

Florida Atlantic University
Christine E. Lynn College of Nursing
August 10, 2015

**Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluations and
Distribution of Merit Salary Increases**

Faculty members are required to submit an Annual Self-Evaluation of their contributions to the College missions of teaching, research/scholarship and service. These Annual Evaluations are reviewed by the Dean or the Dean's designee, and a rating of: Exceptional, Outstanding, Good, Needs Improvement, and Unsatisfactory is assigned overall and in each of the three missions. These ratings are used for distribution of merit salary increases. The criteria for deriving the ratings in each of the three missions are elaborated below:

Administrative

Evaluation of performance for Faculty who have administrative appointments will be based upon (as appropriate) the following:

1. Participates with the Dean and College of Nursing Administrative Team in carrying out the mission and core values of the College and its academic programs.
2. Demonstrates and provides leadership and oversight in support of assigned administrative responsibilities and programs.
3. Demonstrates effective leadership in development of CON initiatives and activities.
4. Demonstrates effective communication in day to day administrative responsibilities; provides responsive service to internal/external customers and community partners that support the mission of the college and its program requirements.
5. Actively identifies, communicates, and implements (or participates in) quality improvement(s) that enhance the mission of the College in teaching, research/scholarship, and service.
6. Participates with the Dean to establish and conduct individual faculty/staff evaluations and performance plans and developmental needs, based on individual Faculty provided self-assessments, consistent with the FAU and CON Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation.

7. Consistently demonstrates mentorship, advising or guiding faculty/staff in understanding their commitment to the mission, core values, and philosophy of the College work assignments.
8. Effectively manages programs under assigned administrative appointment (responsibility).
9. Displays flexibility with changing demands and priorities; works effectively with other administrators and staff to promote efficiency, eliminate bottlenecks, and coordinate all activities of the College.

Teaching

1. Input

Evaluation of faculty performance in teaching is based on criteria in the following categories:

Category 1: Faculty self-evaluation of teaching performance

Category 2: Evidence related to the scholarship of teaching.

Category 3: Leadership in the teaching mission

Category 4: Mentorship of graduate students and faculty

Each of these categories of faculty performance in teaching is elaborated below:

Category 1 Faculty self-evaluation of teaching performance:

- a. The self-evaluation is submitted on time and it provides a comprehensive, description of all contributions to the teaching mission, including number of courses taught, number of students, type of course, development of new courses, development of new instructional materials, leadership, mentoring and evidence of the scholarship of teaching.
- b. There is a record of available SPOT scores, students' comments, and notation of the distribution of grades with a reflective evaluation to enable understanding of these dimensions of teaching evaluation.
- c. There is evidence of the use of SPOT scores and/or peer review to promote growth as a teacher as appropriate.
- d. The self-evaluation contains activities undertaken to enhance teaching effectiveness including those for developing caring-based courses and growing in caring as a teacher.

Category 2 Evidence related to the scholarship of teaching:

- a. The course syllabi reflect Data Center College guidelines and therefore are logically organized with clear information related to assignments and evaluation.
- b. Incorporates stories or narratives of nursing situations as the frame for integrating multiple ways of knowing where appropriate.

- c. Develops course materials that are reflective of the College philosophy as evidenced by course content, assignments, and reading lists exemplifying the ideals of teaching nursing from a caring perspective.
- d. Develops new courses, significantly revises existing courses or updates courses as appropriate.
- e. Evidence of the scholarship of teaching includes meeting a designated number of these 7 criteria: 1) submitting an application for funding for educational programming other than a federal/national grant, 2) education-focused manuscript, 3) education-focused presentation, 4) creative instructional materials and methods, 5) test-writing for national exam, 6) development of caring-focused scenarios for educational purposes, and 7) obtaining external federal funding for an academic program other than a federal/national grant.

Category 3 Leadership in the teaching mission:

- a. Coordinates didactic and practice courses (when appropriate)
- b. Assumes responsibilities for coordination or leadership of an academic program, concentration or track.
- c. Contributes to development of new academic initiatives or policies.
- d. Contributes to program evaluation and quality improvement efforts.
- e. Obtains and maintains certification in nursing area of expertise (if applicable)
- f. Serves as an expert guest lecturer.
- g. Volunteers for educational events (e.g., IPE).

Category 4 Mentorship of students and faculty:

- a. Serves as a member or chair of a PhD dissertation committee or chair or member of 2 DNP capstone projects.
- b. Serves on PhD comprehensive examination committees.
- c. Serves on mentor teams for new faculty.
- d. Shares expertise with faculty in workshops, presentations, forums or one-on-one consultation/mentoring.
- e. Mentors undergraduate student scholarship.
- f. Mentors graduate student educational experiences.

2. Process

The faculty will be responsible for submitting to the Dean or designee a report of teaching activity. This report will include a description of activities related to Categories 1-5 noted above. The Dean or designee will assign a rating of Outstanding, Superior, Good, Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory according to the guidelines set below.

3. Evaluation Guidelines

For a rating of Exceptional:

- Self-evaluation reflects all criteria in Category 1.
- Evidence of the scholarship of teaching includes at least 3 of the 7 criteria in Category 2e: 1) submitting an application for funding for educational programming, 2) education-focused manuscript, 3) education-focused presentation, 4) creative instructional materials and methods, 5) test-writing for national exam, 6) development of caring-focused scenarios for educational purposes, and 7) obtaining external federal funding for an academic program.
- Evidence of leadership includes at least 2 of 7 criteria in Category 3.
- Evidence of mentorship for Professors and Associate Professors includes meeting at least 3 of 5 criteria in Category 4 (including chairing at least one dissertation or two capstone projects for professors). For Assistant Professors, at least 2 of the five criteria will be met.

For a rating of Outstanding:

- Self-evaluation reflects all criteria in Category 1.
- Evidence of scholarship of teaching includes at least 2 of 7 criteria in Category 2e: 1) submitting/obtaining funding for educational programming, 2) education-focused manuscript, 3) education-focused presentation, 4) creative instructional materials and methods, 5) test-writing for national exam, 6) development of caring-focused scenarios for educational purposes.
- Evidence of leadership includes at least 1 of 7 criteria in Category 3.
- Evidence of mentorship at all ranks includes meeting at least 2 of 5 criteria in Category 4. For Full and Associate Professors, this must include chairing at least one dissertation or two capstone projects.

For a rating of Good:

- Self-evaluation reflects all criteria in Category 1.
- Evidence of scholarship of teaching includes at least 1 of 6 criteria in Category 2e: 1) submitting/obtaining funding for educational programming, 2) education-focused manuscript, 3) education-focused presentation, 4) creative instructional materials and methods, 5) test-writing for national exam, 6) development of caring-focused scenarios for educational purposes.
- Evidence of leadership includes at least 1 of 7 criteria in Category 3.
- Evidence of mentorship includes at least 2 of 5 criteria in Category 4. For Full professors, this must include chairing at least one dissertation or two capstone projects.

For a rating of Needs Improvement:

- Self-evaluation does not reflect all the criteria in Category 1.
- Course syllabi are submitted to the Data Center in a timely manner and syllabi are adequate by Data Center guidelines but there is no other evidence of the scholarship of teaching.
- No evidence of leadership in the teaching mission of the College.
- Evidence of mentorship includes at least 1 of 5 criteria for Category 4.

For a rating of Unsatisfactory:

- Self-evaluation does not reflect all the criteria in Category 1.
- Course syllabi are not submitted to the Data Center by the due date and there is no other evidence of the scholarship of teaching.
- No evidence of leadership in the teaching mission of the College.
- No evidence of mentorship.

Scholarship and Research [Tenure and Tenure-Earning Faculty]

1. Input

The following categories shall be used to evaluate faculty scholarship including the scholarship of practice, research, and creative activities. Products of collaborative work will be given the same weight as solo effort when the faculty member's contribution is substantially justified. CEL CON's commitment to academic excellence is reflected in its faculty's wide-ranging scholarship. Scholarship is defined broadly to include research, the integration of knowledge, the transformation of knowledge through the intellectual work involved in teaching and facilitating learning, and/or the application of knowledge to practice to solve compelling societal problems (Boyer, 1990). The productive scholar is continuously involved in research, writing, and creative efforts that advance knowledge in a field.

Evaluation of faculty performance in scholarship, research, and creative activities is based on criteria in the following categories:

Category 1: Faculty self-evaluation of scholarship/research performance

Category 2: Evidence related to scholarship of research/grantsmanship

Category 3: Evidence related to scholarship through publications

Category 4: Evidence related to scholarship through professional presentations

Category 5: Evidence of recognized expertise as a scholar and researcher

Category 1 Faculty self-evaluation of scholarship/research performance

- a) The self-evaluation is submitted on time and provides a meaningful and comprehensive description of the faculty's scholarship and program of research.
- b) The self-evaluation includes review and critique of previous year's professional scholarship/research goals and targets.
- c) The self-evaluation describes activities undertaken by the faculty to enhance their research and scholarship activities.
- d) The self-evaluation includes goals that indicate planned scholarly direction for the upcoming year.

Category 2 Evidence related to scholarship of research/grantsmanship

Tier 1

- a. Submission or resubmission of an application for extramural funding (federal; national foundation)
- b. Funded extramural research (federal, national foundation or agency) as a study Principal Investigator/Multi-Principal Investigator/Co-Project Director

Tier 2

- a. Submission of application for regional, local, or professional organization funding
- b. Serves as a Co-Investigator on a funded extramural research grant (federal, national or agency)
- c. Funded intramural research as a study Principal Investigator/Multi-Principal Investigator/Co-Project Director

Tier 3

- a. Submission of an application for intramural funding (FAU, CEL CON research award, STTI Iota Xi research award)
- b. Funded local or regional research as a study Principal Investigator/ Multi-Principal Investigator/Co-Project Director
- c. Serves as a consultant, project director or manager on a funded extramural research grant (federal, national or agency)

Category 3 Evidence related to scholarship through publications

Tier 1

- a. Publication of a textbook or creative scholarly work
- b. Publication of a data-based article, in the area of program of research, in a refereed journal including online journals
- c. Data-based publication, in the area of program of research, in press (can only be used for one annual evaluation)
- d. Publication, for national/international distribution, of software, audio/visual media, practice or research technology

Tier 2

- a. Publication of chapter in an edited book
- b. Guest editor of a journal or series of publications
- c. Publication, other than data-based, in peer reviewed journal
- d. Published scholarly documents (e.g., white papers/position papers; national/international testimony) demonstrating expertise in the field/discipline

Tier 3

- a. Publication of an article in a non-refereed professional journal
- b. Publication of an article in a non-refereed journal
- c. Invited publication in a refereed journal
- d. Published briefs, columns, blogs and discipline-related information disseminated through various forms of social media

Category 4 Evidence related to scholarship through professional presentations

Tier 1

- a. Invited keynote speaker at an international or national professional meeting/conference
- b. Presentation of refereed professional data-based paper or poster at an international/national professional meeting/conference
- c. Conducts a refereed workshop at an international/national professional meeting/conference

Tier 2

- a. Invited keynote speaker at a regional professional meeting/conference
- b. Presentation of refereed professional data-based paper or poster at a regional professional meeting/conference
- c. Conducts a refereed workshop at an regional professional meeting/conference

Tier 3

- a. Invited keynote speaker at a local professional meeting/conference
- b. Presentation of non-refereed professional paper or poster at an local professional meeting/conference
- c. Conducts a workshop at an local professional meeting/conference (FAU, College, regional/local hospitals)

Category 5 Evidence of recognized expertise as a scholar and researcher

Tier 1

- a. Serves as an editor or associate editor for a professional journal
- b. Invited/nominated member of an international or national governing board
- c. Participated, as an invited expert, on a panel at an international or national professional meeting/conference
- d. Chair or co-chair of a planning committee for an international or national professional meeting/conference

- e. Serves as a reviewer on a federal scientific study review group
- f. Being showcased as an expert by international/national media

Tier 2

- a. Serves as a peer-reviewer or on an editorial board for professional journal(s)
- b. Invited/nominated member of a regional governing board
- c. Member of a planning committee for an international or national professional meeting/conference
- d. Serves as a reviewer on regional/foundational funding agency scientific review groups
- e. Being showcased as an expert by regional/local media

Tier 3

- a. Member of a planning committee for regional or local professional meeting/conference
- b. Invited/nominated member of a local governing board
- c. Serves as a reviewer on FAU, CEL CON or partner College mock review panel
- d. Additional scholarly and creative activities (include information on panels or workshops you organized or served on)

Scholarship and Practice [Practice Teaching Track Faculty]

Evaluation of faculty performance in scholarship, practice, and creative activities is based on criteria in the following categories:

Category 1: Faculty self-evaluation of scholarship/practice performance

Category 2: Evidence related to scholarship of grantsmanship and practice

Category 3: Evidence related to scholarship through publications

Category 4: Evidence related to scholarship through professional presentations

Category 5: Evidence of recognized expertise as a scholar and practitioner

Category 1 Faculty self-evaluation of scholarship/practice performance

- a. The self-evaluation is submitted on time and provides a meaningful and comprehensive description of the faculty's scholarship and program of practice.
- b. The self-evaluation includes review and critique of previous year's professional scholarship/practice goals and targets.
- c. The self-evaluation describes activities undertaken by the faculty to enhance their practice and scholarship activities.
- d. The self-evaluation includes goals that indicate planned scholarly direction for the upcoming year.

Category 2 Evidence related to scholarship of practice grantsmanship

Tier 1

- a. Submission or resubmission of an application for extramural funding (federal; national foundation)
- b. Funded extramural awards (federal, national foundation or agency) as a study Principal Investigator/Multi-Principal Investigator/Co-Project Director

Tier 2

- a. Submission of an application for regional, local, or professional organization funding
- b. Serves as a Co-Investigator / Project Director on a funded extramural grant (federal, national, or agency award)
- c. Funded intramural award as a study Principal Investigator/Multi-Principal Investigator/Co-Project Director

Tier 3

- a. Submission of an application for intramural funding (FAU, CEL CON research award, STTI Iota Xi research award)
- b. Funded local or regional research as a study Principal Investigator/ Multi-Principal Investigator/Co-Project Director
- c. Serves as a consultant, project director or manager on a funded extramural research grant (federal, national or agency)

Category 3 Evidence related to practice scholarship through publications**Tier 1**

- a. Publication of a textbook or creative scholarly work
- b. Publication of a evidence-based article, in the area of program of practice, in a refereed journal including online journals
- c. Evidence-based publication, in the area of program of research, in press (can only be used for one annual evaluation)
- d. Publication, for national/international distribution, of software, audio/visual media, practice or research technology

Tier 2

- a. Publication of chapter in an edited book
- b. Guest editor of a journal or series of publications
- c. Publication, other than evidence-based, in peer reviewed journal
- d. Published scholarly documents (e.g., white papers/position papers; national/international testimony) demonstrating expertise in the field/discipline

Tier 3

- a. Publication of an article in a non-refereed professional journal
- b. Publication of an article in a non-refereed journal
- c. Invited publication in a refereed journal

- d. Published briefs, columns, blogs and discipline-related information disseminated through various forms of social media

Category 4 Evidence related to scholarship of practice through professional presentations

Tier 1

- a. Invited keynote speaker at an international or national professional meeting/conference
- b. Presentation of refereed professional evidence-based paper or poster at an international/national professional meeting/conference
- c. Conducts a refereed workshop at an international/national professional meeting/conference

Tier 2

- a. Invited keynote speaker at a regional professional meeting/conference
- b. Presentation of refereed professional evidence-based paper or poster at a regional professional meeting/conference
- c. Conducts a refereed workshop at an regional professional meeting/conference

Tier 3

- a. Invited keynote speaker at a local professional meeting/conference
- b. Presentation of non-refereed professional paper or poster at an local professional meeting/conference
- c. Conducts a workshop at an local professional meeting/conference (FAU, College, regional/local hospitals)

Category 5 Evidence of recognized expertise as a clinical/practice scholar

Tier 1

- a. Serves as an editor or associate editor for a professional journal
- b. Invited/nominated member of an international or national governing board
- c. Participated, as an invited expert, on a panel at an international or national professional meeting/conference
- d. Chair or co-chair of a planning committee for an international or national professional meeting/conference
- e. Serves as an expert reviewer at the national level
- f. Being showcased as an expert by international/national media (e.g., Cited or interviewed by news media as an expert in related field/practice)
- g. Serves as an elected officer of a professional nursing board at the regional or national level.

Tier 2

- a. Serves as a peer-reviewer for professional journal(s)

- b. Invited/nominated member of a regional governing board
- c. Member of a planning committee for an international or national professional meeting/conference
- d. Serves as a reviewer on regional/foundational funding agency groups
- e. Being showcased as an expert by regional/local media (e.g., Cited or interviewed by news media as an expert in related field/practice)

Tier 3

- a. Member of a planning committee for regional or local professional meeting/conference
- b. Invited/nominated member of a local governing board
- c. Serves as a reviewer on FAU, CEL CON or partner College mock review panel (e.g., educational grant proposal)
- d. Additional scholarly and creative activities (include information on panels or workshops, webinars you organized or served on)

2. Process

The faculty will be responsible for submitting to the Dean or designee a report of their scholarship and research activity. This report will include a description of activities related to Categories 1-5 noted above. The Dean or designee will assign a rating of Outstanding, Superior, Good, Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory according to the guidelines set below.

3. Evaluation Guidelines

For a rating of Exceptional:

- Self-evaluation reflects all criteria in Category 1.
- Evidence includes documentation of at least three Tier 1 activities (only one/category) from any Category 2-5 (only 1 from each of Tiers 2-5)

For a rating of Outstanding:

- Self-evaluation reflects all criteria in Category 1.
- Evidence includes documentation of two Tier 1 in any Category 2-5 and three activities in Tier 2 in any Category 2-5 for a total of five activities (2 in Tier 1 and 3 in Tier 2)

For a rating of Good:

- Self-evaluation reflects all criteria in Category 1.
- Evidence includes documentation of a combination of a total of five activities from Categories 2-5 that includes one Tier 1 activity; one to two Tier 2 activities and/or up to three Tier 3 activities; or four Tier 2 activities and at least one Tier 3 activity from Categories 2-5.

For a rating of Needs Improvement:

- Self-evaluation reflects all criteria in Category 1.
- Evidence includes documentation of all five activities from Tier 3 in Categories 2-5

For a rating of Unsatisfactory:

- Self-evaluation does not reflect all criteria in Category 1.
- Less than five (5) scholarly activities
- No evidence of scholarship

Service

1. Input: Evaluation of faculty performance in service is based on criteria in the following categories:

Category 1: Faculty self-evaluation of service contributions

Category 2: Evidence related to expected service on one College of Nursing standing committee and one program committee (except for the first year of employment for faculty members on the tenure or practice/teaching track).

Category 3: Evidence of service engagement with the college, university, profession, community and/or nursing practice.

Each of these categories noting faculty service contributions is elaborated below:

Category 1: Faculty self-evaluation of service contributions:

- a. The self-evaluation is submitted on time and it provides a comprehensive, description of all contributions to the service mission, including participation with college, university, professional, community, and practice entities.

Category 2: Evidence of expected service:

- a. Description of engagement with one standing committee and one program committee (BSN; MSN; DNP; PhD), noting frequency of meeting attendance and any leadership roles undertaken.
- b. For faculty members in their first year of employment, there will be a description of meetings attended as expected when coming to learn the college committee arrangement and structure.

Category 3: Evidence of service engagement with the college, university, profession, community and/or nursing practice:

- a. Description of service at each of the relevant noted levels: 1) college, 2) university, 3) profession, 4) community, 5) nursing practice. If one or more of these categories is not relevant to your service contribution (eg: practice), make note of it and explain the lack of relevance for this annual evaluation. Examples of service contributions include but are not limited to:

College

- Chair one College of Nursing committee
- Mentoring tenure track faculty in an area of scholarship including publication
- Mentoring and advising undergraduate and graduate students
- Active membership on a task force in the College of Nursing
- Undergraduate/graduate recruitment
- Serving in an interim leadership role

University

- Active membership in a University committee, including chairing the committee
- Participating in a University task force/initiative

Profession

- Contributing to the profession through continuing education or presentation at a meeting, symposium, conference, or a workshop or on radio or television
- Active membership in Sigma Theta Tau including Iota Xi
- Active membership in a professional organization, including leadership responsibilities
- Serving as an abstract reviewer for local, regional, national or international conference.

Community

- Contributing to the community through continuing education or public service engagement by presenting at a meeting, symposium, conference, or a workshop or on radio or television
- Mentoring community colleagues
- Active membership on a board, agency, or commission on the local level

Practice

- Pro bono nursing practice activities

2. Process

The faculty will be responsible for submitting to the Dean or designee a report of service. This report will include a description of activities related to Categories 1-3 noted above. The Dean or designee will assign a rating of Outstanding, Superior, Good, Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory according to the guidelines set below.

Evaluation Guidelines

For a rating of Exceptional:

- Self-evaluation reflects all criteria in Category 1 and Category 2.
- Evidence of service engagement in 4 of the 5 (college, university, profession, community, practice) noted service entities.
- Demonstrates leadership in College/University/Professional commitments.

For a rating of Outstanding:

- Self-evaluation reflects all criteria in Category 1 and Category 2.
- Evidence of the service engagement in 3 of the 5 (college, university, profession, community, practice) noted service entities.
- Demonstrates leadership in at least one service entity commitment

For a rating of Good:

- Self-evaluation reflects all criteria in Category 1 and Category 2.
- Evidence of the service engagement in 2 of the 5 (college, university, profession, community, practice) noted service entities.

For a rating of Needs Improvement:

- Self-evaluation reflects all criteria in Category 1 and Category 2.
- Evidence of the service engagement in 2 of the 5 (college, university, profession, community, practice) noted service entities.

For a rating of Unsatisfactory:

- Self-evaluation reflects all criteria in Category 1 and Category 2 or fails to meet these category criteria
- Evidence of the service engagement in 1 of the 5 (college, university, profession, community, practice) noted service entities.

Overall Evaluation and Merit Consideration

The **overall evaluation** is based on an average of ratings in the three missions of teaching, research and scholarship, and service.

In the event that Merit Salary is available for distribution, to receive a merit salary increase, a minimal rating of “good” is required in all three areas with two ratings of at least “superior”, one of which must be in Teaching or Research/Scholarship.

March 23, 2015: DRAFT: Distributed for Faculty Review and Comment

April 23, 2015: Faculty Comments Added from Faculty Forums

April 27, 2015: Presented at Faculty Assembly; Comments Added following Assembly; Approved for Pilot, January 2015

October 26, 2015: Terminology of Standards changed from Outstanding to Exceptional and Superior to Outstanding.

December 9, 2015: Added Administrative Criteria