.
- The faculty member will set up an appointment with the supervisor to discuss the evaluation and have the opportunity to provide a written response to be included with documentation forwarded.
- The Peer Review Committee will then review the supervisor's recommendation and accompanying documentation. The Peer Review Committee will provide a written recommendation to the unit's chief administrator (e.g. Dean) for final determination.
- The faculty member shall have the opportunity to review the Peer Review Committee's recommendation and provide a written response to be included with documentation forwarded.
- The unit's chief academic administrator will make the final decision with respect to the faculty member's evaluation and contract extension based on the recommendations and documentation provided.
- In the event the unit's chief academic administrator believes the Peer Review Committee's findings are inconsistent with the unit's evaluation procedures and criteria, that individual may contest the Peer Review Committee's findings by providing his or her findings and accompanying documents to the Vice President of Academic Affairs.
- The faculty member shall have the opportunity to review the final recommendation of his or her unit's chief academic administrator and, if dissatisfied with the final recommendation, may provide a written response and appeal to the Vice President of Academic Affairs for review of the evaluation.

Reports:

- The faculty member shall have the right to provide written responses at any level of the review process, to be included in the documentation forwarded.
- Copies of all forwarded documentation shall be provided to the faculty member, supervisor, and Peer Review Committee.
- The supervisor must submit a summary document to the unit's Peer Review Committee that indicates whether or not, in the supervisor's judgment, the faculty member has achieved performance targets in remedying performance deficiencies, that identifies any performance targets that have not been met, and that recommends whether or not the faculty member's probation should be lifted and a contract extension granted. The faculty member will sign this report as an indication that he/she has had the opportunity to read the report. Such a signature connotes neither agreement nor disagreement with the report.
- The Peer Review Committee must submit a final recommendation on probation and contract extension to the unit's chief academic administrator (e.g. Dean), based on review of the supervisor's recommendation, any accompanying faculty written response, and on its own review of the faculty member's performance.
- The unit's chief academic administrator must submit written report to the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Outcome:

- If the faculty member receives a satisfactory evaluation and recommendation for contract extension, he or she shall be taken off probation and granted a two-year contract extension, thereby restoring the faculty member to a full three-year Continuing Multi-year Appointment cycle.

- In the event that the recommendation is against contract extension, no contract extension shall be issued and the faculty member shall have one year remaining in his or her appointment, without further opportunity for contract continuance.

Appeal:

In the event a continuing multi-year appointment faculty member wishes to appeal or otherwise respond to the results of a probation review, he or she has the right to provide written responses at any level of the review process, to be included in the documentation forwarded to the next level of review.

In the event the unit's chief academic administrator (e.g. Dean) believes the Peer Review Committee's findings in a probation review are inconsistent with the unit's evaluation procedures and criteria, he or she may contest the Peer Review Committee's findings by providing his or her findings to the Vice President of Academic Affairs with whom the final decision on evaluation and contract extension rests. Copies of the unit's chief academic administrator's findings shall be forwarded to the faculty member and faculty member's supervisor.

If a faculty member believes that there has been a violation of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), there are a number of formal and informal avenues a faculty member may select. Informally, the faculty member should first seek resolution with the supervisor. In addition, the faculty member may request assistance from the peer review committee. Formally, faculty may avail themselves of Article 20 in the CBA, or file legal action outside the university and bargaining structures.

References: CBA Articles 10 and 20, Administrative Codes, Florida Statutes

Continuing Multi-year Appointment Preliminary Peer Review

- Applies to:
- All Continuing Multi-year Appointment faculty during the third year after their continuing contract start-up date, except for those who have previously undergone a successive multi-year appointment evaluation and/or promotion evaluation at FGCU.
 - Performed only once as an opportunity for formal college level peer review prior to a promotion or a sustained performance review.
- Period under review: First two years as a Continuing Multi-year Appointment faculty member.
- Timeline:
- Prior to the faculty member's third year annual review, the unit's Peer Review Committee submits a Preliminary Peer Review.
- Participants:
- Faculty member, supervisor, Peer Review Committee, and chief academic administrator.
 - The faculty member may request in writing that a colleague observe the review process. This colleague must be identified to the supervisor in writing as having permission to review all evaluative material. This colleague may be his/her mentor or other FGCU faculty colleague. The colleague may examine all submitted material and may observe the supervisor's discussion with the faculty member at the end of the process. The colleague/mentor serves only as an advisor to the faculty member.
 - Neither the faculty member nor the colleague participates in the Peer Review Committee's review process.
- Documentation: Provided by faculty member:
- Updated curriculum vitae.
 - Annual Professional Development Report (APDR) for the first two years.
 - Supervisor's Annual Performance Review Reports of the faculty member for the first two years.
 - Faculty member may include additional relevant materials such as signed letters from students, colleagues, faculty from other institutions, editors, community members, and practitioners in the field.
 - Essential Portfolio Materials should address the faculty member's objectives identified in the PDP.
- Provided by supervisor:
- Preliminary written review of the faculty member's performance in each area of assigned duty during the prior two-year period.
 - Additional relevant materials such as signed letters from students, colleagues, faculty from other institutions, editors, community members, and practitioners in the field, with notification to the faculty member.
 - The faculty member has right of review and response prior to materials being forwarded to the Peer Review Committee. Written response must accompany supervisor's report within 5 working days of the notification.
- Process:
- Faculty member will provide required documentation to the supervisor.
 - Supervisor will forward materials to the Peer Review Committee.
 - The Peer Review Committee will review the documentation and evaluate the faculty member's progress toward promotion and /or sustained performance.
 - The Peer Review Committee submits a written report to the unit's chief academic administrator prior to the faculty member's third annual review.

- Reports
- The Peer Review Committee shall submit a written report to the unit's chief academic administrator (e.g., Dean), with copies to the supervisor and faculty member, concerning the faculty member's progress toward promotion and/or sustained performance. This report must include recommendations for improvement, if any, as well as recommendations for additional university resources and/or adjustments in the faculty member's annual assignment that the Peer Review Committee believes would enhance the faculty member's sustained performance and progress toward promotion.
- Outcome
- The faculty member will meet with the supervisor to discuss the findings of the report.
 - The supervisor will respond to any recommendations from the Peer Review Committee for additional university resources and/or adjustments in the faculty member's annual assignment. Any changes should be reflected in faculty member's PDP for the following year (i.e. fourth year).
- Appeal
- The findings of this review are informational only. The document is the property of the faculty member who may choose to share or not share the document in subsequent reviews.

Promotion Review

- Applies to:** Both multi-year and tenure-line faculty who request promotion from assistant to associate professor or from associate to full professor.
- Period under review:** All previous years at FGCU and any previous years of service documented and credited to the faculty member by the unit dean/director constitute the period under review. Faculty will have at least four full years of full-time experience at the present rank, and at least one full year at FGCU, before applying for promotion. Under exceptional circumstances, a faculty member may petition her/his supervisor for a waiver of this requirement.
- Timeline:**
- Normally conducted during the spring semester; promotion occurs in the immediately following fall semester.
 - January 16: Faculty member's letter of intent to go up for promotion to VPAA.
 - January 30: Documentation submitted to the supervisor.
 - February 28: Peer review committee submits recommendation to supervisor.
 - Dean of Planning and Evaluation will provide the results of the peer faculty poll to the supervisor.
 - March 15: Dean makes recommendation to VPAA.
 - March 30: VPAA makes recommendation for or against promotion and advises the faculty of that decision.
- Participants:**
- Faculty member, supervisor, associate and full professors (as applicable) in unit, and peer review committee. The supervisor and the peer review committee may seek input from the faculty member's peers.
 - The faculty member may request in writing that a colleague participate in the review process. This colleague may be his/her mentor or other FGCU faculty colleague. The colleague may examine all submitted material and may make recommendations to the faculty member regarding their documentation and the review process. Neither the faculty member nor the colleague participates in the peer review committee's final decision making.
 - Each unit shall develop policies to ensure consistency and fairness with respect to the use of external reviewers for promotion reviews.
- Documentation:**
- Updated curriculum vitae.
 - Cumulative information from previous annual reviews.
 - Current year information equivalent to that provided for annual reviews.
 - Peer assessment of teaching must be included in the portfolio.
 - Review of service (if service is a component of the PDPs); this may include contacting the chairs or contact people listed on the APDRs.
 - Documentation of previous years of service credited toward promotion by unit Dean/Director, if applicable.
 - External review of scholarship (if deemed necessary).
- Process:**
- The evaluation process will include at least four independent assessments: a self-assessment; the associate/full professors' assessment; the peer review committee's assessment; and the supervisor's assessment (including the Dean's assessment).
 - A poll of Associate/Full Professor will be conducted by the Office of Planning and Evaluation and delivered to the supervisor.
 - All documentation should be submitted to the supervisor by Jan. 30.

- The supervisor will notify the peer review committee when the materials are in place for review.
- Either the peer review committee or the faculty member may request an initial meeting to review the documentation. This meeting may include the faculty member's colleague.
- The peer review committee conducts a review and passes its evaluation to the immediate supervisor (Chair or Dean) by Feb. 28.
- The supervisor (if other than the Dean) makes his/her recommendation to the Dean, who is responsible for making the final recommendation to the vice president for academic affairs by March 15.
- The VPAA makes his/her recommendation and advises the faculty member of that decision by March 30.

Reports:

- Upon completion of the review, the supervisor prepares a draft Performance Review Report, i.e., a written summary regarding performance that includes the faculty member's self-assessment, the peer review committee's assessment, the associate/full professors' poll, and the supervisor's assessment. The report will include a statement of support or non-support for promotion and a written rationale for the recommendation. The summary is shared with the faculty member, who may elect to meet with the supervisor and discuss the specific findings and recommendations. Subsequently, a final Performance Review Report is prepared, which the faculty member will sign as an indication that he/she has had the opportunity to read the report. Such a signature connotes neither agreement nor disagreement with the report. The faculty member may append a written statement to the report. The report and appended statement, if any, are included in the faculty member's personnel file.

Outcome:

A favorable review requires the faculty member to exceed expectations (stated objectives) as defined by the relevant unit criteria document.

Appeal:

If a faculty member believes that there has been a violation of the CBA, there are a number of formal and informal avenues a faculty member may select. Informally, the faculty member should first seek resolution with the supervisor. In addition, the faculty member may request assistance from the peer review committee. Formally, faculty may avail themselves of Article 20 in the CBA, or file legal action outside the university and bargaining structures.

Faculty making the transition from the University of South Florida at Fort Myers (USF-FM)

For Tenure and Promotion reviews, individual faculty members who made the transition from USF-FM to FGCU and who retained their years of service at USF Fort Myers may choose to be evaluated using the standards developed through the FGCU performance evaluation process or the standards in place when the faculty member was hired by USF. This review will include the previous USF-FM evaluations. While these faculty may choose to use the standards of USF Fort Myers, they must follow the procedures for evaluation outlined in this document. All annual evaluations will be conducted using FGCU standards and procedures. If a USF-FM faculty member chose to reset her or his tenure clock when s/he came over to FGCU, s/he will be held to FGCU standards for the tenure and promotion evaluation.

References: CBA Articles 14 and 20, Administrative Codes, Florida Statutes

Tenure Review

Applies to:	Eligible tenure-line faculty members who apply for tenure.
Period under review:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous five years or appropriate period if a faculty member is approved to go up early for tenure. • At any point after one year of service and before the tenure evaluation process, a faculty member may request that the supervisor conduct an evaluation using the following guidelines.
Timeline:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Normally conducted during the sixth year of service. May be earlier if prior service is credited or with the university's written agreement to an employee's written request. • January 16: Faculty member's letter of intent to go up for tenure to VPAA. • January 30: Documentation submitted to the supervisor. • February 28: Peer review committee submits recommendation to supervisor. • Dean of Planning and Evaluation provides tenured faculty assessment to supervisor. • March 15: Dean makes recommendation to VPAA. • March 30: VPAA makes recommendation for or against tenure to the DCU and informs the faculty member of that recommendation.
Participants:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty member, peer review committee, tenured members of the unit, and supervisor. The supervisor and the peer review committee may seek input from the faculty member's peers. • The faculty member may request in writing that a colleague participate in the review process. This colleague may include his/her mentor or other FGCU faculty colleague. The colleague may examine all submitted material and may make recommendations to the faculty member regarding their documentation and the peer review process. Neither the faculty member nor the colleague participates in the peer review committee's final decision making deliberations. • Each unit shall develop policies to ensure consistency and fairness with respect to the use of external reviewers for tenure reviews.
Documentation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated curriculum vitae. • Cumulative information from previous annual reviews. • Current year information equivalent to that provided for annual reviews. • Peer assessment of teaching must be included in the portfolio. • Review of service (if service is a component of the PDPs); this may include contacting the chairs or contact people listed on the APDRs. • External review of scholarship (if deemed necessary).
Process:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluation process will include at least four independent assessments: a self-assessment; the tenured professors' assessment; the peer review committee's assessment; and the supervisor's assessment (including the Dean's assessment). • All documentation should be submitted to the supervisor by Jan. 30. • The supervisor will notify the peer review committee and the tenured faculty when the materials are in place for review. • Either the peer review committee or the faculty member may request an initial meeting to review the documentation. This meeting may include the faculty member's colleague. • The Dean of Planning and Evaluation will provide a statement of the

tenured professors' vote to the immediate supervisor (Chair or Dean) by Feb. 28.

- The supervisor then meets with the faculty member to discuss the draft Performance Review Report.
- The supervisor (if other than the Dean) makes his/her recommendation to the Dean, who is responsible for making the final recommendation to the vice president for academic affairs by March 15.
- The VPAA makes his/her recommendation to the DCU and informs the faculty member of that decision by March 30.

Reports:

- Upon completion of the review, the supervisor prepares a draft Performance Review Report, i.e., a written summary regarding performance that includes the faculty member's self-assessment, the peer review committee's assessment, the tenured professors' assessment, and the supervisor's assessment. The report will include a statement of support or non-support for tenure and a written rationale for the recommendation. The summary is shared with the faculty member, who may elect to meet with the supervisor and discuss the specific findings and recommendations. Subsequently, a final Performance Review Report is prepared, which the faculty member will sign as an indication that he/she has had the opportunity to read the report. Such a signature connotes neither agreement nor disagreement with the report. The faculty member may append a written statement to the report. The report and appended statement, if any, are included in the faculty member's personnel file.

Outcome:

A favorable review requires the faculty member to exceed expectations as defined by the relevant unit criteria document. If a faculty member meets expectations, the peer review committee and/or the supervisor may recommend a multi-year contract. Otherwise, per Article 15 of CBA the faculty member will be given a written notice that further employment will not be offered.

Appeal:

If a faculty member believes that there has been a violation of the CBA, there are a number of formal and informal avenues a faculty member may select. Informally, the faculty member should first seek resolution with the supervisor. In addition, the faculty member may request assistance from the peer review committee. Formally, faculty may avail themselves of Article 20 in the CBA, or file legal action outside the university and bargaining structures.

Faculty making the transition from the University of South Florida at Fort Myers (USF-FM)

For Tenure and Promotion reviews, individual faculty members who made the transition from USF-FM to FGCU and who retained their years of service at USF Fort Myers may choose to be evaluated using the standards developed through the FGCU performance evaluation process or the standards in place when the faculty member was hired by USF. This review will include the previous USF-FM evaluations. While these faculty may choose to use the standards of USF Fort Myers, they must follow the procedures for evaluation outlined in this document. All annual evaluations will be conducted using FGCU standards and procedures. If a USF-FM faculty member chose to reset her or his tenure clock when s/he came over to FGCU, s/he will be held to FGCU standards for the tenure and promotion evaluation.

References: CBA Articles 15 and 20, Administrative Codes, Florida Statutes

Sustained Performance Evaluations (Post-Tenure Review)

Applies to:	Tenured faculty.
Period under review:	Previous six years.
Timeline:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducted every seven years following receipt of tenure, promotion, or most recent advancement. • January 6: Unit administrators notify faculty who have six years since receipt of tenure, promotion, or most recent advancement • January 30: Documentation submitted to the supervisor. If the faculty member has received an overall satisfactory annual evaluation during the previous six years the supervisor submits a positive report to the Dean by February 28. • February 28: Peer review committee submits a signed written report to supervisor, if the above condition is not met. • March 15: Dean makes recommendation to VPAA. • March 30: VPAA notifies faculty member of review decision.
Participants: Only if an extended SPE is required such as when all six years are not satisfactory evaluations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty member, supervisor, and peer review committee. The supervisor and the peer review committee may seek input from the faculty member's peers. • The faculty member may request in writing that a colleague participate in the review process. The colleague may examine all submitted material and may make a recommendation to the peer review committee. Neither the faculty member nor the colleague participates in the peer review committee's final decision making.
Documentation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated curriculum vitae. • Cumulative information from previous six annual evaluations. • Current year information equivalent to that provided for annual reviews, only if an extended SPE is required. • Any performance improvement plans
Process:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All documentation should be submitted to the supervisor by Jan. 30. • The supervisor then meets with the faculty member to discuss the draft Performance Review Report. • The supervisor (if other than the Dean) makes his/her recommendation to the Dean, who is responsible for making the final recommendation to the VPAA by March 15. <p><u>Refer to these steps only if an extended SPE is required</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluation process will include at least three of the following independent assessments: a self-assessment; the peer review committee's assessment; the supervisor's assessment (including the Dean's assessment). The supervisor will notify the peer review committee when the materials are in place for review. • Either the peer review committee or the faculty member may request an initial meeting to review the documentation. This meeting may include the faculty member's colleague.
Report:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The supervisor shall write a positive report if all prior annual evaluations are satisfactory. The report shall be shared with the faculty member. <p><u>Refer to these steps only if an extended SPE is required.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upon completion of the review, the supervisor prepares a draft

Performance Review Report. The report will contain a written rationale for the recommendation. The summary is shared with the faculty member, who may elect to meet with the supervisor and discuss the specific findings and recommendations. Subsequently, a final Performance Review Report is prepared, which the faculty member will sign as an indication that he/she has had the opportunity to read the report. Such a signature connotes neither agreement nor disagreement with the report. The faculty member may append a written statement to the report. The report and appended statement, if any, are included in the faculty member's personnel file.

- Should deficiencies be identified, a Performance Improvement Plan listing constructive improvements to be undertaken by the faculty member is developed jointly by the faculty member and the supervisor. The plan will include specific performance targets, necessary resources or assistance to facilitate improvement, and a timetable for development and periodic supervisory follow-ups. Before implementation the plan shall be approved by the President or representative (CBA Article 10). The Performance Improvement Plan and any subsequent information, which shows attainment of goals identified in the improvement plan, will be included with the Performance Review Report in the faculty member's personnel file.

Outcomes: A favorable review requires the faculty member to meet expectations (stated objectives) as defined by the relevant unit criteria document. This is consistent with CBA Article 10.3(b)(2)a which reads: "An employee who received satisfactory annual evaluations during the previous six years shall not be rated below satisfactory in the sustained performance evaluation nor subjected to a performance improvement plan."

Appeal: If a faculty member believes that there has been a violation of the CBA, there are a number of formal and informal avenues a faculty member may select. Informally, the faculty member should first seek resolution with the supervisor. In addition, the faculty member may request assistance from the peer review committee. Formally, faculty may avail themselves of Article 20 in the CBA, or file legal action outside the university and bargaining structures.

In the event a continuing multi-year appointment faculty member is assessed "overall unsatisfactory" in his or her annual evaluation and wishes to appeal this, he or she may submit a written request to the academic unit's Peer Review Committee asking it to review the evaluation to ensure that it has been carried out in accordance with the unit's evaluation procedures and criteria. Upon completion of its review, the Peer Review Committee shall submit its findings to the unit's chief academic administrator (e.g. Dean), with copies forwarded to the faculty member and faculty member's supervisor. The final decision with respect to the faculty member's evaluation in this case will be made at this level.

References: CBA Articles 10 and 20, Administrative Codes, Florida Statutes Administrative

Continuing Multi-year Appointment Sustained Performance Review

- Applies to:
 - Faculty on Continuing Multi-year Appointments.
- Period under review: Previous six years since initial continuing contract appointment or last sustained review
- Timeline:
 - Conducted during the seventh year of the continuing multi-year appointment and every seven (7) years thereafter.
 - **October 1:** All materials submitted to supervisor.
 - **October 15:** Supervisor sends preliminary review to the Peer Review Committee
 - **November 15:** Peer Review Committee submits final review
 - **December 15:** Unit's chief academic administrator approves or refers recommendation to VPAA
 - **January 15:** VPAA makes final decision.
- Participants:
 - Faculty member, supervisor, Peer Review Committee, and the unit's chief academic administrator.
 - The faculty member may request in writing that a colleague observe the review process. This colleague must be identified to the supervisor in writing as having permission to review all evaluative material. This colleague may be his/her mentor or other FGCU faculty colleague. The colleague may examine all submitted material and may observe any discussions between the supervisor and the faculty member. The colleague/mentor serves only as an advisor to the faculty member.
 - Neither the faculty member nor the colleague participates in the Peer Review Committee's review process.
- Documentation: Provided by faculty member:
 - Updated curriculum vitae.
 - Annual Professional Development Reports (APDR) for the prior six years.
 - Supervisor's Annual Performance Review Reports of the faculty member for the prior six years.
 - Any Performance Improvement Contracts (PIC) and probation reviews, if applicable.
 - Narrative self-assessment by the faculty member
 - Faculty member may include additional relevant materials such as signed letters from students, colleagues, faculty from other institutions, editors, community members, and practitioners in the field.
 - Essential Portfolio Materials should address the faculty member's objectives identified in the PDP.Provided by the supervisor:
 - Preliminary assessment reflective of both the faculty member's performance for the previous six years and the unit's criteria for sustained performance to the Peer Review Committee.
 - Additional relevant materials such as signed letters from students, colleagues, faculty from other institutions, editors, community members, and practitioners in the field, with notification to the faculty member.
 - The faculty member has right of review and response prior to materials being forwarded to the Peer Review Committee. Written response must accompany supervisor's report within 5 working days of the notification.

- Process:
- The faculty member submits documentation to the supervisor.
 - The supervisor reviews the documentation and prepares a preliminary assessment.
 - The preliminary assessment is shared with the faculty member, who may elect to meet with the supervisor and discuss the specific findings and recommendations. A final assessment signed by both faculty and supervisor
 - Supervisor submits assessment and accompanying documentation to the Peer Review Committee.
 - The Peer Review Committee reviews the documentation and the supervisor's assessment and submits a signed final report to the unit's chief academic administrator (e.g., the Dean), with copies to the faculty member and the supervisor.
 - The faculty member shall have the opportunity to provide written response to the Peer Review Committee's review to be included in the documentation forwarded.
 - The unit's chief academic administrator approves the recommendation of the Peer Review Committee or refers the assessment to the VPAA with the unit's chief academic administrator's recommendation. If the unit's chief academic administrator agrees with the Peer Review Committee's assessment, the process ends with acceptance of their assessment.
 - If the unit's chief academic administrator believes the action of the Peer Review Committee is inconsistent with the unit's sustained performance procedures and criteria, the unit's chief academic administrator may contest the findings by submitting the Peer Review Committee's findings and the unit's chief academic administrator's recommendation to the VPAA with whom the final decision on evaluation and contract extension rests.

- Reports:
- The faculty member shall have the right to provide written responses at any level of the review process, to be included in the documentation forwarded.
 - Copies of all forwarded documentation shall be provided to the faculty member, supervisor, and Peer Review Committee.
 - The supervisor shall write an assessment of the faculty member's performance for the previous six years. If all annual evaluations in the review period received an overall rating of *satisfactory*, the assessment should be positive. This evaluation must address each area of assigned duty during the six-year period, and include a statement regarding continuing contract extension. In the case of Assistant Professors in their first sustained review, the supervisor's assessment must also include a statement about progress toward promotion. The faculty member will sign the supervisor's assessment as an indication that he/she has had the opportunity to read the assessment. Such a signature connotes neither agreement nor disagreement with the assessment. The faculty member may append a written statement to the assessment that is included in the documents forwarded.
 - The Peer Review Committee shall write a final Sustained Performance Review Report reflective of the faculty member's performance for the previous six years, the supervisor's assessment, and the unit's criteria for sustained performance. This report must include recommendations for improvement, if warranted, as well as any recommendations for additional university resources and/or adjustments in the faculty member's annual assignment that the Peer Review Committee believes would enhance the

faculty member's performance. The faculty member will sign the final Sustained Performance Review report as an indication that he/she has had the opportunity to read the report. Such a signature connotes neither agreement nor disagreement with the report. The faculty member may append a written statement to the report. The report and appended statement, if any, are included in the faculty member's personnel file.

- Outcome:
- Any recommendations for improvement, additional resources, and adjustments in assignment, should be reflected in the faculty member's subsequent PDP. Any negative performance issues shall be addressed in following year's annual performance review report.
 - A Continuing Multi-year Appointment faculty member shall not exceed two probationary terms in any given 6-year sustained performance evaluation period. Additionally, a Continuing Multi-year Appointment faculty member hired at the Assistant Professor level shall be expected to have made substantial progress toward promotion to the Associate level by the time of his or her first sustained performance evaluation, and must have achieved promotion to the Associate level prior to his or her second sustained performance evaluation. Failure to meet these conditions may be used by the university as a basis for terminating an employee's contract with one year's notice.

Appeal: In the event a continuing multi-year appointment faculty member wishes to appeal or otherwise respond to the results of a sustained performance review, he or she has the right to provide written responses at any level of the review process, to be included in the documentation forwarded to the next level of review.

In the event the unit's chief academic administrator (e.g. Dean) believes the Peer Review Committee's findings in a sustained performance review are inconsistent with the unit's evaluation procedures and criteria, he or she may contest the Peer Review Committee's findings by providing his or her findings to the Vice President of Academic Affairs with whom the final decision on evaluation and contract extension rests. Copies of the unit's chief academic administrator's findings shall be forwarded to the faculty member and faculty member's supervisor.

If a faculty member believes that there has been a violation of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), there are a number of formal and informal avenues a faculty member may select. Informally, the faculty member should first seek resolution with the supervisor. In addition, the faculty member may request assistance from the peer review committee. Formally, faculty may avail themselves of Article 20 in the CBA, or file legal action outside the university and bargaining structures.

References: CBA Articles 8.4G and 15.9, Administrative Codes, Florida Statutes

Responsibility

The university is committed to the professional development and success of all its employees. The university administration, in collaboration with the faculty, makes performance evaluation decisions regarding annual, multi-year reappointment, continuing multi-year appointment extensions, preliminary peer reviews and continuing multi-year appointment sustained performance, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews, and performance recognition awards. These decisions are based on the extent to which the faculty member attains or exceeds the goals and objectives mutually agreed upon in his or her Professional Development Plan.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement outlines factors that, in addition to documented performance, may influence a university's decision to offer an individual faculty member either a successive multi-year appointment or tenure and permanent status.

- Article 8 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement as amended states:

The university reserves the right to consider offering successive multi-year appointments to employees. Criteria used to determine in which instances to offer successive appointments include consideration of the basis for the initial multi-year appointment, evaluation of performance, professional growth, extent and currency of professional qualifications, contribution to the mission of the department or program, staffing needs, funding source alternatives, and continuing program considerations.

- Article 15 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement as amended states:

The decision to award tenure to an employee shall be a result of meritorious performance and shall be based on established criteria specified in writing by the Board and the universities. The decision shall take into account the following:

- 1) *Annual performance evaluations;*
- 2) *The needs of the department/unit, college/unit, and university;*
- 3) *The contributions of the employee to the employee's academic unit (program, department/unit, college/unit); and*
- 4) *The contributions the employee is expected to make to the institution.*

Consistent with the principles and mission of FGCU, the Faculty Affairs Team has created a reappointment process for multi-year faculty and a tenure process for tenure earning faculty that is performance based. The administration will articulate policies and procedures for offering multi-year appointments. In accordance with Article 8.4(g) of the CBA: "The proposed policies and procedures for offering multi-year appointments shall be available to UFF for review prior to final approval." Adherence to these policies and procedures by all constituencies, faculty and administration, is crucial for the success of FGCU's mission. The FGCU administration will provide timely termination notice to afford a reasonable opportunity for faculty who are not retained to seek employment elsewhere. The University will clearly document reasons for non-reappointment and will ensure that procedural due process safeguards have been followed.

VII. PEER REVIEW COMMITTEES

Six peer review committees will be formed--one for each of the following units:

- College of Arts and Sciences
- College of Business
- College of Health Professions
- College of Education,
- College of Professional Studies
- Library Services

As new academic units evolve, additional peer review committees will be created.

The peer review committee participates in all faculty performance reviews except annual reviews and sustained performance evaluations. They are responsible for the following:

- Providing guidance and assistance to faculty members in preparing the Professional Development Plan, upon request. Providing guidance and assistance to faculty members in preparing documentation for performance reviews, upon request.
- Assisting with annual reviews, upon written request.
- Participating in interim reviews regarding progress toward tenure, upon written request.
- Suggesting the use of and/or assisting with the selection of external reviewers.
- Preparing a written and signed recommendation to the supervisor for reappointment, promotion, and tenure; this recommendation will be included on the Performance Review Report.
- Counseling faculty members and assisting in the informal resolution of disagreements upon written request.

The peer review committee reports its recommendation without a tally of its votes. The CBA refers to the role of the Peer Committee Evaluations in Article 11.

Each peer review committee will consist of five multi-year, tenure earning, or tenured faculty members selected by their peers.

The faculty in each unit will elect, by secret ballot, the individuals who will serve on that unit's peer review committee. All members will be elected to serve for a period of two years. Faculty members may be reelected to serve on the Peer Review Committee. The chair of each peer review committee will be a member of that committee elected by fellow committee members. The chair will serve a one-year term and can be reelected for subsequent terms. The chair will be responsible for convening meetings and coordinating reviews with the faculty member to be evaluated, the faculty member's supervisor, and any other individuals authorized to participate in the review.

VIII. FACULTY AFFAIRS TEAM

The Faculty Affairs Team serves in an advisory capacity to the vice president for academic affairs, providing faculty input regarding personnel matters. In this role, the committee neither usurps nor replaces the formal Grievance Procedure and Arbitration clause (Article 20) and other provisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

The Faculty Affairs Team is responsible for the following:

- Facilitating the establishment and operation of peer review committees.
- Reviewing and, if necessary, making recommendations to the individual units and to the vice president for academic affairs regarding evaluation criteria and outcomes in order to ensure reasonable equity across the colleges/units.
- Providing counsel regarding transition from multi-year contract; fixed and continuing to tenure-line appointments and vice versa.
- Providing counsel regarding salary and rank equity issues within colleges (e.g., between tenure-line and multi-year contract appointments; between current faculty and new hires; or the availability and allocation of summer appointments).
- Providing guidelines for the development of performance awards by the individual units.
- Providing counsel for allocating professional development and resource support.
- Establishing guidelines and providing counsel regarding issues that may impact the performance and professional life of the faculty.

The Faculty Affairs Team will consist of eleven members--two members from each college or school, one member from Library Services, an ex-officio liaison from the office of the vice president for academic affairs, and an ex-officio liaison from the Faculty Senate. The faculty in each college/unit will elect, by secret ballot, the individual or individuals that will represent that unit on the Faculty Affairs Team. The Senate representatives within each unit will conduct the respective elections in the unit. Initially, one member from each college will be elected to serve for one year, and the other member from the same college will be elected to serve for two years. The representative from Library Services will be elected to serve for two years. Thereafter, representatives from all college/units will be elected to a two-year term. Nominations and elections will take place prior to the end of September.

The chair of the Faculty Affairs Team will be a member of the Faculty Affairs Team and will be elected by fellow committee members. The chair will serve a one-year term and can be reelected to subsequent terms. The chair of the Faculty Affairs Team will work closely with the vice president for academic affairs. Key responsibilities of the chair include, but are not limited to, convening meetings, developing meeting agendas, maintaining meeting minutes, and sharing faculty concerns through appropriate channels.

Faculty Performance Recognition Programs

The Faculty Affairs Team will facilitate the establishment of a separate peer committee or committees, which will be responsible for reviews and decisions concerning faculty performance recognition programs. Criteria for these awards and programs will be developed within each unit and reviewed for equity by the Faculty Affairs Team.

IX. FACULTY REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATORS

Faculty affirm the importance of assessment and evaluation of all of the university's activities and personnel. Further, faculty support the use of evaluation results to enhance the performance of both the faculty and the administration to improve the quality of FGCU's educational programs and services. In this context, the FGCU administration invites input from the faculty regarding the leadership performance of supervisors, deans, associate deans, and assistant deans. The formal protocol for such reviews, including the evaluation form, the schedule, and the procedures, are the purview of the FGCU administration and not covered by this evaluation document; however, it is expected that the Faculty Affairs Team will have a meaningful involvement in the design of the evaluation process as well as the administration and interpretation of results.

X. IMPLEMENTATION

The provisions of the Document become effective on 1-24-03 (approval date of Faculty Senate).

The FPED will be reviewed annually by the Faculty Affairs Team to ensure that it remains effective. Recommendations for modifications or amendments come to the Faculty Senate for consideration. The Faculty Senate, after consultation with the faculty at large, may approve any modification or amendment to the FPED. All changes in the FPED are sent to the Provost/VPAA for final approval. Personnel recommendations are to be consistent with the terms and conditions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. A copy of the modifications and amendments will be distributed to the local UFF chapter for their information.

APPENDIX A: Examples of Performance Activities

Activities and documents associated respectively with teaching, scholarship, and service.

The items on these lists are illustrative of the range of faculty responsibilities and will assist the units in establishing evaluation criteria.

(The following lists are not intended to be all-inclusive; this information supplements Section 10.4 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.)

Teaching

- Syllabi, class notes, course revisions, examinations, student reports and projects.
- Program advising and mentoring of students.
- Systematically collected peer evaluations and student perceptions of teaching.
- Peer assessment conducted during the period under review.
- The development of instructional materials, academic programs, innovative teaching strategies and delivery methods, innovative clinical teaching strategies, and software and videos in support of teaching and academic programs.
- Development and presentation of university-sponsored lifelong learning offerings, e.g., workshops, clinics, continuing education programs.
- Development and delivery of individualized library instruction or research assistance for students, faculty, staff, special events, and community partnerships
- Sharing relevant and significant course materials and expertise with other faculty members in the university.
- Contributions to the development of supportive learning resources, including internships and clinical education and providing for significant opportunities for learning outside regularly scheduled class times.
- The development of professional practice programs in such applied disciplines as health care, business, education, government, criminal justice, and human services, and supervising the learning activities and fieldwork of students enrolled in these programs.
- The development and implementation of policies and procedures that aid in the analysis, development, and/or management of a library collection that supports the FGCU curriculum.
- Participation in lifelong learning courses and workshops aimed at enhancing teaching excellence and updating specialty area knowledge and expertise.
- Formal public recognition of pedagogical achievement in the form of an outstanding teaching award, grant, or stipend.
- Letters of support from faculty peers, professional colleagues, former students, and program participants who can attest to the faculty member's teaching performance.

Scholarship (includes works in progress)

- Publication of refereed articles, papers, books, chapters of books, and monographs.
- Edited works in books or textbooks, translations, abstracts, reviews, or criticisms.
- Presentation of papers at professional conferences and meetings.
- Cases, non-refereed articles, papers, encyclopedia entries, and reference materials which contribute to the development and dissemination of new knowledge, theoretical perspectives, or ideologies.
- Policy position papers and comprehensive studies developed for community clients, government, external agencies or organizations, the university, or the profession.
- Musical compositions, artistic performances, paintings, exhibitions, sculptures, and works of performing arts.
- Development of new technology and software for research and teaching purposes.
- Research grants, fellowships, or external funding received to support scholarly work.
- Letters from practitioners, editors, reviewers, co-authors, FGCU administration and faculty, and faculty external to FGCU, which attest to the contributions and quality of the faculty member's scholarship.

Service

Service to the university:

- Active involvement in the governance of departments and/or academic unit, schools, colleges, and the university at large.
- Mentoring and providing guidance to faculty colleagues.
- Serving on or chairing committees or councils.
- Assisting student organizations (clubs, chapters, honor societies) by serving as an advisor, assisting with the development of programs, or coordinating community field trips and projects.

Service to the profession:

- Contributing to professional societies and accrediting or licensing boards.
- Organizing and conducting conferences, symposia, and workshops.
- Serving in leadership positions in professional societies or on licensing boards.
- Serving on or chairing professional committees or editorial review boards.

Service to the community:

- Contributing to local, state, regional, national, or international bodies such as health care providers, business organizations, educational institutions, museums, volunteer civic groups, and governmental boards and agencies.
- Serving as an advisor, officer, or chair for such groups and assisting in the development, implementation, or assessment of programs.