PROCEDURES and CRITERIA for EVALUATION
and
PROMOTION, TENURE, and SALARY INCREASE RECOMMENDATIONS

Department of Computer Science
Florida State University

Approved and adopted by the faculty by unanimous vote on 31 October 1984.
First revised version adopted by the faculty by unanimous vote on 25 January 1986.
Second revised version adopted by the faculty by unanimous vote on 21 January 1993.
Third revised version submitted to the faculty for vote in September 1995.
Fourth revision, to modify structure of P & T Committee approved by vote of the faculty in September 1998.
Fifth revision approved by vote of the faculty in November 2006.
Sixth revision approved by vote of the faculty in December 2008.
Seventh revision approved by vote of the faculty in January 2009.
Eighth revision approved by vote of the faculty in May 2014.

PREAMBLE

These procedures are conceived as a guide to the department for the attainment of collective judgements on matters related to the evaluation of faculty and other teaching and research staff. It is clear and agreed as a premise that the faculty must make judgements, based on as much factual and pertinent information as is practically available, first as individuals and then as a body, on these matters. It is also clear and agreed that all details of this judgement process cannot be specified both because there may be legitimate variations in the way individuals make judgements and because it is impossible to anticipate all matters that may come before the faculty.

Evaluations and recommendations regarding promotion, tenure and termination are made by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. This committee is comprised of the tenure-track faculty of the department. Annual performance evaluations and recommendations regarding salary increases are made by the Faculty Evaluation Committee. This committee is elected by the department and functions in an advisory capacity to the Department Chair on annual performance evaluations. Evaluations are based on criteria and evidence as to a degree of satisfaction of these criteria, relative to the mission of the University and the Department and the duties assigned the person being evaluated. The basic document containing evidence upon which an individual is to be judged is called the individual's Faculty Evaluation Committee Binder. This binder should contain minimally a current *Curriculum Vitae*, and Evidence of Performance reports for the past three years, and student, peer, and administrative evaluation data from the last three years if available, but may contain or reference many other items. It is the individual's responsibility and right to keep the contents of the binder up to date.

The primary distinction between an evaluation for promotion or tenure consideration and merit salary increase recommendation is the length of time of service to be considered in the evaluation. As a general guideline, evaluations for promotion or tenure cover the lifetime contributions of an individual while evaluations for merit salary increases cover recent contributions and current level of activity. The same criteria apply in either of these cases. Exact time spans for these evaluations are not specified. The department places its trust in its elected representatives on the Faculty Evaluation Committee and in the members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee to apply general principles in an equitable, appropriate, unbiased manner.

The remainder of this document contains details on the following subjects:

1. Committee Selection
   a. Faculty Evaluation Committee Selection
   b. Promotion and Tenure Committee Selection
2. Evidence of Performance
3. Curriculum Vitae
4. Faculty Evaluation Committee Binders
5. Faculty Duties and Responsibilities
6. Evaluation of Performance
7. Consideration for promotion and tenure
8. Working Procedures
   a. Procedures and Schedule for the FEC
   b. Procedures and Schedule for the P & T Committee

COMMITTEE SELECTION

Faculty Evaluation Committee Selection

The Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) is elected according to the department's Bylaws. For the purposes of this document, "faculty" shall refer to the body of people who are subject to evaluation by FEC. Election of a new FEC will normally be done in the early fall semester, before annual evaluations are begun. Vacancies on the committee should be filled by special election as they occur.

Promotion and Tenure Committee Selection

The Promotion and Tenure (P & T) committee consists of all faculty members who are voting members in the department and who are eligible to vote in some promotion and/or tenure cases as described in the following. For tenure cases, only tenured faculty vote. For tenure-track faculty promotion to a given rank, only the faculty at that rank or above vote. For specialized faculty promotion to a given rank, only tenured faculty and the specialized faculty at that rank or above vote. Some common cases are the following. For promotion to Associate Professor, only Associate Professors and Full Professors shall vote; for promotion to Full Professor, only Full Professors shall vote; for promotion to Teaching Faculty II, only tenured faculty, Teaching Faculty II, and Teaching Faculty III shall vote; for promotion to Teaching Faculty III, only tenured faculty and Teaching Faculty III shall vote.

EVIDENCE OF PERFORMANCE

A report of Evidence of Performance in teaching, research or creative activities, service, and other University duties shall be submitted annually to the Department Chair by each faculty member. The Evidence of Performance report (EOP) shall be submitted after the end of each calendar year, and shall cover the preceding calendar year.

The information in the EOP may be audited by the State for compliance with the "12-Hour Law", checked against Effort Certification Reports for auditing faculty time reporting data, and used by the University administration in making decisions regarding departmental allocations of budget, faculty lines, and other resources. Therefore, it should not contain any documents that are considered confidential.

Because the EOP is an important part of the basis for the annual evaluation of performance, failure to submit the EOP to the department in time for the annual performance evaluation shall be considered a sufficient cause for expression of official concern in the annual evaluation.

The EOP shall be submitted using a form approved by the Department Chair that is published on the department's Web server. The organization and minimal content shall be as specified below. All items are limited to the calendar year for which the EOP pertains.

A. Identification

   The name and rank of the faculty member.

B. Teaching Assignment
   1. Courses for which the faculty member was the instructor of record (*i.e.*, was responsible for turning in grades), organized as one list per term: Spring, Summer, and Fall. There should be one item per grade sheet. For ordinary courses the item should specify the course number, the course title, the number of students, and the number of credit hours. For individual instruction courses (DIS, project, thesis, dissertation, supervised teaching/research) there should be a separate item for each course and the student's name should be given along with the number of credit hours. If there were courses for which the faculty member was not the principal instructor, but participated in some other way such as supervising a teaching assistant, those should be included also, with a note explaining the role of the faculty member.
   2. Graduate degrees awarded and pending, for which the faculty member served as major professor. The name of each student should be give, with the degree program, and if the student received a degree during the year, the semester in which the degree was completed. Separate lists should be provided for: Ph.D.; master's thesis or project; undergraduate honors thesis.
   3. Graduate student supervisory committees on which the faculty member served but was not major professor. For each student specify the degree program, and if the student received a degree during the year, the semester in which the degree was completed. Separate lists should be provided for: Ph.D.; master's thesis and project.

C. Research Assignment
   1. Publications of which the faculty member was an author, co-author, or editor and that have appeared in print during the year. A complete bibliographic citation should be provided for each publication, including the entire list of authors in the order in which they appeared in the publication, the title, the journal volume and issue number if appropriate, the publisher, the date of publication, and the page numbers. A few sentences of explanation should be provided, addressing the nature, scope, quality, significance, and impact of the work. The following information must also be conveyed in some form: (1) whether the publication was subject to the academic referee process; (2) what was the acceptance rate, if the publication is in the proceedings of a conference and the acceptance rate of the conference was published; (3) what was the individual role and contribution of the role of the faculty member, if there are multiple authors or if the faculty member served as editor rather than author; (4) if there are student co-authors, their identities.
   2. Works in press, in the same format as the list of publications.
   3. Submissions, in the same format as the list of publications.
   4. Works in preparation, in the same format as the list of publications.
   5. Contributed papers presented at meetings by the faculty member (in person) during the year. The citation for each talk should include the title, the name of the meeting, the sponsoring organization, the location, the date, whether the submission was refereed, the acceptance rate if known, and the length of the talk in minutes or hours. Some items here will duplicate items listed above as publications, if the conference had printed proceedings.
   6. Invited talks given by the faculty member at meetings, conferences, and symposia during the year. The information for each talk be the same as for contributed papers, to the extent that it applies.

7. Colloquia and individual seminar talks that the faculty member gave at universities, labs, and similar organizations during the year.
8. Honors and awards received by the faculty member during the year for research and creative activities.
9. Grant and contract proposals submitted during the year, for which the faculty member was PI or co-PI. The list should include for each proposal the funding organization, the title, the PI, the complete list of co-PI's if any, the starting and ending dates, the number of students supported, and the amount of funds requested. If the proposal is multi-institutional, FSU's share of the funds should be broken out. If the grant or contract is for education or training, rather than research, that should be indicated.
10. Grants and contracts awarded during the year, for which the faculty member was PI or co-PI. For each contract and grant the same information should be provided as for the submitted proposal list above. Renewals and extensions should only be included if they involved additional budget, not reported in the EOP for a prior year.

D. Service Assignment
1. Departmental committees on which the faculty member served during the year.
2. College/school committees, task forces, and governing bodies on which the faculty member served during the year.
3. University committees, task forces, and governing bodies on which the faculty member served during the year.
4. Local, state, and regional committees, task forces, and governing bodies outside the University on which the faculty member served during the yearr, including any work for the State University System.
5. International and national bodies on which the faculty member served during the year. Whether membership is appointed or elected should be indicated.
6. Review panels or boards on which the faculty member served. Examples include NSF proposal review panels and conference program committees.
7. Journals for which the faculty member served as editor or editorial board member.
8. Service-related publications.
9. Service-related presentations.
10. Offices held in organizations related to service, including professional societies.
11. Honors and awards received for service.
12. Service to Florida's Public Schools. Examples include judging high school debates, science fairs, brain bowls, performances, fine arts exhibits, career talks, mentoring, tutoring, and commencement addresses.
13. Service to government, business, and industry that is not included in any of the above lists.

E. Other Activities

Any other activities and achievements that the faculty member believes are evidence of performance of her or assigned responsibilities for the year.

The EOP shall also include any other interpretive comments or supporting data that the Faculty member deems appropriate in evaluating his or her performance for the year.

CURRICULUM VITAE

The information that is reported in the EOP on an annual basis is also recorded, in a cumulative format, in the *Curriculum Vitae* (Vitae) using the Faculty Expertise and Advancement System.

FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE BINDERS

The FEC shall have on file a binder for each faculty member called his or her Faculty Evaluation Committee Binder (FEC Binder). This binder must contain a current Curriculum Vitae, all EOP, all Annual

Evaluation letters from the Department Chair, and summaries of all student and peer evaluations of teaching conducted for the faculty member from the last three years. Copies of major articles and successful external grant or contract proposals the least three articles that the faculty member considers to the best examples of his/her work from the previous three years should be included. Copies of the syllabi from courses taught during the last three years should be included.

Many other items may be considered a logical part of the binder, including copies of successful grant or contract proposals, copies of significant software, patents and inventions, and noteworthy teaching materials. Any item not actually in the binder must be referenced with directions as to location of the item. (Simply mentioning an item in the Vitae does not give it binder status.) It is the faculty member's right and responsibility to maintain this FEC binder in a timely manner.

FACULTY DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Faculty of the Department of Computer Science has numerous duties and responsibilities to the students and faculty of the University and the people of the State and Nation. The major examples are as follows:

- research and creative activity in various areas related to computer science;
- effective teaching of all students at the basic studies level;
- effective teaching of computer science and other science majors at the undergraduate level;
- effective teaching of computer science and other science majors at the graduate level;
- effective training of Ph.D. students in Computer Science;
- service to the Department, University, State, Nation, and World in matters relating to computer science; and
- advancement of understanding and appreciation of computer science by non-experts.

It is recognized that an individual faculty member may not excel in all these areas. It is also recognized that the faculty as a whole must excel in all of these areas. A faculty member who contributes little to some areas is expected to contribute more to others.

The areas of faculty responsibility listed above have considerable overlap (as do the categories listed in the Vitae Format). For example, research and creative activity are important for good teaching, the more so as the academic level increases. As another example, an essential activity such as academic counseling has aspects of both teaching and service. As still another example, certain activities such as reviewing manuscripts for journals or conferences and proposals for granting agencies often represent both scholarly activity and service.

Criteria for effective performance.

The following descriptions are to be used as a guide in recognizing effective performance in the areas of responsibility listed above.

1. **Research and creative activity.**

   Research and creative activity are required for good teaching, at least above the basic studies level. In addition, research must be regarded as a highly desirable activity in itself. The advancement of knowledge through research and creative activity is a primary mission of the Department and the University. The faculty member is expected to maintain a current knowledge and understanding of scientific advances, to contribute to these advances, and to disseminate results in reports, meetings, conferences, and publications.

2. **Teaching at the basic studies level.**

The basic objectives in teaching at this level include: (a) to help students prepare for their inevitable encounters with computing devices and the influence of these devices on their lives; (b) to provide background for basic science teachers in primary and secondary schools; (c) to promote awareness of computers and computer science as they affect other professions and careers; and (d) to provide understanding of basic computing principles and methodologies.

The faculty member assigned to teach a course at the basic studies level is expected to make every reasonable effort to present basic and relevant material appropriate for non-science majors in such a way as to stimulate student interest and understanding.

3. **Undergraduate teaching of science majors.**

The objectives are: (a) to educate professional computer scientists to fill B.S. level government and private sector positions; (b) to prepare interested students for graduate work in computer science or related fields; and (c) to provide students from related disciplines with necessary background in computing.

Faculty members assigned to teach courses at this level are expected to present organized and current material consistent with related courses and the departmental curriculum. Effective classroom teaching must be combined with a willingness to assist students who require special attention. Classroom presentations should challenge students to critically examine and question the issues before them.

4. **Graduate teaching at the M.S. level.**

The objectives include: (a) to educate M.S.-level professional computer scientists for careers in the public and private sectors; (b) to prepare interested students for advanced graduate work in computer science and related fields; and (c) to provide appropriate background in computer science for students from related fields of science.

At this level, classroom teaching of the type described under 3 is expected but with more emphasis on the quality and timeliness of course content. What is taught one year may be superseded the next year by newer research results. The successful teacher must at least keep abreast of developments and preferably participate in them.

Also at this level, the emphasis on working with students individually becomes greater. The good teacher works with M.S. students in preparing papers, projects, seminars, and theses, either as a member of the student's committee or as a helpful advisor when appropriate.

5. **Graduate teaching at the Ph.D. level.**

There is one principal objective: to educate future national and international leaders in computer science and related disciplines.

The successful teacher at the doctoral level must understand intimately and critically the latest developments in a chosen specialized field and encourage and assist doctoral students to do the same. Doctoral students are to be taught means of establishing new ideas and concepts, as well as established ones, through active supervision of their study and dissertation research.

6. **Service.**

Service activity most often falls into the category of helping others (or organizations of others that may include the contributor as a member) in ways that do not directly benefit the contributor.

Examples include committee work at all levels, counseling undergraduate students, administrative assignments, and certain types of editing and reviewing. Each faculty member is expected to spend some time and resources on service activity.

Effectively carrying out the Faculty Duties and Responsibilities, as discussed above, is expected of the faculty and does not necessarily imply meritorious performance, right to tenure, or right to promotion. Generally speaking, these rights are earned by performance of duties at a higher than adequate level. This section concludes with guidelines for recognition of these higher levels of performance.

Criteria for Specialized Faculty Promotions.
Promotion of a Teaching Faculty (Specialized Faculty in the teaching track) is based on how well they execute on the Assignment of Responsibilities, which includes teaching and service. The primary function of Teaching Faculty is to teach a range of courses within the Department. Thus, they should concentrate their career development on building an effective teaching portfolio, maintaining and updating their domain knowledge, honing their oral/written communication skills, and keeping up with course delivery methods within the education field. Additionally, it is expected that teaching faculty will have substantial service assignments.

Promotion to Teaching Faculty II

In order to be considered for promotion to Teaching Faculty II, the candidate must meet or exceed all of the following criteria:
> The candidate should normally have served at least 5 years as Teaching Faculty I or equivalent grade at another institution. Only a candidate with extraordinarily strong justification will be considered for promotion to Teaching Faculty II prior to the fifth year.
> Promotion to Teaching Faculty II requires a consistent record of outstanding teaching including Student Feedback surveys from each class. A review of the data from the previous five years must show high ratings and/or continuous improvements.
> The candidate must demonstrate the ability to teach a range of courses in different areas of Computer Science.
> The candidate must demonstrate the ability to create new courses or develop new course materials for existing courses.
> The candidate must demonstrate a continuous effort to improve and keep oneself up-to-date professionally.
> Promotion to Teaching Faculty II requires a strong record of service to the Department, College, and/or University. Actively participating in departmental activities is a part of service to the department.

Promotion to Teaching Faculty III

Faculty in the rank of Teaching Faculty III are expected to be leaders in the department. In addition to having a strong record of excellence in teaching and service, candidates are expected to demonstrate leadership in teaching and service. A successful candidate is expected to meet or exceed all of the following.
> The candidate should normally have served at least 5 years as Teaching Faculty II or equivalent grade at another institution. Only a candidate with extraordinarily strong justification will be considered for promotion to Teaching Faculty III prior to the fifth year. Promotion to Teaching Faculty III requires the consistent demonstration of teaching excellence in the past five years. A review of the data from the previous five years must show high ratings and/or continuous improvements. Winning a university teaching award or other significant recognition is a strong indication of teaching excellence.
> The candidate must show the ability to teach a wide range of courses beyond reaching the rank of Teaching Faculty II (at least two new course-preparations in the evaluation period).

- ➢ The candidate must create at least one new course in the evaluation period.
- ➢ The candidate must demonstrate a continuous effort to improve and keep oneself up-to-date professionally.
- ➢ During the evaluation period, the candidate must demonstrate leadership in teaching. Examples of leadership in teaching include but not limited to the following:
  - o Introducing innovative teaching practices in classes
  - o Introducing innovative technology uses in teaching
  - o Leading the efforts in major curriculum changes
- ➢ During the evaluation period, the candidate must demonstrate leadership in service to the Department, College, and the University in additional to maintaining an excellent service record including actively participating in department activities. Examples of leadership in service include but not limited to:
  - o Serving as the chair of a major committee such as the undergraduate curriculum committee.
  - o Leading an effort to create and provide new service/educational opportunities that significantly benefit students, the department, the college, or the University.

Criteria for promotion to Associate Professor.

A candidate must normally have taught satisfactorily at both the undergraduate and graduate level. He or she must have maintained an up-to-date knowledge of his or her field and be able to communicate this knowledge. The Department will particularly value the candidate who has not merely carried out assigned duties effectively but who has made innovative contributions where appropriate, including work done on his or her own initiative. He or she should have worked successfully with graduate students on research topics in his or her field. The FEC will look for evidence that the candidate is capable of generating student interest in his or her research specialty.

Research work of high quality is essential. It should have already received some recognition at the national level, as evidenced by citations, invited presentations, grant support and/or letters of evaluation from distinguished experts outside the University. There must be concrete evidence that the candidate will eventually achieve distinction in his or her field.

Criteria for promotion to Professor.

Promotion to Full Professor is warranted when the promise implicit in the promotion or appointment to Associate Professor has been fulfilled. The candidate must have made substantial contributions to the teaching program of the department. He or she should have worked successfully with graduate students on research topics in his or her field, through completion of the Ph.D. degree. The candidate's research work should have achieved international recognition by objective standards, have breadth of interest, and be judged of considerable importance to his or her field. The candidate's scholarly work should also have contributed to the graduate programs of the department.

Criteria for awarding Tenure.

The technical criteria for awarding of tenure for an assistant professor are the same as those for promotion to Associate Professor. The awarding of tenure for a faculty member who comes to FSU with an initial rank of associate or full professor requires that the faculty member has met the Department's criteria for promotion to his/her current rank at the time tenure becomes effective. In addition, except for cases of tenure upon appointment, the awarding of tenure also requires that the faculty member has satisfactorily performed his/her assigned duties while employed at FSU. The awarding of tenure must be considered more than a reward for excellent performance, however. The goals and mission of the department, and the

degree with which the candidate contributes to these, are an important consideration. The awarding of tenure is the means by which the department controls its long-term growth and direction.

Criteria for awarding Specialized Faculty Honorific Professor working titles

Members of the Teaching and Research Specialized Faculty tracks may be granted an honorific working title containing the word "Professor," as specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement Table J.5 "Honorific Working Titles". Such an honorific title shall require at least two nominations by the tenured faculty in the department and may only be granted with the recommendation of a majority vote of the tenured faculty, in recognition of scholarly accomplishments in the field of Computer Science. The criteria for granting such an honorific title to Teaching and Research Faculty are the same as for promotion or initial appointment to the corresponding tenure-track rank.

1. **Teaching(Research) Assistant Professor**

   The successful candidate must have reached the rank of Teaching(Research) Faculty I or higher, hold a Ph.D. degree in Computer Science or in a closely-related field, and meet the department's expectations of scholarly accomplishments comparable to an initially-appointed tenure-track Assistant Professor.

2. **Teaching(Research) Associate Professor**

   The successful candidate must have reached the rank of Teaching(Research) Faculty II or higher, and meet the following additional criteria:

   i)   Meet the criteria for Teaching(Research) Assistant Professor.
   ii)   For Teaching Faculty, have Graduate Teaching Status (GTS) in the department.
   iii) Candidates appointed at FSU in the Specialized Faculty track for fewer than five years, excluding leaves, shall meet the department's expectations of scholarly accomplishments comparable to the tenure-track Associate Professor rank.
   iv)   Candidates appointed at FSU in the Specialized Faculty track for at least five years, excluding leaves, the expected scholarly accomplishments are scaled proportionally to the average Assignment of Responsibilities (AoR). For Teaching Faculty, substantial teaching-related scholarly activities such as curricular development and textbook publications are expected.

3. **Teaching(Research) Professor**

   The successful candidate must have reached the rank of Teaching(Research) Faculty III, and meet the following additional criteria:

   i)   Meet the criteria for Teaching(Research) Associate Professor.
   ii)   Candidates appointed at FSU in the Specialized Faculty track for fewer than ten years, excluding leaves, shall meet the department's expectations of scholarly accomplishments comparable to the tenure-track Full Professor rank.
   iii) Candidates appointed at FSU in the Specialized Faculty track for at least ten years, excluding leaves, the expected scholarly accomplishments are scaled proportionally to the average AoR. For Teaching Faculty, substantial teaching-related scholarly activities such as curricular development, textbook publications, and serving as (co-)investigator on extramural research or educational grants are expected

Criteria for merit salary increase.

As a general principle, meritorious performance should be rewarded with merit salary increases. Meritorious performance is defined as performance of assigned duties at the levels "Meets FSU's High Expectations", "Exceeds FSU's High Expectations", and "Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations:. While an equation is not specified, it is required that all faculty in a higher level performance category receive a merit raise equal to or greater than any faculty member in a lower level performance category when the FEC recommendation is provided to the chair. The time span for evaluation for meritorious performance is relatively short: recent activity as well as current level of activity should be considered.

It is recognized that there is an element of relativity in the making of recommendations for salary increases that is not present in promotion and tenure considerations.

In making salary increase recommendations, the Department shall allocate merit increases from separate pools, one for tenured and tenure-earning members of the faculty and one for other members of the faculty, the size of each pool being proportional to the sum of the base salaries of the corresponding group.

EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE

The Faculty Evaluation Committee is responsible for the peer component of the annual performance evaluation for all members of the department's faculty.

Such evaluations must of necessity be accomplished in two steps: individual evaluations by each member of the FEC, followed by a consensus evaluation by the Committee itself. It is the duty of each FEC member, before participating in any such consensus evaluation by the FEC, to carefully review all evidence available to the committee that is relevant, including in all cases the current FEC Binder of the faculty member being evaluated, and to form a carefully considered evaluation of the performance of the faculty member under consideration. If any evidence is considered that is external to the FEC Binder, in cases of negative outcome at least, the faculty member being evaluated should be informed as to the nature of this evidence and given opportunity to respond to, refute, or interpret said evidence.

Research and Creative Activity.

A faculty member elected to FEC is presumed to have the knowledge and ability to judge the quantity and quality of an individual's contribution in this category. All information in the FEC Binder related to research and scholarly and creative activity must be taken into account in evaluating an individual's performance in this category.

Teaching.

The Department relies on the questionnaires approved by the Florida Board of Governors and the University Senate for student evaluation of teaching for a reading on classroom aspects of the teaching function. The department recognizes that student evaluations of teaching are opinions of non-experts who are non-objectively involved in the process being evaluated. The department also recognizes that there are many aspects of teaching, some of which are intimately tied to research and creative activity, that are not addressed in such questionnaires.

Questionnaires for the evaluation by students of teaching will be distributed in each class of a faculty member (regardless of size) during the Fall and Spring semester of each academic year. The results will be returned to the faculty member involved for information and guidance. A copy of the summary sheet shall be placed by the faculty member in his or her FEC Binder. If any individual student response sheets are included in the binder, then the entire set for the class must be included.

To provide context for the interpretation of student evaluations of teaching, starting with courses taught in Fall 2006, the faculty member will attach to each summary sheet from the student evaluation of teaching a table indicating the count of students awarded each of the possible grades (A, A-, B+, etc.) in the corresponding class.

The FEC (or a teaching evaluation committee designated by FEC) will conduct classroom visitations during the Fall and/or early Spring semester for faculty members selected by the FEC. A faculty member whose classroom is visited will be evaluated by at least two faculty members designated by the FEC using visitation schedules, which meet the requirements of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Written evaluations of the classroom visitation will be made using a faculty-approved teaching evaluation instrument. These evaluations will be submitted to the faculty member, but are not required to be part of the FEC Binder.

The department acknowledges that there are no effective means of quantifying some of the most important aspects of good teaching: those having to do with instillation of insight, imagination, mental discipline, and positive emotions in students. Accordingly, along with the student evaluations of teaching, all other information in the FEC Binder related to teaching, any written evaluations of classroom visitations submitted by the faculty member, as well as the considered opinion of the members of FEC based on experience from direct observation (such as in seminar talks) and direct feedback from students, should be used in evaluating an individual faculty member's teaching performance.

Service.

All information in the FEC Binder related to service must be taken into account in evaluating an individual's performance in this category.

Overall evaluation.

The overall evaluation shall be an average of evaluations in the categories, weighted according to the percent assignment in each category of the assignment of responsibilities. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will rate each faculty member's performance by placing each faculty member in one of the following annual evaluation categories for each specific area of assigned duties ("Teaching", "Research", and "Service", or a subset thereof when applicable) and overall ("Overall Performance"). No restrictions exist as to how many faculty members can be placed in a given category.

1. **Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations**.

   This describes a faculty member who far exceeds performance expectations during the evaluation period and achieves an extraordinary accomplishment or recognition in teaching, research, or service, which may include several of the following: highly significant research or creative activities; demonstrated recognition of the individual by peers as an authority in his/her field; securing significant external funding; attaining significant national or international achievements, awards, and recognition.

2. **Exceeds FSU's High Expectations**.

   This describes an individual who exceeds expectations during the evaluation period by virtue of demonstrating noted achievements in teaching, research, or service, which may include several of the following: high level of research/creative activity, professional recognitions, willingness to accept additional responsibilities, high level of commitment to serving students and the overall mission of the Department, involvement/leadership in professional associations, initiative in solving problems or developing new ideas.

3. **Meets FSU's High Expectations**.

   This describes an individual who demonstrates the requisite knowledge and skills in his/her field of specialty and complete assigned responsibilities in a manner that is both timely and consistent with the high expectations of the university.

4. **Official Concern**.

   This describes an individual who demonstrates the requisite knowledge and skills in his/her field of specialty but is not completing assigned responsibilities in a manner that is consistent with the high standards of the university.

5. **Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations**.

   This describes an individual who fails to demonstrate with consistency the knowledge, skills, or abilities required in his/her field of specialty and/or in completing assigned responsibilities.

The evaluation process implemented by the Faculty Evaluation Committee shall not require a forced distribution of evaluation ratings. Upon request, ratings of faculty members by the Faculty Evaluation Committee will be provided to requesting faculty members without the identification of individual faculty members. The ratings of the Faculty Evaluation Committee will be submitted as recommendations to the department Chair. If FEC's rating differs from the Chair's rating, the Chair submits both ratings to the Dean and the Provost.

CONSIDERATION FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

The Promotion and Tenure Committee is responsible for all recommendations for promotion, tenure, and termination for all members of the department. This committee will consider all faculty below the rank of tenured full professor for promotion or tenure, or both, if applicable, each year. The P & T Committee will use the FEC Binders for purposes of forming a recommendation decision. Upon being recommended by the P & T Committee, the preparation of the nomination binder is initiated as per University and College policies and guidelines. The nomination binder is reviewed by the P & T Committee before leaving the department.

SALARY INCREASE RECOMMENDATIONS

The FEC shall advise the Department Chair concerning all salary increases based on faculty performance, and shall approve all recommendations made by the department to the dean regarding salary increases for members of the department's faculty. If the FEC and the Department Chair cannot reach consensus on recommendations for salary increases, then the Department Chair will forward both the FEC's recommendations and the chair's recommendations to the Dean.

WORKING PROCEDURES

Procedures and Schedule for the FEC

The normal life cycle of a particular FEC runs through the academic calendar year. The duty calendar for FEC is as follows.

FALL SEMESTER

1. **Election.**

   The FEC is elected by the faculty. This election is conducted as specified in the departmental bylaws.

2. **Convention.**

   FEC convenes and elects a chair. The Department Chair calls and conducts this first meeting.

3. **Teaching Evaluation.**

   The FEC begins the process of doing peer evaluation of teaching as described in Section *Peer Evaluation* of these procedures.

4. **Science area representative.**

   The FEC must elect a representative to the Science Area Promotion and Tenure Committee.

1. **Evaluation.**

   The FEC continues its annual evaluation of faculty, reminding the faculty to update FEC Binders. A period of time is then set aside for members of FEC to familiarize themselves with the FEC Binders of faculty members, after which the FEC meets to form consensus evaluations. The FEC then provides each faculty member with a report of his or her peer evaluation, with copies to the Department Chair for attachment to the Annual Evaluation letter. The FEC is responsible for coordinating schedules with the Department Chair, in order that the Department Chair has the FEC evaluations in time to serve as input to the evaluations performed by the Department Chair.

2. **Other business.**

   The FEC may have other business of an evaluational or recommendational nature that does not fall into the normal flow of events as outlined here. This business may be brought before the FEC at any time by the Department Chair, but this slack period, using an experienced FEC, is the most appropriate time for such matters if time does not constrain otherwise.

3. **Salary increase recommendations.**

   In consultation with the Department Chair regarding external guidelines and funds available, the FEC works with the Department Chair on salary increase recommendations, as described previously in this document.

Procedures and Schedule for the P & T Committee

FALL SEMESTER

1. Promotion and tenure recommendations are made for the department.

SPRING SEMESTER

1. Considerations for promotion and tenure and third year pre-tenure evaluations are begun in late spring. The P & T Committee assesses the potential of members of the department for promotion or tenure recommendations to occur in the Fall semester. Appropriate actions, such as requesting outside letters of evaluation, must be initiated for those considered likely candidates. The third year evaluations of Assistant Professors will be written by the P & T Committee chair with feedback from the members of the P & T committee.

Revision and Reaffirmation Process

Changes to the **PROCEDURES and CRITERIA for EVALUATION and PROMOTION, TENURE, and SALARY INCREASE RECOMMENDATIONS** require a two-thirds majority vote of the Voting Membership as specified in the departmental bylaws.

In order for this document to remain in force, if a period of five (5) years elapses without approval of any amendment the document shall be reaffirmed by written secret ballot of a majority of the Voting Membership. Before such a reaffirmation ballot, an opportunity shall be provided for members of the faculty to propose amendments and have them considered for inclusion in the ballot.