

**FLORIDA GULF COAST UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION**

4/2/03

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA AND STANDARDS**

## Table of Contents

I.	Preamble .....	2
II.	Professional Development Plan (PDP):.....	3
	A. Introduction .....	3
	B. Writing a Professional Development Plan.....	4
	C. Performance Categories for the PDP.....	4
III.	Category Descriptions and Performance Criteria .....	5
	A. Teaching .....	5
	1. Descriptions of Teaching.....	5
	2. Teaching Assessment Criteria .....	6
	B. Service .....	7
	1. Descriptions of Service.....	7
	2. Service Assessment Criteria .....	8
	C. Scholarship .....	8
	1. Descriptions of Scholarship.....	8
	2. Scholarship Assessment Criteria .....	9
IV.	Annual Evaluation .....	11
	A. Annual Evaluation Portfolio .....	11
	B. Two Key Questions .....	12
	C. Supervisor's Role .....	12
V.	Failure to Meet Expectations.....	13
	A. Performance Improvement Plan (PIP).....	13
	B. Performance Improvement Contract (PIC) .....	14
VI.	References .....	16

## I. PREAMBLE

The statements in this document are meant to fulfill, advance, and enhance the professional, scholarly, research, and service functions of the faculty of the College of Education of Florida Gulf Coast University.

As a College of Education, our mission is to advance the quality of education. That call extends beyond merely “teaching” which is defined as “directing or giving lessons.” The Latin root of “education” means, “to bring forth.” In the case of our charge, faculty of the College of Education is to “bring forth knowledge and skill.

Education, then, requires that we nurture, inspire, guide, and support a community of learners that includes students, faculty, staff, families, and other community partners. Our educational pursuits within these communities may come to be defined in eclectic formats and designation of faculty effort that may evolve into arrangements unique to the varied community members.

We define our mission in our learning community in an integrated sense. That is, education is, in itself, broadly defined and in the arena of our work, it is one with scholarship and service. We acknowledge that these three notions are inseparable in our practices. The overarching belief is that all that we do contributes to an ever-changing community of learners and encompasses discovery, interaction, new knowledge, action research, service to constituents, facilitation of learning, and collaboration.

The COE supports faculty members’ exercise of academic freedom in research, publication, and the classroom, as well as their expectation to practice their craft in a diverse, respectful, and collaborative environment free from discrimination. In pursuit of such an environment, faculty members recognize their responsibility to treat students, staff, and colleagues in a collegial manner. As key players in such an environment faculty members have a professional responsibility to be active, informed, and productive members of the FGCU community and in their chosen academic fields. Faculty members are expected to take responsibility for their own professional career development paths and to be informed as to appropriate evaluation criteria and processes.

Respectfully submitted,

Joyce Honeychurch, Ph.D. (chair)  
Bill Engel, Ed.D.  
Brenda Lazarus, Ph.D.  
Linda Ray, Ph.D.  
Russell Sabella, Ph.D.

## II. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (PDP)

### A. INTRODUCTION

**The Professional Development Plan (PDP) is the cornerstone of all faculty evaluation processes at FGCU.** In the past, objectives were written by the faculty member and approved by the faculty member's supervisor so that the objectives were deemed appropriate for the university, college, division, and professor. Faculty members assumed if they accomplished more than the objectives or accomplished them in an outstanding way, they would exceed expectations. The mentality was, "I'll work as hard as I can, take on extra tasks, strive to exceed and I will be evaluated as such." This document is a major change from that belief system.

The current FPED document includes the following statement:

- **The PDP will include a statement identifying whether the listed objectives are intended to serve as performance targets whose achievement will signal an overall assessment of "meets expectations" or alternatively, one of "exceeds expectations."**

This statement requires a shift in thinking from "I'll do more and exceed" to "Viewed as a whole, I believe that these objectives support my goal of exceeding and that it is my intent at the outset of writing my PDP to exceed in this area by *achieving* the target objectives listed." Faculty members will need to carefully assess their ability to exceed given their long-range goals, how many areas to target as exceeds, and carefully craft their PDP from the onset.

This is a much more complicated task when one considers personal professional goals, division goals, college goals, and university goals. There is no doubt that developing a PDP will now be a much more serious, reflective endeavor and will require careful consideration by the faculty member and his/her supervisor to balance the work of the university, college and division with teaching, scholarship and service. Furthermore, PDPs should have a keen sense of focus so that the work of the college and divisions can be completed equitably. Approaching the PDP task with a spirit of collaboration will ensure that objectives are written not only to meet personal goals (especially in service), but also to support the work of the College as a unit.

The FPED calls for a sense of "reasonableness" when considering what it means to exceed. The FPED states:

- **According to Article 9 of the CBA (2001-2003), "Scheduled hours for all employees shall not normally exceed forty (40) hours per week. Time shall be allowed within the normal working day for research, teaching, or other activities required of the employee, when a part of the assigned duties." The objectives listed on the PDP should be achievable in a normal forty-hour workweek.**

The Peer Support Committee recognizes that this is another major shift in thinking for many faculty members. As mentioned earlier, a common belief is that of "work harder, achieve more." Many can only adhere to this belief by also working longer to accomplish an ever-growing "to-do" list. However, we would like to suggest that exceeding is not linked solely to quantity of objectives met but more to quality of objectives met and quality of work associated with those objectives.

The faculty member must consider how to maintain balance among teaching, scholarship, and service to effectively achieve goals. From the FPED language, "meet" cannot be viewed as mediocre but rather what is expected of a productive faculty member. The questions then become, "Can I reasonably be expected to 'exceed' in all areas year after year? Is it not more reasonable to consider 'meets' in some areas so that I can exceed in others during a given year?" Meets is commendable and expected. Exceeds is not meant to be the norm.

## B. WRITING A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

When writing a Professional Development Plan, each faculty member in the COE, in collaboration with his or her supervisor, must prepare a document containing stated goals (long-term aspects across the duration of a contract) and objectives (specific targeted achievements for the period under review.) See FPED, THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN, page 3, Description of the Professional Development Plan.

The main purpose of reflective writing of goals and objectives is not to stifle creativity or to interfere with academic freedom to teach, but to ensure that a faculty member has input into the evaluation process with fair and equitable determination of progression and/or achievement of academic goals. The faculty member meets with his or her supervisor to review goals and objectives and discuss what resources may be needed to assist faculty in achieving the identified goals for the year. Revisions, too, will be made in collaboration with one's supervisor and signed off by one's supervisor. A faculty member may revise and/or amend his/her PDP during an academic year. It is understood that the PDP is a "living document" which reflects present and unfolding opportunities and goals.

There is an assumption that goals and objectives reflect differing expectations, based on the rank and place in career of the faculty member.

## C. PERFORMANCE CATEGORIES FOR THE PDP

Faculty performance, as outlined in the FPED, is to be evaluated on a three-point scale, which includes "*exceeds*," "*meets*," and "*does not meet*." These terms are reserved for assessments with respect to teaching, service, and scholarship for individual faculty in a given evaluation year. All faculty members will develop objectives that reflect their professional goals to meet or exceed expectations.

In addition to the three categories of performance assessment above, a faculty member with a **Continuing Multi-Year Appointment (CMYA)** appointment is evaluated for his/her overall performance, which is an evaluation assessment that relates to his/her continued

employment. Following an annual evaluation of “overall satisfactory” a faculty member’s three-year cycle of employment is continued. With an annual evaluation of “overall unsatisfactory” the faculty member is placed on a one-year Performance Improvement Contract (PIC), a contract to improve his or her performance. Definitions of “overall satisfactory” and “overall unsatisfactory” are as follows:

Overall Satisfactory: The performance rating of “overall satisfactory” indicates the faculty member is fulfilling all of his/her expected duties and functions proficiently in the College of Education. This rating indicates that the faculty member has received a performance rating of a “meets” or “exceeds” on two or more of the categories (teaching, service, scholarship) during the year being evaluated. Faculty members in good standing at the end of a given evaluation year shall receive an offer of an employment contract on at least as favorable terms as his/her existing contract extending three years from that May 1<sup>st</sup>. Upon acceptance by the faculty member, this contract shall supersede the existing employment contract.

Overall Unsatisfactory: The performance rating of “overall unsatisfactory” indicates the faculty member has received a performance evaluation of “Does Not Meet” in two or more categories (teaching, service, scholarship) or the faculty member has not met performance targets (“objectives”) which were designed to remedy the deficiencies identified in the most recent Performance Review Report. The performance rating of “overall unsatisfactory” modifies the faculty member’s CMYA. The faculty member is put on probation and is considered *not in good standing* for the following evaluation year as of May 1<sup>st</sup> of that year.

### **III. CATEGORIES TO BE EVALUATED**

#### **A. TEACHING**

The mission statement of Florida Gulf Coast University emphasizes the importance of the role of teaching. In keeping with the University’s mission, excellence in teaching effectiveness is expected of faculty in the College of Education. Beyond this, a number of COE faculty members may strive to be superior teachers, which requires special diligence and ingenuity.

- **DESCRIPTION OF TEACHING**

*The following descriptions of “meets” and “exceeds” in teaching are not operational definitions; rather they are “word sketches” for faculty to consider.*

**“MEETS” IN TEACHING**: This faculty member fulfills duties in teaching as expected such as conducting classes, being available to students, staying current in the discipline, and contributing to departmental and, when appropriate, university-wide teaching endeavors. This faculty member is creative and enthusiastic about teaching, plans carefully, and consistently carries through on plans. His/her students find this instructor to be an effective classroom lecturer and learning facilitator. This faculty member uses student feedback to improve the course. This instructor will be considered by his/her

colleagues as a dependable member of the faculty and generally receives satisfactory teaching evaluations. . Though he/she is demanding, this instructor is humane in his/her relationships with students and exerts every effort to be personally supportive.

*"EXCEEDS" IN TEACHING:* In addition to meeting, this faculty member is also widely read in the discipline and is continuously introducing into his/her courses the results of his/her own investigation. This teacher generally receives outstanding teaching evaluations from both students and faculty. The faculty member promotes high levels of student learning by continually assessing student needs and outcomes. Further, the teacher integrates content and strives to ensure that students make connections among disciplines. This professor uses innovative methods and technologies to enhance learning. This faculty member may receive recognition/rewards for outstanding teaching.

- **TEACHING ASSESSMENT CRITERIA**

A faculty member will include goals and objectives in his/her PDP that support his/her targeted level of effectiveness, i.e., "meets" or "exceeds." Below is a list that contains goals (overarching) and objectives (with products and other substantive outcomes). This is not an exhaustive list and other teaching goals and objectives may be written to support the faculty member's stated target of "meets" or "exceeds."

1. Possessing and maintaining a thorough knowledge of the subject, including cognizance of relevant, ongoing research and application;
2. Demonstrating proven experience and knowledge of established pedagogy in addition to the use of innovative methodology such as cooperative learning, collaboration, hands-on learning, and integration across other curriculum/age-appropriate areas;
3. Emphasizing the importance of critical thinking and creative problem solving rather than rote or formulaic learning;
4. Using high quality, current instructional materials, implementing technology as often as is feasible and encouraging increased use of technology by students;
5. Developing, revising and presenting course syllabi that clearly state course objectives, activities, requirements, and related assessments;
6. Strengthening and adjusting course content to reflect local, state, national, and international standards;
7. Providing leadership toward a genuine effort to establish a classroom atmosphere that is inclusive, supportive of student development, and conducive to learning;
8. Modeling high standards for scholarship, thus promoting high standards for student achievement and performance;
9. Participating in team teaching and collaborative opportunities with colleagues and the community;
10. Communicating clearly and applying consistently rigorous standards for evaluating student performance;
11. Publicizing grading policies and procedures;

12. Providing opportunities for students to participate in authentic (versus standardized) measures of assessment, i.e., development of a rubric, creation of a portfolio, and/or the development of a project for performance assessment;
13. Affording regular opportunities for students to informally assess the course content and methods;
14. Assisting students individually and outside of class when appropriate;
15. Adapting learning opportunities for meeting individual needs;
16. Promoting equity and diversity in all classroom activities to foster respect and understanding among all cultures and individuals;
17. Encouraging environmentally sound practices in the community and the world;
18. Continuing to be actively involved in professional development and to stay current in the relevant areas of content, theory, and practice.

## B. SERVICE

Service activities are an integral part of a faculty member's work in the College of Education and involve a faculty member's contributions of his or her professional knowledge, experience and expertise to the profession, the University or its personnel or its sub units, and to the local or regional community. Service activities are those which:

- Add to the profession;
- Add to the University, College, or School;
- Accrue in some direct way to the University or unit's mission; or
- Add to the public welfare or the common good.

### • DESCRIPTION OF SERVICE

*The following descriptions of "meets" and "exceeds" in service are not operational definitions; rather they are "word sketches" for faculty to consider.*

**"MEETS" IN SERVICE:** This faculty member fulfills all committee assignments effectively and positively contributes to the work of the committee. He/she assists willingly in the service needs of students, the department, college, and University. This person may present in-service training programs for schools or for professional continuing learning for persons in his/her discipline or presents a civic or community training program. The faculty member may attend regional or national professional meeting, serve as a paper reviewer, chair, or discussant, and may perform consulting work or other similar activities for a small honorarium.

**"EXCEEDS" IN SERVICE:** This faculty member has earned respect for his/her student advising, community outreach, and committee work. This faculty member has distinguished himself/herself for work with students, committees, and continuing education, having received service-oriented awards or having served with distinction on campus-wide committees and/or organizations. This faculty member frequently serves as a leader of school and community organizations. He/She is also well known throughout regional organizations within his/her discipline by serving as an officer, chair, or in some other relevant leadership position.

- **ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR SERVICE**

A faculty member will include goals and objectives in his/her PDP that support his/her targeted level of service achievement, i.e., “meets” or “exceeds.” Below is a list that contains goals (overarching) and objectives (with products and other substantive outcomes). This is not an exhaustive list and other teaching goals and objectives may be written to support the faculty member’s stated target of “meets” or “exceeds.”

Service to the University-

- Involvement in university governance of departments, programs, schools, colleges and the university at large;
- Mentoring or otherwise facilitating fellow professionals;
- Supporting university goals or mission with service on committees or advisory boards or by providing assistance with fund raising and recruitment efforts;
- Providing assistance to colleagues or students by providing guest lectures, peer feedback, and assisting student organizations or activities;
- Providing assistance in curriculum design.

Service to the Profession-

- Membership, leadership or other contribution to professional societies and accreditation or licensing boards;
- Organizing and conducting conferences, symposia, and workshops;
- Chairing or other service to professional committees or editorial review boards.

Service to the Community-

- Providing expertise, leadership, consultation or participation to local, regional, state, national or international organizations including schools, school districts, other educational institutions or programs, agencies, social service organization, civic groups and governmental boards, agencies or coalitions/partnerships,
- Providing in-service training, supervision, and other services to the above-named organizations.

## C. SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarly activities can take many forms across a faculty member’s career. Factors affecting a faculty member’s scholarship include his/her discipline, career progression, type of assignment, and the background and interests of the faculty member. In other words, the situation of a given faculty member plays a part in determining his or her scholarship goals.

- **DESCRIPTION OF SCHOLARSHIP**

*The following descriptions of “meets” and “exceeds” in scholarship are not operational definitions; rather they are “word sketches” for faculty to consider.*

**“MEETS” IN SCHOLARSHIP:** This faculty member stays current in his/her professional discipline, presents at conference(s) or professional organizations, or has submitted work in professional venues such as peer-reviewed publications, proceedings, conference presentations, and funded grants. This faculty member has a current scholarly agenda

which is demonstrated by works that fit under one or more of the Boyer categories of scholarly activity: Scholarship of teaching, discovery, integration and application. Scholarly works or products substantiate the faculty member's competence and currency in his or her discipline.

*"EXCEEDS" IN SCHOLARSHIP:* This faculty member's publications and creative scholarly activity make him/her respected beyond the campus in his/her field. He/she has published frequently in quality journals and otherwise has his/her creative scholarly activity judged excellent by his/her professional colleagues.

- **ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR SCHOLARSHIP**

A faculty member will include goals and objectives in his/her PDP that support his/her targeted level of attainment in scholarship, i.e. "meets" or "exceeds." Below is a description of scholarly activity that contains numerous suggestions to help a faculty member write his/her scholarship goals (overarching) and objectives (with products and other substantive outcomes).

Additionally, exemplars that demonstrate the four categories of Boyer's definition of scholarship are provided to better circumscribe the parameters of "scholarship" in the College of Education.

- **THE BOYER MODEL**

1. The scholarship of teaching

- a. Transmitting, transforming and extending knowledge
- b. Pedagogical research in one's discipline
- c. Use of innovative practices such as the use of case studies
- d. Development of a Web-based assessment system
- e. Design of a new course
- f. Restructuring of a course or a unit in an existing course.

2. The scholarship of discovery (Pure or Basic Research)

- a. The effort to discover new knowledge
- b. Experimental research in a school
- c. Historical research
- d. Case study research
- e. Publication in a refereed journal
- f. Dissemination of research via electronic journal.

3. The scholarship of integration

- a. Aims to organize and disseminate the results of other scholarship in general and accessible form
- b. Original perspectives resulting from the creative combination of prior knowledge
- c. Integration and team teaching of two courses

- d. Integration of technology into a course
- e. Team teaching
- f. Development of an interdisciplinary methods course
- g. Writing a textbook
- h. Presenting a talk at a professional conference
- i. Publishing a paper
- j. Writing an essay
- k. Producing a creative work.

4. The scholarship of application (Applied Research)

- a. Uses results of other scholarship to address consequential practical problems
- b. Shapes and influences other forms of scholarly activity when it
- c. Produces special insights derived from attempts at application
- d. Consulting for a local school system or a local agency
- e. Working on a specific problem in a school or agency
- f. Working on a grant with a school or agency.

• MAJOR CATEGORIES OF RESEARCH

1. Basic scholarship is focused on the creation of new knowledge; outputs from basic scholarship activities include publication in refereed journals, research monographs, scholarly books, chapters in scholarly books, proceedings from scholarly meetings, papers presented at international/national/regional academic meetings, publicly available research working papers, and papers presented at faculty research seminars.
2. Applied scholarship is concerned with the application, transfer, and interpretation of knowledge to improve education practice and teaching; outputs from applied scholarship activities include publication in professional journals, professional presentations, educational journals, in-house journals, published book reviews, published technology reports, and papers presented at faculty workshops.
3. Instructional development activities are focused on the enhancement of the educational value of instructional efforts of the institution or discipline; outputs from instructional development activities include textbooks, publications in professional journals, proceedings from pedagogical meetings, written cases with instructional materials, instructional technology artifacts, and publicly available materials describing the design and implementation of new courses. For purposes of maintaining academic and professional qualifications, creative scholarly activity also includes creative consulting, attendance at workshops, seminars and short courses in the area of specialization and earning professional and academic honors and awards.

## IV. ANNUAL EVALUATION

### A. ANNUAL EVALUATION PORTFOLIO

To prepare for annual evaluation, a faculty member will present a portfolio with a narrative attached. Portfolios will contain course syllabi for all courses taught and the following:

- Updated curriculum vitae.
- An updated PDP with the faculty member's goals and objectives that supports his/her targeted level of effectiveness, i.e., "meets" or "exceeds."
- Annual Professional Development Report (APDR), which reflects any amendments to the PDP, e.g., change of target from "exceeds" to "meets," and statements of how the objectives of the PDP have been met.

The portfolio will cover the period of time from the writing of one's PDP to the end of the academic year. See FPED, PERFORMANCE REVIEWS, page 9, Annual Review.

For the **TEACHING** section of the portfolio, a faculty member is to state his or her targeted level of teaching effectiveness ("meets" or "exceeds") and include materials that support the fact that the target was achieved, e.g., student evaluations for all courses taught, relevant handouts and/or DL e-documents, self-evaluation of one's teaching effectiveness, and a peer assessment of teaching

For the **SERVICE** section of the portfolio, a faculty member is to state his or her targeted level of service achievement ("meets" or "exceeds") and include materials that support the fact that the target was achieved, e.g., evidence of the expertise or experience brought to a service activity, documentation of the activity and its impact (self-reflection and/or thank you notes or emails/letters from recipients), external evaluations (not simple testimonials), meeting minutes, agendas, calendar of attendance, program evaluations, and work/products that resulted from the service.

For the **SCHOLARSHIP** section of the portfolio, a faculty member is to state his or her targeted level of attainment in scholarship ("meets" or "exceeds") and include materials/artifacts that support the fact that the target was achieved, e.g., copies of articles, books, and manuscripts/galleys, audio and video recordings; copies of software developed, or other original procedures; copies of contracts with publishers; letters accepting articles for publication; materials establishing that publications are refereed, juried or selective; copies of invitations or letter of acceptance from professional conferences relating to presentations at meetings; information showing the significance of the conference, workshop, or professional development activity within the discipline; programs of conferences and meetings; copies of material published in proceedings or annals; evidence of ongoing scholarly efforts and a self-evaluation of scholarship effectiveness.

## B. TWO KEY QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

Two key questions are to be answered within the contents of the portfolio and attached narrative:

- "Did you accomplish what you said you were going to do?"
- "Is the evidence you provided sufficient?"

## C. SUPERVISOR'S ROLE IN EVALUATION OF ANNUAL PERFORMANCE

The supervisor will be diligent and thorough when considering a faculty member's quality of performance in the annual evaluation. The supervisor is to assess the evidence to see if the faculty member's targeted level of effectiveness, i.e., "meets" or "exceeds" has been attained.

When evidence does not sustain a faculty member's stated target of "exceeds," it is a supervisor's prerogative to find evidence for and make a declaration of a "meets" performance; or, in the case of exceptional and unexpected performance, to find evidence for and a declaration of "exceeds" when the faculty member's stated target was "meets." Moreover, the supervisor's prerogative extends to a finding and a declaration of "does not meet stated objectives" when the evidence does not support a finding of "meets."

Does Not Meet: A faculty member has not met expectations when he or she cannot support with evidence that the agreed upon objectives during an evaluative period are fully completed. A faculty member receives "does not meet" when there is no tangible evidence that objectives have been fully completed. The faculty member's supervisor assumes the responsibility of assessing the evidence to meet each stated objective.

Supervisor's Report: Upon completion of evaluating a faculty member's portfolio, the supervisor prepares a draft Performance Review Report (PRR), i.e., a written summary regarding performance. This evaluation must include a statement regarding progress toward reappointment (if applicable), tenure (if applicable), and/or promotion. The summary is shared with the faculty member, who may elect to meet with the supervisor and discuss the specific findings and recommendations. Subsequently, a final Performance Review Report is prepared, which the faculty member will sign as an indication that he/she has had the opportunity to read the report.

In the event a faculty member is dissatisfied with the Performance Review Report, he/she may ask the College of Education's Peer Support Committee to review the evaluation to ensure that it has been carried out in accordance with the College's evaluation procedures and criteria. Upon completion of its review, the Peer Support Committee shall submit its findings to the Dean of the College of Education, with copies forwarded to the faculty member and faculty member's supervisor. The final decision with respect to the faculty member's evaluation in this case will be made at the Dean's level.

## V. FAILURE TO MEET EXPECTATIONS

### A. PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLAN (PIP)

When any faculty member receives a "*Does not Meet*" in one area, improvement is necessary with the writing of a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP). The PIP will contain specific performance targets ("objectives") that are designed to remedy the deficiencies

identified in the supervisor's Performance Review Report (PRR). The faculty member shall incorporate all objectives stated in the PIP into the current PDP for the next annual review. The first step in improvement is determining the root of the deficiency, which will then direct the selection of appropriate remedial efforts. The PIP will establish a clear connection between the underlying cause of the deficiency and the planned remedial method.

The current FPED document (1-29-03), page 10, includes the following statement:

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

Performance targets may be viewed as goals with measurable objectives and are written specific to the area in which the faculty member received an unsatisfactory annual evaluation. For example, if a faculty member received an unsatisfactory annual evaluation in the area of teaching, performance targets are developed that relate specifically to areas of deficit in teaching. Such performance targets must have the following characteristics:

- Reasonable expectation for successful completion within the next academic year
- Designed to address the specific area targeted for improvement (In the above example, a faculty member might have received an unsatisfactory annual evaluation in teaching, based on student feedback consistent across courses, that the faculty member was disorganized in class, that assignments were unclear, and were not returned in a timely manner. Performance targets must address these specific areas, within the larger area of teaching).
- Includes specific resources and assistance necessary for success with clear delineation of responsibility. The faculty member has the responsibility to seek out peer assistance. The supervisor and Peer Review Committee may assist the faculty member in securing such resources.
- Is a contract that contains jointly agreed upon targets and is signed by the faculty member and supervisor (may include input from the Peer Review committee)
- Includes specific timelines for target behaviors
- Includes a schedule for periodic supervisory review, but is scheduled a minimum of once per semester

Failure to meet the agreed upon performance targets ("objectives") will result in an "overall unsatisfactory" evaluation which, in turn, will require the faculty member to enter into a Performance Improvement Contract (PIC).

## **B PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT CONTRACT (PIC)**

When a (CMYA) faculty member receives a rating of “Overall Unsatisfactory” on the annual evaluation, that faculty member shall be required to enter into a Performance Improvement Contract (PIC). See FPED, PERFORMANCE REVIEWS, page 7, The Performance Improvement Contract for CMYA.

The PIC provides an avenue of contractual rehabilitation for faculty members who have been evaluated as “Overall Unsatisfactory.” Responsibility for the preparation of a PIC rests with the faculty member in consultation with his/her supervisor. The faculty member has the right to request assistance from the PRC to develop an acceptable PIC. In any case, the PRC is the final arbiter of the acceptability of a PIC, and the faculty member shall sign and deliver a copy of his/her PIC to the PRC. Satisfactory performance of the obligations of a PIC automatically entitle a faculty member to regain good standing at the expiration of the PIC, which coincides with the end of the evaluation year on April 30<sup>th</sup>. Unsatisfactory performance of the obligations of a PIC results in no change from probationary status to good standing, and no offer of a successive contract.

The (CMYA) faculty member writes a draft of the contract in consultation with the supervisor, which is signed by both. Both the faculty member and supervisor have obligations under the contract (listed below). It shall be finalized by or before September 30 of the calendar year in which an “Overall Unsatisfactory” annual rating was determined, and all terms of the contract shall be met by June 1 of the following calendar year. A copy of the PIC and any subsequent modifications to it are sent to the Peer Review Committee, the Dean of the College, and placed in the faculty member's file in the Office of Academic Affairs.

The specific items listed in the contract will vary depending upon the area(s) of deficiency leading to an overall annual evaluation of “unsatisfactory overall” and shall include, at minimum, the unmet objectives (or negotiated equivalent substitutes) from the prior contract, reasonable additional objectives for the current contract period (the negotiated PDP for the current year), and objectives/methods of remediation of deficiency appropriate to the need. These methods of remediation may include, but are not limited to, formal training through workshops or institutes, mentoring, collaboration with peers, etc. The objectives, methods, and measurement criteria shall be written in clearly measurable terms as defined in the three sections giving criteria for teaching, service and scholarship in this document.

#### **Obligations of the Faculty Member:**

- Draft the memorandum of understanding (the PIC) in consultation with and in full agreement of the supervisor.
- Clearly state the areas of deficiency, the perceived underlying cause of the deficiency, the performance targets for the term of the PIC (goals), the professional activities in which he or she will engage, and the objective evidence that will indicate that each goal has been met.
- Clearly identify the time and resources or other supports needed to achieve the goals. The activities and objectives listed on the PIC should be achievable in a normal forty-hour workweek.

- Identify dates (on or near November 15, February 1, and March 1) on which meetings will occur between the faculty member and supervisor to review progress; additional dates may be warranted.
- Monitor her/his own progress toward the goals, and initiate negotiations with the supervisor if and when a goal appears unrealistic.
- Propose modifications to the contract if and when appropriate. Modifications are appropriate only when necessitated by circumstances outside the control of the faculty member (e.g., change in workload assignment), and negotiated with the supervisor.
- Meet all goals and conditions of the PIC. Any unmet objective may be considered sufficient to justify non-renewal of the faculty member's employment contract.

#### **Obligations of the Supervisor:**

- Consider rank, experience, and labor and time-intensive activities when negotiating activities and objectives.
- Provide reasonable resources and release time for faculty member to attend appropriate remedial training (e.g., teaching workshops or IT training). This does not include tuition or release time for coursework toward a degree.
- Provide guidance for faculty member in suggesting methods for the remediation of deficiencies.
- Facilitate the faculty member's progress through directives or suggestions consistent with the goals of the PIC; agree to modifications of the PIC when warranted.
- Monitor progress of faculty member over the course of the PIC period, meet with the faculty member at least once per semester, and provide feedback at appropriate times regarding progress.

Remediation efforts will necessarily depend upon the areas of deficiency. The first step in remediation is determining the root of the deficiency, and will be necessary in selecting appropriate remedial efforts. The PIC will establish a clear connection between the underlying cause of the deficiency and the planned remedial method.

In the event that the faculty member and supervisor cannot reach agreement on the terms of the PIC, the next level supervisor will consider the perspectives of both parties and make a final ruling on the matter.

## **VI. REFERENCES**

Boyer, E. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: priorities of the professorate. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Collective Bargaining Agreement (2001-2003). United Faculty of Florida.

Diamond, R. (1995). Preparing for promotion and tenure review: A faculty guide. Boston: Anker Publishing Co., Inc.

Florida Gulf Coast University (January 29, 2003). Faculty Performance Evaluation Document. University Faculty Senate document. Moray/ share/faculty governance/