

FAMU

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA

All Colleges and Schools

Last revised: Fall 2024

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA

College of Agriculture and Food Sciences

Approved: December 2023

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA College of Agriculture and Food Sciences

Approved: December 2023

Introduction

The approved post-tenure review policies and procedures for faculty at Florida A&M University (FAMU) are available on the FAMU Faculty Resources website available at this URL:

<https://www.famu.edu/administration/academic-affairs/faculty-resources.php>

For additional information on the application submission process, contact the Office of the Provost via email academic.affairs@famu.edu or by phone 850-599-3276.

Overview

The Post-Tenure Review process for tenured faculty in the College of Agriculture and Food Sciences (CAFS) at Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (FAMU) shall include consideration of the following:

- i. The level of accomplishment and productivity relative to the faculty member's assigned duties.
- ii. The faculty member's history of professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities to the university and its students.
- iii. The faculty member's activities in support of student success
- iv. Other relevant measures of faculty conduct and performance as deemed appropriate by the college.

The CAFS post-tenure review dossier includes an updated curriculum vitae and the last five years of annual FAMU faculty evaluations, Assignments of Responsibility (AORs), student evaluations, and a summary of accomplishments from the faculty. Faculty members should follow university requirements in the preparation and submission of their review dossier.

Tenured faculty in CAFS are expected to perform their assigned duties in a manner that meets or exceeds the expectations of the College and the University. The assigned duties may include a combination of any of the following: academic instruction, research and/or extension (including sponsored activities), public/institutional service, and academic support activities, including advisement and other instructional activities. The percentage assigned to these activities will vary as a career evolves. However, except in the rare case of significant other responsibilities, a tenured faculty should have a minimum assignment of 10% research and/or extension (including sponsored activities).

Post-Tenure Review Criteria

The post-tenure review criteria for the College of Agriculture and Food Sciences have been approved by Office of the Provost. They are subject to revision **prior** to the **next** review cycle. Please see the website address listed above for the latest version. The criteria are as follows:

A. **TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS**

Faculty members demonstrate continued teaching effectiveness through the following attributes:

- Addressing the appropriate course content and objectives
 - Effectively conveying the subject matter to students
 - Organizing accessible and clear course materials
 - Providing appropriate, timely, and fair grading practices
 - Meeting classes reliably and promptly
 - Incorporating innovative teaching
 - Maintaining availability to students outside of office hours
 - Stimulating students' curiosity and desire to learn
 - Developing critical thinking and creative abilities
 - Creating and fostering an atmosphere conducive to learning.
- ii. A FAMU Faculty Evaluation is done at the end of each academic year. An overall average rating in the category of Teaching Effectiveness must be at three (3) or above to **“Meet Expectations.”** Any missing evaluation will be considered as “Meets.”
- iii. FAMU’s Class Climate is a course evaluation feedback system that allows students to evaluate the course and the instructor. Students submit these evaluations at the end of each semester for each course the faculty has taught. To **“Meet Expectations”** a faculty member must have an overall average of “Good” or better on the question “Overall Rating of Instructor.” The number of responses on an individual course evaluation may be taken into consideration.
- iv. As **optional** material, the candidate may provide supervisor’s annual course/classroom evaluations over the last five (5) years. These evaluations may be used as **additional** documentation to support teaching effectiveness.

B. **RESEARCH, EXTENSION AND SCHOLARSHIP**

Faculty members demonstrate their research, extension, and scholarship through publications, presentations, grant submissions, grant awards, and supervision of graduate students.

To “Meet Expectations” in Research, Extension, and Scholarship, a faculty member must demonstrate that they “Meet Expectations” in **two (2)** of the five (5) areas below:

- i. Publish (or shows acceptance of) at least two (2) works of scholarship in peer reviewed publications or receive peer reviewed design or competition awards. Scholarship can be defined as papers, posters, or design work. The publications can be conference proceedings, journals, book chapters, books, or other peer reviewed venues.
- ii. Present at least two (2) peer reviewed papers and/or abstract submissions in professional meetings or conference proceedings or perform other discipline related professional activities (e.g., workshops, seminars, colloquia, competitions).
- iii. Engages in submission of at least one (1) grant as PI or Co-PI as evidenced by the FAMU office of research (the research may be internal or external) grant proposal procurement or other research related activities on or off campus.
- iv. Secure at least one (1) grant funding for either research and/or training that supports undergraduate, graduate students and/or faculty.
- v. Supervision and graduation of Ph.D. students (Entomology faculty members only).

C. PUBLIC / INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE and STUDENT SUPPORT

Faculty will be assigned service responsibilities for their programs, the school, and the university through assigned committee and/or ad hoc committees. Candidates must demonstrate that they “Meet Expectations” in at least **three (3)** of the following:

- i. Actively participate in more than 80% of the Division’s Faculty Meetings.
- ii. Actively participate in more than 80% of the CAFS Meetings.
- iii. Actively participate in university committee assignments.
- iv. Academic advisement of students.
- v. Mentoring students. Activities include but are not limited to taking students to appropriate conferences and introducing students to industry and graduate school opportunities.
- vi. Providing service to the FAMU Clientele through serving on boards, providing expertise, organizing events to serve the community etc.
- vii. Volunteering for events in or outside the school such as recruitment activities, high school visits, fall and spring preview, STEM day, student club advisor etc.

The Post-Tenure Review regulation defines that a faculty member “**exceeds expectations**” when there is a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond “meets” expectations. A faculty member “**does not meet expectations**” when the faculty member’s performance falls below the normal range of annual variation of performance of “meets expectations” but is capable of improvement. A faculty

member's performance is rated as "**unsatisfactory**" when the faculty member fails to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or the performance involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable university regulations and policies.

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA College of Education

Approved: December 2023

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA

College of Education

Approved: December 2023

Introduction

The approved post-tenure review policies and procedures for faculty at Florida A&M University (FAMU) are available on the FAMU Faculty Resources website at the following URL:

<https://www.famu.edu/administration/academic-affairs/faculty-resources.php>

For additional information on the application submission process, contact the Office of the Provost via email at academic.affairs@famu.edu or by phone at 850-599-3276.

Post-Tenure Review Procedures

Contained herein is a description of the procedures for post-tenure review of candidates in the College of Education (COE) at Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (FAMU). Each faculty member should be familiar with the College of Education criteria for evaluation of faculty for post-tenure review. The procedures outlined in this document provide a detailed description of the various steps in the process for evaluation of a candidate. These procedures are identical for all faculty of the College of Education.

College of Education Procedures for Post-Tenure Review

During the spring semester of a given academic year, each faculty member should, in consultation with the department chair, be assessed on their teaching, research, and service duties. Assessment is completed utilizing the university's Faculty Evaluation Form. In addition to a copy of the form being provided to the faculty member, a copy of the completed Faculty Evaluation Form is maintained in the Office of the Dean.

Each semester, the faculty member in consultation with the department chair is assigned teaching, research, and service duties. The Assignment of Responsibility (AOR) shall align with the faculty member's work load. The AOR shall be revised every semester to reflect the faculty member's work expectations in the areas of teaching effectiveness, research and creative ability, performance in service, and other university services. The FAMU Annual Faculty Evaluation shall reflect the faculty member's time and effort as agreed upon on the AOR.

Faculty members undergoing post-tenure review should prepare their portfolio materials in accordance with university requirements. Within the College, review of post-tenure portfolios is initially completed by the department chair. The College Post-Tenure

Review Committee will serve in a fact-finding and consultative role, reviewing the candidates' dossier, annual evaluations, and chair's letter. The committee will report its findings on the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's packet via memo to the dean. This memo shall be included in the packet.

The dean shall add to the packet a brief letter assessing the level of achievement during the period under review and rate the faculty member as specified by the University's post-tenure review rating scale.

Post-Tenure Review Criteria

The post-tenure review criteria for the College of Education have been approved by Office of the Provost. The criteria are subject to revision **prior** to the **next** review cycle. Please visit the FAMU Faculty Resources website for the latest version.

The College of Education criteria for the evaluation of post-tenure review is subject to the policies of Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, the University's Board of Trustees, and the Board of Governors of the State University System of Florida.

Each faculty member should be familiar with the criteria for annual evaluation of faculty outlined in the FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form. The criteria outlined in the form detail the components relative to teaching effectiveness, research and creative ability, performance in service, and other university duties utilized in the evaluation of a candidate.

NOTE: Faculty members are required to submit an electronic portfolio via the designated platform for post-tenure review. Evidence included within the portfolio should demonstrate the candidate's performance relative to teaching effectiveness, research and creative ability, performance in service, and other university duties. The candidate will be responsible for uploading documentation to the portfolio and will bear responsibility for the readability of exhibits provided within the portfolio. The candidate must adhere to submission deadlines published by the designated university office.

Teaching Effectiveness

1. Organization and planning of courses.
2. Evidence of careful preparation document by current course outlines, syllabi, or other appropriate methods distributed at the beginning of class meetings.
3. Ability to make course(s) challenging, inspire interest and thought in subject matter, and encourage students to understand all phases of the course(s).
4. Quality of scholarship and professionalism; mastery and currency in principal subject area and related disciplines.
5. Ability to maintain professional classroom decorum, and to project an atmosphere of friendliness and concerns for students.
6. Punctuality with respect to classroom attendance, adherence to announced schedule, grading of tests and assignment, and submitting required reports.

7. Accessibility and openness to questions; maintenance of office hours and availability for student consultation.
8. Appropriateness, relevance and fairness of examinations or student evaluations.

Research and Creative Ability

1. Evidence of presentation of papers or creative works at professional meetings/societies or exhibitions.
2. Evidence of papers or articles published in professional journals and/or of books published.
3. Evidence of recognized creative work in his/her field such as musical compositions, paintings, product design, sculptures, dance, theatre, etc.
4. Extent of on-going research or creative endeavors.
5. Extent of development of research projects or submission of proposals relative to research or creative ability.
6. Evidence of Ph.D. students supervised and graduated.

Performance in Service

1. Performance on departmental college/school, and university-wide committees, councils and task forces.
2. Contribution to faculty meetings and regular program activities.
3. Membership in appropriate professional organizations and contributions to these.
4. Involvement in activities leading to professional development, continuing education, certification, or licensure.
5. Performance in community activities on a local, state, national or international level.

Other University Duties

1. Performance as an academic advisor.
2. Performance as a counselor/advisor to clubs or organizations, direction of interns, or other university related groups.
3. Performance in administrative duties.

Post-Tenure Review Performance Rating Scale

NOTE: An overall rating will be calculated for each performance area of the FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form (i.e., teaching effectiveness, research and creative ability, performance in service, and other university duties). The overall rating is calculated as an average of all applicable criteria for the performance area. The rating scale reflects the following weights: Exceeds=4; Meets=3; Does Not Meet=2; and Unsatisfactory=1.

Exceeds Expectations:

1. Faculty received an average rating of four or higher on the annual FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form in the area of teaching effectiveness during the five years of the post-tenure review period; and

2. Faculty received an average rating of four or higher on the annual FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form in the area of research and creative ability during the five years of the post-tenure review period; and
3. Faculty received an average rating of four or higher on the annual FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form in the area of performance in service during the five years of the post-tenure review period; and
4. Faculty received an average rating of four or higher on the annual FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form in the area of other university duties as reflected in the assignment of responsibility during the five years of the post-tenure review period, if applicable.

Meets Expectations:

1. Faculty received an average rating of three or higher on the annual FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form in the area of teaching effectiveness during the five years of the post-tenure review period; and
2. Faculty received an average rating of three or higher on the annual FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form in the area of research and creative ability during the five years of the post-tenure review period; and
3. Faculty received an average rating of three or higher on the annual FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form in the area of performance in service during the five years of the post-tenure review period; and
4. Faculty received an average rating of three or higher on the annual FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form in the area of other university duties as reflected in the assignment of responsibility during the five years of the post-tenure review period, if applicable.

Does Not Meet Expectations:

1. Faculty received an average rating of two or higher on the annual FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form in the area of teaching effectiveness during the five years of the post-tenure review period; and
2. Faculty received an average rating of two or higher on the annual FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form in the area of research and creative ability during the five years of the post-tenure review period; and
3. Faculty received an average rating of two or higher on the annual FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form in the area of performance in service during the five years of the post-tenure review period; and
4. Faculty received an average rating of two or lower on the annual FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form in the area of other university duties as reflected in the assignment of responsibility during the five years of the post-tenure review period, if applicable.

Unsatisfactory:

1. Faculty received an average rating of 2 or lower on the annual FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form in the area of teaching effectiveness during the five years of the post-tenure review period; and
2. Faculty received an average rating of 2 or lower on the annual FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form in the area of research and creative ability during the five years of the post-tenure review period; and
3. Faculty received an average rating of 2 or lower on the annual FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form in the area of performance in service during the five years of the post-tenure review period; and
4. Faculty received an average rating of 2 or lower annual FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form in the area of other university duties as reflected in the assignment of responsibility during the five years of the post-tenure review period, if applicable.

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA FAMU-FSU College of Engineering

Approved: December 2023

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA FAMU-FSU College of Engineering *Approved December 2023*

Introduction

The approved post-tenure review policies and procedures for faculty at Florida A&M University (FAMU) are available on the FAMU Faculty Resources website available at this URL:

<https://www.famu.edu/administration/academic-affairs/faculty-resources.php>

For additional information on the application submission process, contact the Office of the Provost via email academic.affairs@famu.edu or by phone 850-599-3276.

Post-Tenure Review Criteria

The post-tenure review criteria for the FAMU-FSU College of Engineering have been approved by Office of the Provost. They are subject to revision **prior** to the **next** review cycle. Please see the website address listed above for the latest version.

Post-Tenure Review ratings are based on faculty evaluation, merit and promotion criteria that may be found in each academic department's bylaws in addition to a review of professional conduct and violations of university policies and state laws that have resulted in disciplinary actions.

EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS: Evidence to support this rating includes awards, honors, annual evaluations, as well as evidence of meeting criteria identified by the academic unit's bylaws as meritorious performance and relative to the faculty member's AOR. This rating is applied to faculty members who, among other factors:

1. Received overall rating of 4 or greater in the FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form in each annual evaluation during the five-year post-tenure review period, **AND**
2. Received rating of 4 or greater in each of the Assignment of Responsibilities (AOR) categories (Teaching, Research and Service) in each annual evaluation during the five-year post-tenure review period, **AND**
3. Are compliant with state laws, Board of Governors' regulations, and university, college, and department regulations and policies.

MEETS EXPECTATIONS: Evidence to support this rating includes faculty evaluation, merit, and promotion criteria identified by the academic unit's bylaws and relative to the

faculty member's AOR. This rating is applied to faculty members who, among other factors:

1. Received overall rating of 2 or greater in the FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form in each annual evaluation during the five-year post-tenure review period, **AND**
2. Received rating of 2 or greater in each of the Assignment of Responsibilities (AOR) categories (Teaching, Research and Service) in at least three (3) of the five (5) years during the post-tenure review period, **AND**
3. Are compliant with state laws, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.

DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS: In applying this rating, there must be evidence that the faculty member's performance during the 5-year review period has fallen below expectations as specified by the academic unit's bylaws and relative to the faculty member's AOR. This rating is applied to faculty members who, among other factors:

1. Received overall rating lower than 2 in the FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form in one annual evaluation during the five (5) years of the post-tenure review period **OR**
2. Received rating of lower than 2 in any one of the Assignment of Responsibilities (AOR) categories (Teaching, Research or Service) for three (3) or more years during the five (5) years of the post-tenure review period, **BUT**
3. Are compliant with state laws, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.

UNSATISFACTORY: Evidence to support this rating must include prior feedback of performance problems with an opportunity to remediate those problems. To assign this rating the faculty member must have:

1. Received overall rating lower than 2 in the FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form in two (2) or more annual evaluations during the five (5) years of the post-tenure review period, **OR**
2. Received rating lower than 2 in any two (2) of the Assignment of Responsibilities (AOR) categories (Teaching, Research and Service) for three (3) or more years during the five (5) years of the post-tenure review period as evidenced in the letters from the department chair, **OR**
3. Exhibited a pattern of non-compliance with state laws, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.

NOTES:

1. The "overall rating" is an average across all 22 categories on the FAMU *Faculty Evaluation Form for Supervisors* (see attached Appendix) for each specific year.
2. Ratings for individual Assignment of Responsibility (AOR) categories are determined as follows:

- Teaching Effectiveness: Average rating over its 11 categories on the FAMU *Faculty Evaluation Form for Supervisors*.
- Research and Creative Activity: Average rating over its 6 categories on the FAMU *Faculty Evaluation Form for Supervisors*.
- Service: Average rating over its 5 categories on the FAMU *Faculty Evaluation Form for Supervisors*.

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA

College of Law

January, 2024

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA

College of Law

Approved January, 2024

Introduction

The approved post-tenure review policies and procedures for faculty at Florida A&M University (FAMU) are available on the FAMU Faculty Resources website available at this URL:

<https://www.famu.edu/administration/academic-affairs/faculty-resources.php>

For additional information on the application submission process, contact the Office of the Provost via email academic.affairs@famu.edu or by phone 850-599-3276.

Post-tenure review is for the purpose of maintaining and enhancing the quality and vitality of the faculty. The evaluation guidelines reflect the mission and goals of the law school. The guidelines equally value various scholarly traditions, effective teaching pedagogies, and the performance of assigned or faculty-selected service activities.

The Florida A&M University College of Law Committee on Retention, Promotion, and Tenure adopts the following guidelines for post-tenure review of faculty scholarship, service, and teaching performance.

Post-Tenure Review Criteria

The post-tenure review criteria for the College of Law have been approved by Office of the Provost. They are subject to revision **prior** to the **next** review cycle. Please see the website address listed above for the latest version.

A. GUIDELINES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW – SCHOLARSHIP

After tenure, the College of Law Faculty should continuously demonstrate scholarly expertise. Faculty member's evidence a continuing ability to critically analyze, synthesize, and expound sophisticated factual and legal subjects in a multitude of ways. The following guidelines apply for evaluating scholarship:

1. Publication of articles, essays, and books including trade books, magazine articles, interviews, op-ed pieces, legal briefs, and blog posts.
2. Participation on panels, conferences, and lectureships.

3. Preparation of statutes and codes, book reviews, and other evidence of scholastic commitment.
4. Service on editorial boards, state, university, and community boards, workshops, and seminars.
5. Engagement in the legal community.
6. Leadership roles in legal organizations
7. Integration of scholarship into teaching and mentoring activities.
8. Substantially completed but not yet published materials identified in part 1, above.
9. Service as a referee for colleagues considered for appointment, promotion, or tenure at other law schools.

The foregoing is not an exhaustive list and purposely avoids a quantitative standard. However, for each post tenure review, only scholarly production within the five-year review period shall be considered.

B. GUIDELINES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW -- TEACHING

After tenure, the College of Law Faculty should continuously demonstrate teaching expertise. Faculty may demonstrate teaching expertise by the following materials:

- Description of the courses taught.
- Description of teaching approaches and techniques which **include** those related to preparing students for the Bar Exam.
- Description of independent research projects supervised.
- Any other materials that demonstrate a level of accomplishment, effectiveness, and productivity in teaching, including but not limited to student teaching evaluations, statement of teaching philosophy, syllabi, professional development trainings or programs attended.

Concerns Regarding Student Teaching Evaluations: During the development of these criteria, a faculty committee at the College of Law expressed concerns regarding the use of student teaching evaluations for evaluation at the college level. They stated that there has been historically a very low rate of return for evaluations from law students. As a result, limited evaluations cannot reasonably or consistently reflect teaching performance, are statistically unreliable, and skew results towards outlying feedback. Additionally, they cited studies which show that student teaching evaluations, including averages, are biased and a poor measure of teaching

effectiveness.¹ While the Office of the Provost acknowledges these concerns, it still will incorporate, as appropriate, student teaching evaluations into the process.

C. GUIDELINES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW – SERVICE

College of Law faculty are expected to provide beneficial service to the College, the University, and society by means of activities in addition to scholarship and teaching. The following guidelines apply for evaluating faculty service:

1. Standards as to service expectations set forth in the College of Law Faculty Handbook (latest edition) for tenure consideration, are incorporated herein by reference.
2. Each tenured faculty member is expected to attend faculty meetings and serve on law school or university committee. This expectation may be altered with respect to tenured members on approved leave (paid or unpaid), sabbatical, or other University or College of Law assignments.
3. Each tenured law faculty member should engage in professional service activities.
 - a. Professional service activities are those intended to stimulate serious discussion and consideration of the law, to educate the public regarding the law, and to share information with the legal profession, public officials, and the community regarding law related matters and issues.
 - b. Such activities include, but are not limited to, assisting governmental bodies; participating in educational programs aimed at the bar, the public, schools, parents, children, and educators, participating in bar associations and related groups; providing pro bono and other services to the community, participating in community organizations, providing commentary/analysis and expertise on law-related matters, and other related activities.

Meets Expectations – Performance that substantially meets the faculty member’s assigned responsibilities over the past five years as determined by teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty receiving a satisfactory or better performance rating in each annual evaluation during the last five years shall not be rated below Meets Expectations

¹ See Luis Melecio-Zambrano, *Teaching Evaluations Reflect—And May Perpetuate—Academia’s Gender Biases*, SCIENCE, Jan. 20, 2023, <https://www.science.org/content/article/teaching-evaluations-reflect-and-may-perpetuate-academia-s-gender-biases>; Colleen Flaherty, *Even ‘Valid’ Student Evaluations Are ‘Unfair,’* INSIDE HIGHER ED, Feb. 26, 2020 (citing study by Justin Esarey & Natalie Valdes titled “Unbiased, Reliable and Valid Student Evaluations Can Still be Unfair”); John W. Lawrence, *Student Evaluations of Teaching are Not Valid*, American Association of University Professors, May-June 2018, <https://www.aaup.org/article/student-evaluations-teaching-are-not-valid>.

The Post-Tenure Review regulation defines that a faculty member “**exceeds expectations**” when there is a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond “meets” expectations. A faculty member “**does not meet expectations**” when the faculty member’s performance falls below the normal range of annual variation of performance of “meets expectations” but is capable of improvement. A faculty member’s performance is rated as “**unsatisfactory**” when the faculty member fails to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or the performance involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable university regulations and policies.

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA

College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences – Institute of Public Health

Approved: December 2023

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences – Institute of Public Health

Approved: December 2023

Introduction

The approved post-tenure review policies and procedures for faculty at Florida A&M University (FAMU) are available on the FAMU Faculty Resources website available at this URL:

<https://www.famu.edu/administration/academic-affairs/faculty-resources.php>

For additional information on the application submission process, contact the Office of the Provost via email academic.affairs@famu.edu or by phone 850-599-3276.

Post-Tenure Review Criteria

The post-tenure review criteria for the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences – Institute of Public Health have been approved by Office of the Provost. They are subject to revision **prior** to the **next** review cycle. Please see the website address listed above for the latest version.

For a faculty member to “**meet expectations**” for post tenure review, the applicant must show competence in the following performance areas: (a) teaching; (b) research/scholarly activities; (c) service, and (d) clinical practice (as appropriate). A faculty member should be competent in these areas. Although faculty members are not evaluated based solely on their performance in any one area, it should be the goal for each faculty member to have a balance between teaching, research, service, and practice (as appropriate).

A faculty member **meets** expectations in **teaching** by having been overall average rating of 3 or better in the area of Teaching Effectiveness on the Faculty Evaluation Form.

A faculty member **meets** expectations in **research and scholarship** by having on overall rating of 3 or better in the area of Research and Creative Activity on the Faculty Evaluation Form

A faculty member **meets** expectations in **service** by having on overall rating of 3 or better in the area of Service on the Faculty Evaluation Form

Additionally, the faculty member must not have sustained violations of applicable state and federal law and applicable published College, University, and Board of Governors regulations, policies, and procedures.

The faculty member must submit a dossier as specified by university post-tenure review requirements. For a rating other than “meets,” a faculty member will be evaluated on the following competencies:

Competence in teaching will be based on:

1. Student evaluations (number of students in the class will be considered).
2. Evaluations of clinical rotations and/or residency programs, if applicable.
3. Faculty Annual Evaluations
4. Academic tutoring and training of graduate and undergraduate students.
5. Mentoring and teaching students by serving as a role model for patient educational programs presented at the college, university, practice site, and/or community.
6. Innovations in teaching.

Competence in research/scholarly activities will be based on (where applicable):

1. Externally funded scholarly activities (e.g., research grants, training grants, service delivery programs, etc.).
2. Successful efforts to secure external funding for scholarly activities.
3. Demonstration of productivity following internally funded grants (e.g., faculty development, seed grants, etc.).
4. Presentation of posters, abstracts, etc.
5. Publications in scholarly journals, conference proceedings, etc.
6. Supervision and graduation of Ph.D. graduate students.

Competence in service will be based on (when applicable):

1. Service as a chair or member on departmental, college and university committees.
3. Community and public service activities.
4. Professional service at the local, state and/or national level.
5. Participation on review panels, editorial boards, and/or serve as consultant, etc.
- 6 Medication counseling programs for patients and/or providers.
7. Involvement with community-based health-related educational programs as a speaker or coordinator
8. Contribution to continuing education programs at the college or university.
9. Involvement in student activities
10. Student counseling
11. Advisor/mentor for student organization

The Post-Tenure Review regulation defines that a faculty member “**exceeds expectations**” when there is a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond “meets” expectations. A faculty member “**does not meet expectations**” when the

faculty member's performance falls below the normal range of annual variation of performance of "meets expectations" but is capable of improvement. A faculty member's performance is rated as "**unsatisfactory**" when the faculty member fails to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or the performance involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable university regulations and policies.

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA

College of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities

Approved: December 2023

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA College of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities

Approved: December 2023

Introduction

The approved post-tenure review policies and procedures for faculty at Florida A&M University (FAMU) are available on the FAMU Faculty Resources website available at this URL:

<https://www.famu.edu/administration/academic-affairs/faculty-resources.php>

For additional information on the application submission process, contact the Office of the Provost via email academic.affairs@famu.edu or by phone 850-599-3276.

Post-Tenure Review Criteria

The post-tenure review criteria for the College of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities have been approved by Office of the Provost. They are subject to revision **prior** to the **next** review cycle. Please see the website address listed above for the latest version.

Faculty in the College of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities shall be evaluated for post-tenure review on the criteria listed below.

A faculty member “**meets**” expectations by satisfying **all** of the conditions listed under Teacher Effectiveness, **two** (2) or more of the conditions under Scholarly Activities as appropriate to assigned duties, and **three** (3) or more of the conditions under University/Public Service as appropriate to assigned duties.

Faculty must also meet legal and professional codes of ethics and maintain professional rapport with University and college administrators, students, staff, department faculty, and faculty colleagues in other colleges.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

A. TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS

Faculty member demonstrates continued teacher effectiveness which includes but not limited to the following:

1. Demonstrates competent usage of the English language in the relevant field.
2. Meets classes reliably with no unexplained absences.
3. Plans and distributes syllabi at the beginning of each semester.
4. Demonstrates evidence of effective teaching including the use of results from student evaluations.
5. Maintains office hours and is reasonably available to students

throughout the academic year.

B. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

Faculty member demonstrates continued research and scholarship which includes but not limited to the following:

1. Publishes (or shows acceptance) of scholarly works, i.e. Journals, book, book chapters, monographs. Self-publication not accepted.
2. Presents or performs other professional activities related to the applicant's discipline.

Equivalent work in certain special fields may be substituted for publications and presentations. (See item D below)

3. Funded Research Proposals
4. Submission of Research Proposals to External Funding Agencies.

C. UNIVERSITY/PUBLIC SERVICE

Faculty member demonstrates continued university/public service which includes but not limited to the following:

1. Attends and actively participates in campus committees and performs other related responsibilities when assigned.
2. Attends campus (department, college, university) and non-campus (regional, national, international) professional meetings.
3. Holds offices in appropriate professional organizations.
4. Maintains membership and actively participates in professional organizations.
5. Volunteers for services in community or campus activities.
6. Performs administrative type activity (e.g., preparing academic reports) in addition to assigned teaching responsibilities, when assigned.
7. Performs recruitment service.

D. RESEARCH, CREATIVE ACTIVITIES, PERFORMANCES AND EXHIBITIONS

Demonstrated artistic, technical or managerial expertise on activities within the following category:

Music:

- a. Director/Conductor.
- b. Musical Director/Producer.
- c. Opera Choreographer/Drill Designer/Field Show Designer.
- d. Performer.
- e. Vocal/Diction coach.
- f. Instrumental Instructor.
- g. Stage/Sound Production Designer.

- h. Recording/Sound Engineer.
- i. Music Management.
- j. Technical/Sound Production Director.
- k. Production Management, i.e., marketing, promotion, fundraising, tickets.
- l. Music Educator/Teaching Artist/ (creation of materials that support teaching music across the curriculum or music for social change).
- m. Composer or Arranger of new works and/or productions, performances.
- n. Creator of new approaches and innovative techniques in presenting standard and/or traditional works.

Theatre:

- a. Director/Musical Director.
- b. Choreographer.
- c. Performer.
- d. Vocal/Dialect Coach.
- e. Movement /Combat Coach.
- f. Designer (scenery, projections, costumes, lighting, sound, properties, or other appropriate positions in production).
- g. Stage Management.
- h. Dramaturgy.
- i. Technical Director.
- j. Producing (marketing, promotions, fundraising, and ticketing services).
- k. Playwright or creation of new works and/or productions, performances.
- l. New approaches and innovative techniques in presenting standard and/or traditional works.

Visual Arts:

- a. Curator (curating art exhibitions).
- b. Juried Exhibitions (participating in local, regional, national, international art exhibitions).
- c. One-person and/or Invitational Group Exhibitions (gallery, museum).
- d. Artist Residencies.
- e. Digital Design (graphic design, motion graphics, animation, game design, etc.).
- f. Artist (Artworks created during the past six years in related media).
- g. Juror, Judge (for local, regional, national, international exhibitions, art festivals).
- h. Guest Speaker or Guest Artist (at professional conference, gallery, museum or other venue).

CREATIVE WRITING:

- a. Publication of a poem, short story, or creative non-fiction essay in nationally or internationally distributed journals. Digital publications to be judged in same manner as print publications.

- b. Publication of a collection of poems, short stories, or creative non-fiction essays by a university, trade/commercial, or respected independent small press. Self-published material will not be considered.
- c. Publication of a book review or interview in a nationally or internationally distributed journal.
- d. Publication of one (1) chapbook* (20-30 pages); two (2) chapbooks would be equivalent to one (1) book. A *chapbook* is a small booklet that contains poetry, short stories, or a compilation of both genres.

The Post-Tenure Review regulation defines that a faculty member “**exceeds expectations**” when there is a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond “meets” expectations. A faculty member “**does not meet expectations**” when the faculty member’s performance falls below the normal range of annual variation of performance of “meets expectations” but is capable of improvement. A faculty member’s performance is rated as “**unsatisfactory**” when the faculty member fails to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or the performance involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable university regulations and policies.

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA

College of Science and Technology

Approved: December 2023

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA College of Science and Technology

Approved: December 2023

Overview

A faculty member undergoing post-tenure review, as described in Florida Board of Governors (BoG) Regulation 10.003, will provide a university-designated dossier highlighting accomplishments and demonstrating performance relative to assigned duties. In the College of Science and Technology (CST), the dossier, faculty member's personnel file, and other records related to professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance, will be assembled by faculty and the Department Chair. Then the Chair submit the documentation together with a letter of recommendation to the Dean. The package will be reviewed by the Dean. Following BoG Regulation 10.003, the Dean will forward to the Provost the materials being reviewed along with a letter with the Dean's recommended performance ratings of Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations Does Not Meet Expectations, and Unsatisfactory using the scale below in the in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity, service, and an overall rating based upon the performance rating criteria elucidated below.

Performance Rating Criteria (PRC)

As CST has both Ph.D. and non-Ph.D. departments, the College has two sets of PRC. Faculty in CST will be evaluated based on their assigned responsibilities for categories of (1) teaching, (2) research, and (3) service or other non-credit generating activities that align with the University and CST Missions, as documented in their Assignment of Responsibility Forms for the previous five years. Evidence to be considered for the Dean's evaluation of effectiveness in each category may include some of the following (but not be limited to):

Provide evidence and documentation about each one of the criteria listed below:

1. Teaching

- a. Outlines, syllabi and other materials developed for use in courses.
- b. A record of excellent classroom attendance and promptness.
- c. Written evaluations such as the SuSSAI or other means.
- d. Mentoring or advising activities.
- e. Innovative teaching.
- f. Participation in professional development activities related to teaching.

2. Scholarly Activity

- a. Submitted and published scholarly work to venues such as books, peer-reviewed journals, patents, conference proceedings, conference or seminar presentations.
- b. Submission of proposals to funding agencies.
- c. Funded research proposals.
- d. Scientific contributions to a funded or non-funded research project.

- e. Supervision of undergraduate students' research.
- f. Supervision of graduate students or participation on graduate thesis committee.

3. Professional & Public Service

- a. Community outreach or service activities such as school visits, judging science fairs, or similar events.
- b. Participation in recruitment activities or other activities to promote the development of the department, college and university.
- c. Service on department, college or university level committees.
- d. Service as a reviewer for professional journals or research proposals.
- e. Contributions to professional organizations.
- f. Provision of mentorship to junior faculty, instructors or adjuncts.

Ranking for non-Ph.D. granting departments

Exceeds Expectations – The candidate should meet **4 out of 6** criteria in the three categories mentioned above. Performance substantially above assigned responsibilities over the past five years as determined by: the quality of instructions in assigned courses; research outputs as determined by proposals submitted, funding awarded, and/or research outcomes and outputs, and level of service or other non-credit generating activities compared to assigned effort.

Meets Expectations – The candidate should meet **3 out of 6** criteria in the three categories mentioned above. Performance that substantially meets the faculty member's assigned responsibilities over the past five years as determined by: teaching of assigned courses; submitting proposals, generating research funding, and/or research outcomes and outputs. This includes publications and/or student research mentorship as expected of a CST faculty member with similar assigned effort for research; and providing service or other non-credit generating activities that meet the assigned effort.

Does Not Meet Expectations – Meets the expectations **in 2 out of 6**, or less criteria in the three categories mentioned above. Performance that systematically fails to meet the assigned effort for teaching, research, or service and other non-credit generating activities over the past five years.

Unsatisfactory – Failure to meet expectations that reflect disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance that involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in university regulations and policies. A faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation during two or more of the previous 5 years or has sustained violations of applicable state and federal law and applicable published College, University, and Board of Governors regulations, policies, and procedures may be deemed unsatisfactory.

Ranking for Ph.D. granting departments

Exceeds Expectations – Performance **substantially above** assigned responsibilities over the past five years or the period since the last review in **five or more** of the following conditions:

Teaching

- a) Contribution to curriculum development or course creation;
- b) Teaching courses at a variety of levels (service, undergraduate major and graduate major) if the opportunity to teach such has been offered during the period;
- c) Implementation of innovative pedagogical techniques or methods obtained from the active participation in conferences, training or scholarly activities related to teaching;

Research

- d) External research funding awarded,
- e) Four or more scholarly output as defined in 2 above;
- f) Supervision and/or production of a Ph.D. graduate student;

Service

- g) Service as chair on one or more committees
- h) Demonstrated innovations in service or other activities that further the University or College of Science and Technology Mission.

Meets Expectations – Performance that substantially meets the faculty member’s assigned responsibilities over the past five years or period since the last review as determined by (as appropriate based on the Assignment of Responsibilities): teaching of assigned courses; receiving satisfactory or above student evaluations ; research activity as defined by satisfying **four (4) or more** of the requirements listed under 2. *Scholarly Activity* or **one** of the requirements listed under Research above; and providing service or other non-credit generating activities as described in Section 3. that meet the assigned effort. Faculty receiving a satisfactory or better performance rating on the Faculty Evaluation Form in each performance area (i.e., Teaching Effectiveness, Research and Creative Activity, and Service) during the last five years shall not be rated below Meets Expectations.

Does Not Meet Expectations – Performance that systematically fails to meet the assigned effort for teaching, research activity as defined by satisfying **less than four** of the requirements in 2. *Scholarly Activity* shown above or **none** of the requirements listed under Research above; service and other non-credit generating activities as described in 3. *Professional and Service Activities* over the past five years or the period since the last review. Evaluation must be consistent with the faculty member’s Assignment of Responsibilities over that period.

Unsatisfactory – Failure to meet expectations that reflect disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance that involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in university regulations and policies. A faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation during two or more of the previous 5 years or has sustained violations of applicable state and federal law and applicable published College, University, and Board of Governors regulations, policies, and procedures may be deemed unsatisfactory.

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA

School of Architecture and Engineering Technology

Approved: December 2023

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA School of Architecture and Engineering Technology

Approved: December 2023

Introduction

The approved post-tenure review policies and procedures for faculty at Florida A&M University (FAMU) are available on the FAMU Faculty Resources website available at this URL:

<https://www.famu.edu/administration/academic-affairs/faculty-resources.php>

For additional information on the application submission process, contact the Office of the Provost via email academic.affairs@famu.edu or by phone 850-599-3276.

Post-Tenure Review Criteria

The post-tenure review criteria for the School of Architecture and Engineering Technology have been approved by Office of the Provost. They are subject to revision **prior** to the **next** review cycle. Please see the website address listed above for the latest version.

The criteria to “**Meet Expectations**” in each performance area is as follows:

A. Teaching

The faculty will demonstrate effective teaching through their Program Director’s “End of Year” Evaluations and the FAMU Class Climate Surveys. Candidates must meet the expectations for both methods listed below:

1. The director’s evaluations are done at the end of each academic year. The faculty must provide the evaluations for the last five (5) years they have taught at FAMU. At least 50% of the supervisor’s evaluations must “Meet expectations.” If the supervisor does not provide a written evaluation, the assessment will be considered “Meets Expectations.”
2. FAMU’s Class Climate Survey is done at the end of each semester for each course. The faculty must provide the Class Climate report of the classes for the last five (5) years they have taught at FAMU. At least 50% of these evaluations must be “Satisfactory.”

These definitions are utilized in this performance area:

“**Meets Expectations**” is defined as having an average score of “3” or better on Teaching Effectiveness on the FAMU Faculty Evaluation Form,

A “**Satisfactory**” student evaluation is defined as having an average rating of “Good” or better on the FAMU Class Climate Survey.

B. Research and Scholarship

The faculty will demonstrate effective research and scholarship through peer-reviewed publications, presentations, and externally funded grants. Candidates must meet the expectations in the last 5 years at FAMU for two (2) of the methods listed below:

1. Publish (or show acceptance of) at least two (2) works of peer-reviewed scholarship. The candidate must be listed as the first or second author. Peer-reviewed scholarship can be books, chapters, papers, articles, abstracts, posters, or design work. The publications can be books, book chapters, conference proceedings, journals, or other peer-reviewed venues approved by the Dean.
2. Present at least one (1) work of peer-reviewed scholarship in a professional meeting, conference, workshop, seminar, colloquia, competition, or other public venue. The candidate must be recognized as the first or second author of the material.
3. Secure at least one (1) grant with external funding. The FAMU Office of Sponsored Research must recognize the candidate as the Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-PI.

C. Service

The faculty will demonstrate effective service through appointed or ad hoc committees. Candidates must meet expectations in their last five (5) years at FAMU for the three (3) methods listed below:

1. Serve on one (1) University Committees. This includes Faculty Senate, Search, Tenure and Promotion, Appeals, Space, Graduate Council, or similar activities documented in their AOR.
2. Serve on five (5) SAET or Program Committees. This includes Search, Tenure Promotion, Curriculum, Appeals, or similar activities documented in their AOR.
3. Serve on two (2) SAET Service Activities. This includes recruitment events, high school visits, student organization support, or similar activities documented in their AOR.

The Post-Tenure Review regulation defines that a faculty member “**exceeds expectations**” when there is a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond “meets” expectations. A faculty member “**does not meet expectations**” when the faculty member’s performance falls below the normal range of annual variation of performance of “meets expectations” but is capable of improvement. A faculty member’s performance is rated as “**unsatisfactory**” when the faculty member fails to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or the performance involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable university regulations and policies.

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA

School of Allied Health Sciences

Approved: December 2023

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA

School of Business and Industry

Approved: December 2023

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA

School of Business and Industry

Approved: December 2023

Introduction

The approved post-tenure review policies and procedures for faculty at Florida A&M University (FAMU) are available on the FAMU Faculty Resources website available at this URL:

<https://www.famu.edu/administration/academic-affairs/faculty-resources.php>

For additional information on the application submission process, contact the Office of the Provost via email academic.affairs@famu.edu or by phone 850-599-3276.

Overview

The Post-Tenure Review process for tenured faculty in the School of Business and Industry (SBI) at Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (FAMU) is established to accomplish the following:

- (a) promote continued high standards of quality and productivity among the SBI's tenured faculty;
- (b) determine whether a faculty member is meeting the responsibilities and expectations associated with assigned duties in research, teaching and service;
- (c) recognize and reward exceptional achievement and provide appropriate retention incentives; and
- (d) provide directions for appropriate remedial and other employment actions, if needed.

Post-Tenure Review Criteria

The post-tenure review criteria for the School of Business and Industry have been approved by Office of the Provost. They are subject to revision **prior** to the **next** review cycle. Please see the website address listed above for the latest version.

“Recommended Performance Rating Scale” means a rating scale including the following.

1. **Exceeds Expectations:** a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performance of faculty across the faculty in SBI.
2. **Meets Expectations:** expected level of accomplishment compared to faculty across the faculty in SBI.

3. **Does Not Meet Expectations:** performance falls below the normal range of annual variation in performance compared to faculty members in SBI but is capable of improvement.
 4. **Unsatisfactory:** failure to meet expectations that reflects disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts offered to correct or improve performance, or incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable university regulation and policies.
- General guidelines that are used for rating performance:
 - a. **Exceed Expectations:** A faculty member must excel in all three areas below over the five-year period under review.
 - Teaching includes but is not limited to:
 - An overall average score of 4 or higher in all categories on the FAMU Annual Faculty Evaluation.
 - An overall average rating of Very Good or better on student evaluations.
 - Maximum of **three** (3) course preparations per semester (actual number of preparations will be determined by the department chair in consultation with the Dean consistent with students' needs)
 - Research includes but is not limited to:
 - At least two presentations or proceedings and one refereed journal article or
 - Two refereed journal articles.
 - Service includes but is not limited to:
 - Attend at least 80 percent of all SBI Faculty and Staff meetings.
 - Attend at least 80 percent of all Departmental meetings.
 - Fully participate in assigned SBI and FAMU committees.
 - Fully support in all assigned FAMU, SBI, and Departmental activities.
 - b. **Meet Expectations:** A faculty member must meet expectation in all three areas below over the five-year period under review.
 - Teaching includes but is not limited to:
 - A overall average of 3 or better in all categories on the FAMU Annual Faculty Evaluation
 - An overall average rating of Good or better on student evaluations.
 - Maximum of **three** (3) course preparations (actual number of preparations will be determined by the department chair in consultation with the Dean consistent with students' needs)
 - Research includes but is not limited to:
 - At least two scholarly presentations or proceedings, or
 - At least one peer reviewed journal.
 - Service includes but is not limited to:

- Attend at least 80 percent of all SBI Faculty and Staff meetings.
- Attend at least 80 percent of all departmental meetings.
- Participate in assigned SBI and FAMU committees.
- Support in assigned FAMU, SBI, and departmental activities.

c. **Does Not Meet Expectation:** The faculty member's performance is in one of the three categories below over the five-year period under review.

- Teaching includes but is not limited to:
 - An overall average of two (2) or higher on the FAMU Annual Faculty Evaluation.
 - An overall average rating of Fair or better on student evaluations.
 - Maximum of **three** (3) course preparations (actual number of preparations will be determined by the department chair in consultation with the Dean consistent with students' needs)
- Research includes but is not limited to:
 - One scholarly presentation or proceeding.
- Services includes but is not limited to:
 - Attend less than 80 percent of all SBI Faculty and Staff meetings.
 - Attend less 80 percent of all Departmental meetings.
 - Inadequate participation in all SBI Departmental, and FAMU committees as assigned.
 - Inadequate support of assigned FAMU, SBI, and Departmental activities required

d. **Unsatisfactory:** The faculty member's performance is in one of the three categories below over the five-year period under review.

- Teaching includes but is not limited to:
 - An overall average of less than two on the FAMU Annual Faculty Evaluation.
 - An overall average rating of below Fair on student evaluations.
 - Maximum of **three** (3) course preparations (actual number of preparations will be determined by the department chair in consultation with the Dean consistent with students' needs)
- Research includes but is not limited to:
 - No scholarly presentations, proceedings, or peer-reviewed papers.
- Service includes but is not limited to:
 - Attend less than 80 percent of all SBI Faculty and Staff meetings.
 - Attend less 80 percent of all Departmental meetings.
 - Inadequate participation in all SBI Departmental, and FAMU committees as assigned.
 - Inadequate support of assigned FAMU, SBI, and Departmental activities required.

- Failure to meet expectations that reflects disregard, or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts offered to correct or improve performance.
- Incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable university regulation and policies.

Note: These are meant to be guidelines. According to the Post-Tenure Review Regulation, Chairs or Directors provide initial inputs on faculty member's performance to the Dean who makes a rating recommendation to the provost. A faculty member's final rating is solely delegated to the University Provost.

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA

School of Allied Health Sciences

Approved: December 2023

Introduction

The approved post-tenure review policies and procedures for faculty at Florida A&M University (FAMU) are available on the FAMU Faculty Resources website available at this URL:

<https://www.famu.edu/administration/academic-affairs/faculty-resources.php>

For additional information on the application submission process, contact the Office of the Provost via email academic.affairs@famu.edu or by phone 850-599-3276.

Post-Tenure Review Criteria

The post-tenure review criteria for the School of Allied Health Sciences have been approved by Office of the Provost. They are subject to revision **prior** to the **next** review cycle. Please see the website address listed above for the latest version.

The following criteria listed in the performance categories below shall be used to conduct the post-tenure review (PTR). They will be used to determine whether a faculty member under review has conscientiously and with professional competence discharged the duties appropriately associated with the faculty member's position.

The criteria herein shall be used to determine whether a faculty member under review receives a rating of "meets expectations." The competencies to be considered fall into three categories:

I: Teaching

II: Scholarship

III: Professionally Related Service and/or Administration

Faculty will be evaluated based on their assigned duties as indicated on their Assignment of Responsibility form. A faculty member should satisfy a minimum of **three (3) conditions** in each category to "meet expectations."

I. Performance Competency: Teaching

- Responds effectively and appropriately to classroom needs and modifies courses accordingly.

- Has satisfactory student evaluations.
- Demonstrates positive student outcomes and/or learning experiences.
- Engages in activities that enhance content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and/or pedagogical content knowledge.
- Uses appropriate teaching/administrative methodologies.
- Maintain consistent Office Hours
- Consistent engagement with students when using a virtual teaching platform.

II. Performance Competency: Scholarship/Research/Creative Activity

- Maintains disciplinary knowledge.
- Presents papers or posters at professional conferences or workshops in the area of health and science.
- Submits and publishes health and science related scholarly work such as books, peer-reviewed journals, conference proceedings, etc.
- Participates in the broader scholarly and/or creative community:
- Contributes to academic, professional, and/or public venues.
- Draws on professional expertise to work with practitioners in the field.

III. Performance Competency: Service

- Participates satisfactorily in departmental functions, activities, and meetings.
- Participates in committees and/or equivalent service at the college, university.
- Participates in professional, public, and/or community service related to one's area of expertise.
- Participates in university workshops, conferences and meetings.
- Performs student advisement activities.
- Serves as an advisor to a student organization.

The Post-Tenure Review regulation defines that a faculty member “**exceeds expectations**” when there is a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond “meets” expectations. A faculty member “**does not meet expectations**” when the faculty member’s performance falls below the normal range of annual variation of performance of “meets expectations” but is capable of improvement. A faculty member’s performance is rated as “**unsatisfactory**” when the faculty member fails to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or the performance involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable university regulations and policies.

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA

School of Journalism and Graphic Communication

Approved: December 2023

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA School of Journalism and Graphic Communication

Approved: December 2023

Introduction

The approved post-tenure review policies and procedures for faculty at Florida A&M University (FAMU) are available on the FAMU Faculty Resources website available at this URL:

<https://www.famu.edu/administration/academic-affairs/faculty-resources.php>

For additional information on the application submission process, contact the Office of the Provost via email academic.affairs@famu.edu or by phone 850-599-3276.

Post-Tenure Review Criteria

The post-tenure review criteria for the School of Journalism and Graphic Communication (SJGC) have been approved by Office of the Provost. They are subject to revision **prior** to the **next** review cycle. Please see the website address listed above for the latest version.

Criteria for rating faculty performance are established by unit faculty and supported by SJGC leadership and the provost. The criteria describe performance expectations for tenured faculty in the School of Journalism and Graphic Communication. They reflect the mission and vision of SJGC and the various duties and responsibilities expected of tenured faculty.

In each of the rating categories, **Research** can be interpreted as, but not limited to, grants submitted and received, papers published, presentations given, book chapters written and/or edited, panels served on, manuscripts reviewed, and creative works. **Teaching** can be interpreted as, but not limited to, courses taught, new course preparations, and workshops attended to improve teaching. **Service** can be interpreted as, but not limited to, membership on school and university committees, service on national boards, chairing or serving on thesis and dissertation committees, and being an advisor to student clubs, student organizations and student media. Optional documents could include, but not limited to, letters of support from students or colleagues, thank you letters, commendations, committee assignments, etc.

Additionally, faculty as expected to demonstrate satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations and university regulations and policies.

The rating categories for post-tenure review are:

- a) **Exceeds expectations:** a clear and significant level of accomplishment (defined as an average score of 4.0 or above across all areas of the Faculty Evaluation Form) beyond the average performance of faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit. Performance is appreciably better in the areas of teaching, service and research than the average faculty member of the candidate's present rank and field at peer institutions. Service must involve at least three distinct activities as defined above.

- b) **Meets expectations:** expected level of accomplishment (an average score of 3.00-3.99 across all areas of the Faculty Evaluation Form) compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit. Sustained record is commensurate with other peer institutions. Satisfactory or better (defined as no more than one "Does not meet") in any performance area of teaching, research, and service on their annual evaluation over the review period. Service should involve at least two distinct activities as defined above.

- c) **Does not meet expectations:** performance falls below the normal range (an average score of 2.0-2.99 across all areas in the Faculty Evaluation Form) of annual variation in performance compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit but is capable of improvement. This also applies to a faculty member who has received one overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation during the review period or unsatisfactory performance in a single performance area over two or more years. This evaluation may also be given if there is a correctable pattern of non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations and university regulations and policies. Service should involve at least one distinct activity as defined above.

- d) **Unsatisfactory:** failure to meet expectations (an average score below 2.00 across all areas in the Faculty Evaluation Form) that reflect disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in university regulations and policies. A faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation during two or more years during the review period or unsatisfactory performance in multiple areas of performance (i.e., teaching, research, and service) over three or more years during the review period also may be rated as unsatisfactory. This rating is given to a faculty member who demonstrates a willful disregard to perform duties assigned by the University or sustained violations of applicable state and federal law and applicable published College, University, and Board of Governors regulations, policies and procedures.

3. Process Requirements

(a) The faculty member shall complete a dossier following the requirements of the university. The dossier will be submitted to the immediate supervisor, either the division director of Journalism and Public Relations or Graphic Communication or the associate dean.

(b) The director/associate dean shall review the completed dossier as specified by the university process.

(c) The director/associate dean shall forward the dossier to the SJGC post-tenure review committee (PTR committee) for review. The purpose of this assessment is to evaluate and affirm that the faculty member is making contributions consistent with those expected of a tenured faculty member, provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development when needed, and recognize faculty members who continue to exceed expectations.

(d) The dean shall review the packet, the director's/associate dean's letter, and the findings of the PTR committee and forward a recommendation to the provost as specified by the university process.

(f) The provost shall notify the faculty member, the faculty member's program director/associate dean, and the dean of the outcome of the review.

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA School of the Environment

Approved: December 2023

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA

School of the Environment

Approved: December 2023

Introduction

The approved post-tenure review policies and procedures for faculty at Florida A&M University (FAMU) are available on the FAMU Faculty Resources website available at this URL:

<https://www.famu.edu/administration/academic-affairs/faculty-resources.php>

For additional information on the application submission process, contact the Office of the Provost via email academic.affairs@famu.edu or by phone 850-599-3276.

Overview

A faculty member of the School of the Environment (SoE) undergoing post-tenure review will provide a university-designated dossier highlighting accomplishments and demonstrating performance relative to assigned duties. In the SoE, the dossier and other records related to professional conduct, academic responsibilities, student evaluation, and annual performance, will be reviewed by the Dean of the School.

Following the university's post-tenure review requirements, the Dean will forward to the Provost the materials being reviewed along with a letter of achievement and a recommended performance rating as specified by university requirements.

Post-Tenure Review Criteria

The post-tenure review criteria for the School of the Environment have been approved by Office of the Provost. They are subject to revision **prior** to the **next** review cycle. Please see the website address listed above for the latest version.

Faculty in the School of the Environment (SoE) will be evaluated based on their assigned responsibilities in the categories of (1) teaching, (2) research, and (3) service or other non-credit generating activities that align with the University and SoE Missions, as documented in their Assignment of Responsibility Forms for the previous five years.

For each category, the Dean shall assign ratings based on the following criteria:

Exceeds Expectations – Performance substantially above assigned responsibilities over the past five years as determined by: number of courses taught versus assigned (overload assignments); research outputs as determined by proposals submitted,

funding awarded, and/or research outcomes and outputs include the number of Ph.D. students supervised and graduated compared to expectations of a SoE faculty member with a similar assigned effort for research; and level of service or other non-credit generating activities compared to assigned effort. The rating of Exceeds Expectations will also be given to faculty who demonstrate innovations in teaching, research, service, or other activities that further the University or SoE Mission.

Meets Expectations – Performance that substantially meets the faculty member’s assigned responsibilities over the past five years as determined by: teaching of assigned courses; submitting proposals, generating research funding, and/or research outcomes and outputs include the number of Ph.D. students supervised and graduated expected of a SoE faculty member with similar assigned effort for research; and providing service or other non-credit generating activities that meet the assigned effort. Faculty receiving a satisfactory or better performance rating in each annual evaluation during the last five years shall not be rated below Meets Expectations.

Does Not Meet Expectations – Performance that systematically fails to meet the faculty member’s assigned responsibilities over the past five years as determined by: teaching of assigned courses; submitting proposals, generating research funding, and/or research outcomes and outputs include the number of Ph.D. students supervised and graduated expected of a SoE faculty member with similar assigned effort for research; and providing service or other non-credit generating activities that meet the assigned effort.

Unsatisfactory – Failure to meet expectations that reflect disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance that involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in university regulations and policies. A faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation during two or more of the previous 5 years or has sustained violations of applicable state and federal law and applicable published College, University, and Board of Governors regulations, policies, and procedures may be deemed unsatisfactory.

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA School of Nursing

Approved March, 2024

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA

School of Nursing

Approved March, 2024

Introduction

The approved post-tenure review policies and procedures for faculty at Florida A&M University (FAMU) are available on the FAMU Faculty Resources website available at this URL:

<https://www.famu.edu/administration/academic-affairs/faculty-resources.php>

For additional information on the application submission process, contact the Office of the Provost via email academic.affairs@famu.edu or by phone 850-599-3276.

I. Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide guidance on post-tenure review in the School of Nursing

II. Policy

The School of Nursing post-tenure review process conforms to the policies and guidelines concerning post-tenure review adopted by the Florida Board of Governors of the State University System and by Florida A&M University. While this document is intended to be comprehensive and precise with regards to school level performance criteria, the faculty member should have familiarity with the Florida BOG and university regulations related to the Post-Tenure Review (PTR).

III. Background

Each tenured faculty member shall have a comprehensive post-tenure review of five years of performance in the fifth year following the last promotion or the last comprehensive PTR review, whichever is later. For faculty hired with tenure, the hire date shall constitute the date of the last promotion. Tenured faculty in administrative roles, such as department chairs or directors, shall be evaluated annually by the appropriate college Dean based on criteria established by the university. A PTR review may be delayed, or exemption granted for compelling reasons approved by the provost. Visit the URL listed above for that latest version of PTR policies and procedures.

IV. School of Nursing Post-Tenure Review Process and Procedures

School of Nursing Post-Tenure Review includes the following process:

1. Faculty members scheduled for review during the academic year will be notified by the department chair at least two (2) months in advance to provide them with sufficient time to accumulate the PTR Dossier review materials. Faculty members may also contact the Office of the Provost to obtain information regarding their post-tenure review schedule.
2. The faculty member shall complete and submit a university-designated dossier as outlined in Appendix A and the documentation provided at the URL given above.
3. The faculty member's department chair shall review the completed dossier, the faculty member's personnel file, and other records related to professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance.
 - Additional records related to professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance concerns.
 - A letter assessing the level of achievement and certification that the letter includes, if applicable, any concerns regarding professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance during the period under review.
4. The faculty member's department chair shall forward the dossier, including all records and the chair's letter, to the School of Nursing dean for review. The department chair's evaluation letter shall include a discussion of the faculty member's performance in the areas of scholarship/research, teaching, and service and practice considering the faculty member's interests, assignments, and the stage of the faculty member's career.
5. The dean of the School of Nursing shall review all materials provided by the faculty member's department chair.
6. The dean of the college shall add to the dossier an evaluation letter assessing the level of achievement during the period under review. The letter shall include any concerns regarding professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance. The letter shall also include the dean's recommended performance rating using the evaluation standards as defined by the post-tenure review criteria section below.
 - The faculty member being reviewed will be given an opportunity by the provost to provide a written response to the Post-Tenure Review evaluation. The Dean will maintain, as a part of the faculty member's confidential personnel file within the SON, a record of the evaluation letter.
7. The dean of the college shall forward the dossier to the provost for review.

8. The provost shall follow the FAMU post-tenure review process and procedures to complete the review including notifying the candidate of the provost's decision.

VI. Evaluation Standards

- A. Post-Tenure Faculty Performance evaluations are based on the following standards of Performance:
 1. The level of accomplishment and productivity relative to the faculty member's assigned duties in research, teaching, and service, including clinical and administrative assignments.
 2. The faculty member's history of professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities to the university and its students.
 3. The faculty member's non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.
 4. Unapproved absences from teaching assigned courses.
 5. Substantiated student complaints.
 6. Other relevant measures of faculty conduct as appropriate.

- B. Tenured faculty performance evaluations are primarily based on the Faculty Assignment of Responsibilities (AORs), academic performance dossier, and any additional data gathered by the faculty member, academic affairs, or the School of Nursing administration. A standards-based scale is the basis for rating full-time faculty in each performance area: teaching effectiveness, scholarly activities, and service.

Post-Tenure Review Criteria

The post-tenure review criteria for the School of Nursing have been approved by Office of the Provost. They are subject to revision **prior** to the **next** review cycle. Please see the website address listed above for the latest version.

Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria & Standards (Adapted from Florida BOG Regulation 10.003, 2023; JMU, 2020; UNC, 2021)

- Exceeds expectations: a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performance of faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit. *This rating is given to faculty who consistently and substantively exceed the school's standards of performance. Individuals receiving this rating stand as exemplars of the highest levels of professional academic performance within the school.*

- Meets expectations: expected level of accomplishment compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit. *Individuals receiving this rating*

constitute those valued faculty on whom the continued successful operation of the school rests.

- Does not meet expectations: performance falls below the normal range of annual variation in performance compared to faculty across the faculty member’s discipline and unit but is capable of improvement. *This rating is given to faculty who did not meet the school’s standard of performance consistently but shows potential for improvement.*
- Unsatisfactory: failure to meet expectations that reflect disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable university regulations and policies. *This rating is given to faculty who 1) did not meet the school’s standards for performance, 2) did not show professional growth and improvement as needed, or 3) consistently violated one or more of the standards of performance. This rating represents performance that is not acceptable.*

Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching is a primary function of the university and occurs through a wide variety of teaching-learning activities in which the learner acquires new knowledge, skills and/or attitudes. Teaching is the outcome of professional development, practice expertise, and scholarly activities.

- *Refer to the School of Nursing (SON) Post-Tenure Review **Teaching Effectiveness Criteria** Supplemental Document.*

Scholarship

Scholarship refers to systematic and diligent inquiry for the purpose of creating, discovering, developing, integrating, creatively applying, or refining knowledge. In nursing, scholarship occurs in many forms and contexts, for example formal research or the development of evidence-based practice guidelines. Scholarship outcomes are successful when they are disseminated as new knowledge and ideas for others to read, view, critique, and use. The goal of scholarship is to inform and enhance the scholar, students, professional colleagues, and the mission of the profession. Interdisciplinary and community-engaged scholarships are valued by the School of Nursing.

- *Refer to the School of Nursing (SON) Post-Tenure Review **Scholarship Criteria** Supplemental Document.*

Service

Service refers to professional development activities that contribute to the mission of the school, the university, the community, and the nursing profession. Service involves not only membership, but active contributions and outcomes in campus committees, groups, and off-campus professional organizations.

- *Refer to the School of Nursing (SON) Post-Tenure Review **Service Criteria** Supplemental Document.*

Appendix A

Post-Tenure Review Dossier Materials

The materials to be include in the post-tenure review document will create a Review Dossier composed of the following:

1. Updated curriculum vitae, prepared according to the SON standard vitae format. Be sure to **highlight** the following on the vitae, as relevant:
 - ✓ Teaching activities during the previous five (5) years
 - Courses taught
 - Summary of student, dean, and peer evaluations of teaching
 - ✓ Scholarly/Research/Creative Works activities during the previous five (5) years
 - Peer-reviewed publications with selected other types of publications, as relevant
 - Peer-reviewed presentations
 - Invited presentations
 - Associate editorship or editorial board membership
 - Review panel membership
 - Other miscellaneous accomplishments
 - Research support, including
 - pending support
 - active support
 - support completed since tenure, promotion or the last promotion or post-tenure review
 - ✓ Service activities during the previous five (5) years
 - Administrative positions held, including a brief description of duties, responsibilities, and time commitment.
 - Committee membership (Healthcare Focus)
 - School of Nursing
 - University
 - Local/State/National/International Committee
 - Community Service/ Professional Memberships
 - ✓ Practice activities during the previous five (5) years

- A summary of practice activities including practice role and site and time commitment
 - ✓ Awards, honors, and other recognition during the previous five (5) years
 - A list of honors and awards
2. A narrative of no more than five (5) pages highlighting the contributions made during the five-year review period by the faculty member in each performance area appropriate to your assigned duties in teaching, research, service, scholarship, creative works, extension, clinical and administrative assignments. You may include an explanation of any variation in your annual performance during the review period.
 3. A statement that estimates the average percentage effort over the five-year review period you were assigned in each performance area described in your narrative. Your overall average effort over all of your performance areas should total 100%.
 4. Supporting documents during the 5-year review period including Assignment of Responsibilities (AORs) or equivalent, annual evaluations, and student teaching evaluations. Also, estimate your average score on Question #8 of your student evaluation "Overall rating of instructor."
 5. Up to five (5) pages of optional material relevant to your review may be added.

Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching is a primary function of the university and occurs through a wide variety of teaching-learning activities in which the learner acquires new knowledge, skills and/or attitudes. Teaching is the outcome of professional development, practice expertise, and scholarly activities.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does not meet expectations	Unsatisfactory
<p>1. Receives excellent to very good student, Dean, and/or peer evaluations for the last 5 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Receives average rating of 4 or > of 5 points across all student course evaluations of item #8: Overall rating of instructor. b. Above Satisfactory evaluations by the Dean c. Above Satisfactory evaluations by Peers <p>2. Makes significant contributions to curriculum revision and/or development., i.e., serve as champion and/or chair of curriculum revisions and/or development.</p> <p>3. Develops and implements creative, evidence-based teaching activities.</p>	<p>1. Receives very good to good student, Dean, and/or peer evaluations for the last 5 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Receives average rating of 3-3.99 of 5 points across all student course evaluations of item #8: Overall rating of instructor. b. Satisfactory evaluations by the Dean. c. Satisfactory evaluations by Peers <p>2. Makes contributions to curriculum revision and/or development consistently.</p> <p>3. Augment and implement evidence-based teaching strategies.</p>	<p>1. Receives fair student, Dean, and/or peer evaluations for the last 5 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Receives average rating below 3 of 5 points across all student course evaluations of item #8: Overall rating of instructor. b. Fair evaluations by the Dean. c. Fair evaluations by Peers. <p>2. Inconsistent contributions to curriculum revision and/or development.</p> <p>3. Requires support to provide clear objectives, guidelines for teaching and learning, course content, and course expectations.</p>	<p>1. Disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance involves incompetence or misconduct.</p> <p>2. Receives unsatisfactory student, Dean, and/or peer evaluations for the last 5 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Receives average rating below 2 of 5 points across all student course evaluations of item #8: Overall rating of instructor. b. Fair evaluations by the Dean. c. Unsatisfactory evaluations by Peers.

<p>4. Holds formal and informal academic advisement conferences with students throughout the semester, implements student success plan for at-risk students, and documents conferences in student's files.</p> <p>5. Always implement best-practices and follow SON procedures when developing a new course and/or teaching new and established courses.</p> <p>6. Always model professional role in the classroom and /or clinical settings.</p>	<p>4. Holds formal and/or informal academic advisement conferences with students throughout the semester, posts and keeps office hours.</p> <p>5. Consistently augments and teaches established courses according to SON procedures and best practices.</p> <p>6. Models the professional role in classroom and clinical situations, i.e., professional attire, appearance, and interactions.</p>	<p>4. Formal and/or informal academic advisement practices with students are inconsistent. Office hours posted but fails to keep office hours, as scheduled or reschedule in a timely manner.</p> <p>5. Requires directive cues and support to implement best-practices or follow SON procedures when augmenting and/or teaching established courses.</p> <p>6. Inconsistent role modeling behaviors in the classroom and clinical, i.e., attire, appearance, and interactions.</p>	<p>3. No contributions to curriculum revision and/or development.</p> <p>4. Requires extensive support to provide clear objectives, guidelines for teaching and learning, course content, and course expectations.</p> <p>5. Does not hold formal and informal academic advisement conferences with students throughout the semester, fails to implement student success plans for at-risk students, and/or minimal to no evidence of academic advisement conferences referenced in student's files.</p> <p>6. Fails to implement best-practices or follow SON procedures when augmenting and/or teaching established courses.</p>
---	---	---	--

			<p>7. Inappropriate role modeling behaviors in the classroom and clinical situations, i.e., unprofessional attire, untidy and unkempt appearance, and disrespectful interactions.</p>
--	--	--	---

Scholarship

Scholarship refers to systematic and diligent inquiry for the purpose of creating, discovering, developing, integrating, creatively applying, or refining knowledge. In nursing, scholarship occurs in many forms and contexts, for example formal research or the development of evidence-based practice guidelines. Scholarship outcomes are successful when they are disseminated as new knowledge and ideas for others to read, view, critique, and use. The goal of scholarship is to inform and enhance the scholar, students, professional colleagues, and the mission of the profession. Interdisciplinary and community-engaged scholarships are valued by the School of Nursing.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does not meet expectations	Unsatisfactory
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Two scholarly professional publications such as books, monographs or articles not including abstracts or proceedings within the last five years; At least one publication shall be refereed. <li style="text-align: center;">and 2. Funded or non-funded grant (or) individual or collaborative research, or paper or poster presentation at a professional meeting within the last five years. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One scholarly professional publication such as books, monographs or articles not including abstracts or proceedings within the last five years; At least one publication shall be refereed. <li style="text-align: center;">and 2. Funded grant or non-funded (or) individual or collaborative research, or paper or poster presentation at a professional meeting within the last five years 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One scholarly professional publication such as book(s), monographs or articles not including abstracts or proceedings within the last five years; no referred publications. <li style="text-align: center;">or 2. Funded or non-funded grant (or) individual or collaborative research, or paper or poster presentation at a professional meeting within the last five years 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance involves incompetence or misconduct. 2. No scholarly professional publication such as book(s), monographs or articles not including abstracts or proceedings within the last five years; no referred publications. <li style="text-align: center;">or 3. No funded or non-funded grant (or) individual or

			collaborative research, or paper or poster presentation at a professional meeting within the last five years
--	--	--	---

Service

Service refers to professional development activities that contribute to the mission of the school, the university, the community, and the nursing profession. Service involves not only membership, but active contributions and outcomes in campus committees, groups, and off-campus professional organizations.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does not meet expectations	Unsatisfactory
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chair or Co-Chair two or more college or university committees. 2. Chairing special task force. 3. Demonstrates effective formal mentoring of peers and other faculty members in the area of teaching, research or practice. 4. Active/Continuous participation as a committee member in a health care focused national or international organization and makes professional contributions and advocates for the profession. 5. Serves as journal editor, manuscript reviewer, conference paper reviewer. (3 or more per year). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chair or Co-Chair one or more college or university committees. 2. Co-chair of special task force. 3. Demonstrates effective informal mentoring of peers and other faculty members in two of the following areas: teaching, research or practice. 4. Intermittent participation as a committee member in a health care focused national or international organization and makes professional contributions and advocates for the profession. 5. Serves as journal editor, manuscript reviewer, conference 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Co-Chair or committee member of one college or university committees. 2. Member of special task force. 3. Demonstrates effective informal mentoring of peers and other faculty members in one of the following areas: teaching, research or practice. 4. Limited participation as a committee member in a health care focused national or international organization but does not make professional contributions and/or advocate for the profession. 5. Serves as journal editor, manuscript reviewer, conference paper reviewer. but in 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance involves incompetence or misconduct. 2) Committee member of one college or university committees. 3) No participation in the special task force when requested. 4) Does not provide mentoring either formal or informal of peers and other faculty members. 5) No participation as a committee member in a health care focused national or international organization.

<p>6. Contributes substantively to activities that support the mission and goals of the department.</p>	<p>paper reviewer. (Two or less per year). 6. Contributes to activities that support the mission and goals of the department.</p>	<p>a limited capacity (1 per year). 6. Limited contributions to activities that support the mission and goals of the department.</p>	<p>6) Does not serve as a journal editor, manuscript reviewer, or conference paper reviewer. 7) No contribution to activities that support the mission and goals of the department.</p>
---	---	--	---