

## UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs  
PO Box 113175 235 Tigert Hall  
Gainesville, FL 32611-3175  
Tel: (352)392-2404  
Suncom: 622-2404  
Fax: (352) 392-8735  
Internet: capaldi@nersp.nerdc.ufl.edu

April 3, 1997

### MEMORANDUM

To: Academic Deans

From: Elizabeth D. Capaldi Provost

Subject: Sustained Performance Evaluation

Enclosed is a draft of the bare bones implementation of sustained performance evaluation that we said we would provide. You can add complexity if you desire. Also enclosed is a list of the faculty members who need to participate in this process as of this date. We have three years to complete evaluation of this group (starting in 1997-1998 and finishing this group by 1999-2000). Note we suggest you do faculty who have been post-tenure or post-promotion the longest first, and that you provide a schedule to your faculty. Obviously, each year additional faculty will become eligible for this review and we will provide a list each Fall of those faculty who enter the eligible category in that year.

Please let me know if you have questions; I would like to receive your draft procedures by April 18, 1997.  
Thank you.

EDC/lc

Enclosure

cc: Catherine Longstreth Victor Yellen

## **SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM (SPEP)**

### **A. General Information**

The Board of Regents has approved a Sustained Performance Evaluation Program (SPEP) to become effective at the beginning of the 1997-98 academic year. The SPEP requires that tenured faculty members receive a sustained performance evaluation once every seven years following the award of tenure or their most recent promotion. The purpose of this evaluation is to document sustained performance as a tenured faculty member during the previous six years of assigned duties and to encourage continued professional growth and development. Tenured faculty with administrative appointments of chairperson and above shall not be eligible for this review until they resume faculty duties for the required six year period. Specifically, the evaluation is designed to determine if a tenured faculty member's performance is satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

This program is to become effective at the beginning of the 1997-98 academic year. In phasing-in implementation of this program, the University shall review eligible faculty members, those who were awarded tenure or promotion in rank prior to 1991-92, by the end of the 1999-2000 academic year.

### **B. Review Schedule**

Each eligible faculty member shall be notified of the scheduled review date, by his or her chair. The first group (approximately one-third of the currently eligible faculty in the College) has accrued the longest time since tenure and/or promotion will be reviewed in 1997-98, and so on. Refer to Attachment 2.

After the initial evaluation "phase-in" period, all faculty members will be scheduled for review every seven years after their first review, or after they have served seven years after being tenured or promoted.

### **C. Sources and Methods of Evaluation**

The chair shall prepare the information for the assessment. The information shall include a faculty member's last six annual letters of evaluation and related evaluative information (e.g., data from student evaluation of teaching program) contained in the faculty member's evaluation file for this period of review.

The file shall be submitted to a committee for review.

### **D. Appointment and Responsibility of Sustained Performance Evaluation Program Committee (SPEPC)**

It shall be the responsibility of the SPEPC to review the materials and to prepare an evaluation report. The report shall rate the faculty member's performance according to the following:

- 1) Sustained performance is satisfactory.
- 2) Sustained performance is below satisfactory in one or more areas of assigned duties and responsibilities.

The SPEPC's evaluation report and recommendation for an improvement, if applicable, shall be advisory to the chair and shall be considered in the chair's review and assessment of the faculty member's SPEP information.

## **E. Responsibility of Chair**

Following the chair's review of the SPEP information including the SPEPC's report, the chair shall prepare the evaluation of the faculty member's sustained performance. The results of the sustained performance review may be incorporated in the annual letter of evaluation, as appropriate. The chair will rate the faculty member according to one of the two evaluation categories mentioned above and provide a statement explaining his/her decision. The faculty member may attach a concise response to the evaluation and that statement will be attached to the evaluation and become part of the faculty member's personnel record. A meeting will be scheduled with the faculty member to review the evaluation. In addition to discussing the faculty member's SPEP report, this meeting may also serve as the end-of-the-year evaluation performance conference.

## **F. Performance Improvement Plan**

Faculty members whose performance is identified through the SPEP as being below satisfactory shall develop, in concert with the department chair, a Performance Improvement Plan with specific performance targets and a time period for achieving the targets. The department shall provide specific resources identified in the plan. It shall be the responsibility of the department chair to meet periodically with the faculty member to monitor any required Performance Improvement Plan and to provide evidence that his or her prescribed performance targets are met.

Failure to meet these performance targets in the specified time frame could result in those actions described in Article 16 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement for in-unit faculty or the University's Rule 6C1-7.048 of the Florida Administrative Code for faculty who are not covered by the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

## **G. Appeal Process**

If the faculty member and his or her chair fail to agree upon the elements to be included in the Performance Improvement Plan, the faculty member may use the University's appeal process, which includes a review by the Dean and/or Provost's designee, whose decision is final.

## **H. Timetables**

Attachments include a (1) SPEP timetable and (2) projected evaluation timetable for eligible faculty.

## **I. Report to the Provost**

On or before June 30th, the listing of those tenured faculty identified by the college or unit as needing improvement shall be submitted to the Provost with appropriate Vice President (HSC~AS) with a brief statement of the identified faculty member's required improvement plan.

Attachments (1) & (2)

NOTE: The draft of the proposed procedures for sustained performance evaluations for each academic unit will be sent to the elected members of the University's Academic Personnel Board (APB's) for review and comments submitted to the Provost. The drafts and APB's comments then will be returned to the units for the deans or directors for review and use as appropriate. The final draft will be reviewed and made available to the faculty for review and comment with a copy sent to the UFF for review and comment for in-unit faculty. Once this review process is completed, the dean or director will send the final copy of the plan to the Provost for approval.