

**Sustained Performance Evaluation (SPE) Standards and Procedures
English Department**

Approved by Department of English, 8/28/17

Returned by Provost's office February 2018

Approved by Department of English again, 2/19/18

In accordance with the university mandate for a Sustained Performance Evaluation (SPE) process to “follow a seven-year cycle for each tenured faculty member,” the department of English establishes the following standards and procedures, as supplemental to those specified in the Provost’s SPE memorandum of October 3, 2016.

1) As stated in the Provost’s memorandum, the faculty member under review will provide the following items in his/her SPE portfolio: a current curriculum vitae, copies of the faculty member’s last seven annual assignments and annual evaluations, a copy of the SPE performance expectations of the English department, a brief (2 pages) narrative of accomplishments for the period under review, and a copy of the report of the previous SPE, if available.

2) Portfolios will be reviewed by the English department’s SPE committee, which will include all tenured faculty members. The entire committee will discuss and vote on the cases of associate professors. Only full professors will discuss and vote on the cases of full professors. If a faculty member disagrees with the decision of the departmental SPE committee, the result will be reviewed by the College Performance Review Committee of the College of Arts and Letters.

3) The results of SPE reviews will be duly recorded by the chair of the department. Full records of SPE proceedings, including portfolios, will be delivered to and stored by the dean of the College of Arts and Letters; copies will also be kept by the department.

4) The Provost’s SPE memorandum specifies that “each academic unit that does annual evaluations shall define expectations for sustained performance among its tenured faculty in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.” Moreover, these guidelines expressly require inclusion of annual evaluations in SPE portfolios. Because consistency between long-term and short-term evaluation criteria is both desirable and necessary, the English department establishes the following relation between annual evaluations (which weigh teaching, scholarship, and service equally) and the three available SPE rankings:

Exceeds Expectations: In at least 4 out of the 7 years under review, the faculty member will have received annual evaluations with an overall score in the top two categories (Exceptional, Outstanding); the faculty member will have received no overall annual evaluation score in the bottom two categories (Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory).

Meets Expectations: In at least 4 out of the 7 years under review, the faculty member will have received annual evaluations with an overall score in the top three categories (Exceptional, Outstanding, Good) but will not have met the above criteria for "Exceeds Expectations." No more than one annual evaluation can have received an overall score in

the bottom category (Unsatisfactory). If the faculty member has received a Performance Improvement Plan connected to any of the annual evaluations, it is expected that he or she will have fulfilled the plan, or be in the process of doing so (in accordance with the timeline specified in the plan).

Fails to Meet Expectations: The faculty member has not met the criteria for either Exceeds Expectations or Meets Expectations.

The above standards employ the new five-tier annual evaluation system mandated by the university: Exceptional, Outstanding, Good, Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory. In the many cases where SPE portfolios will include some annual evaluations from years when the old four-tier system (Excellent, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Below Satisfactory) was still in use, those particular years will be assessed as follows:

Exceeds Expectations: In at least 4 out of the 7 years under review, the faculty member will have received annual evaluations with an overall score in the top two categories (Excellent, Above Satisfactory); the faculty member will have received no overall score in the bottom category (Below Satisfactory).

Meets Expectations: In at least 4 out of the 7 years under review, the faculty member will have received annual evaluations with an overall score in the top three categories (Excellent, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory). If the faculty member has received a Performance Improvement Plan connected to any of the annual evaluations, it is expected that he or she will have fulfilled the plan, or be in the process of doing so (in accordance with the timeline specified in the plan).

Fails to Meet Expectations: as above.

5) The Provost's memorandum also states that "the SPE is separate and distinct from annual and other employee evaluations in that the evaluation will focus on long-term accomplishments over a period of multiple years." That is, evaluation over a protracted period will capture long-term patterns in a faculty member's professional progress that may not be apparent from the annual reviews regarded separately. To take one example, long-term work on a major scholarly or creative project will not necessarily result in a regular series of annual publications, and, in any case, qualitative judgments must prevail over quantitative measures in evaluations of intellectual achievement. Likewise, on-going activities that fall under the headings Community Engagement and Undergraduate Research, categories that have only recently been added to the English department's annual evaluation criteria, may not be fairly and fully represented in the annual evaluations alone. The SPE review committee will of course consider such activities whether or not they were part of the annual evaluation criteria in the years under review. If the SPE candidate has relevant accomplishments during the review period that are not captured by annual evaluations, the candidate should highlight those accomplishments both in the curriculum vitae and in the 2-page narrative to be submitted in the portfolio. In addition, the candidate should discuss in the narrative any extraordinary circumstances that have a clear bearing on the period under review. Taking all such factors into account,

the department's SPE review committee may consider the adjustment of a candidate's SPE evaluation as defined above.

In accordance with the above, the SPE committee will look not only at Annual Evaluation scores but will, if necessary, count and average quantifiable accomplishments over the 7 year period under review in order to be able to evaluate longer-term developments in teaching, research and service not captured in the Annual Evaluation. The faculty member under review should use the brief narrative to trace such developments.

For example, a faculty member might publish 4 peer-reviewed journal articles in a single year and publish 3 additional articles in another year within the review period. In that case, the faculty member would have received an "Exceptional" ranking for those two years but lower (potentially significantly lower) in the other 5 years under annual review. In this case, the SPE committee may note that had the 7 publications been evenly distributed, the faculty member would have received 7 "Exceptionals" in research and therefore should easily receive "Exceeds Expectations" in the research portion of SPE. Likewise, graduate teaching might lead to an exceptionally heavy theses advisement over 2 to 3 years and may offset a lack of advisement in other years. Criteria added to Annual Evaluations (such as service learning, undergraduate research) may not have been recorded in earlier Annual Evaluations, but should nevertheless be counted and averaged.

The English Department notes that the publishing cycle for academic work, particularly in the humanities, is long and delays related to the editing of any publication type enumerated in the Annual Evaluation criteria will not be held against the SPE candidate. However, it is possible that faculty members may earn "Outstanding" or "Good" Annual Evaluation ratings based upon works list as "In Press" or "Works in Progress." If such work does not appear in print within the review period, the SPE committee will consider these as "non-publications" and will assign a ranking based upon publications in print along the principles of averaging total publications (and other quantifiable accomplishments) by 7.