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### School of Teacher Education Bylaws

**College of Education**

**The Florida State University**

*Adopted April 3, 2015, by a quorum of voting Faculty*

*Amended December 2, 2016, by a quorum of voting Faculty*

*Amended December 11, 2019, by a quorum of voting Faculty*

*Amended June 9, 2020, by a quorum of voting Faculty*

*Amended Sept 10, 2020, by a quorum of voting Faculty*

*Amended Nov 1, 2020, by a quorum of voting Faculty*

#### Name and Mission of the Organization

**Article I: Name and Mission of the Organization**

**Section I.1.** The name of this organization is the School of Teacher Education (STE) of the College of Education at Florida State University. “School” hereafter will refer to the School of Teacher Education.

**Section I.2.** Our mission is to provide exemplary leadership both within and beyond traditional school settings. The School supports scholarship, professional practice, and professional development of its Faculty members as they engage in scholarship, teaching and learning, and service.

#### Purpose of the Bylaws

**Article II: Purpose of the Bylaws**

These Bylaws are created to assist in the effective and efficient Faculty governance of the School of Teacher Education at The Florida State University. These Bylaws are subject to the higher authority of regulations adopted by The Florida State University and statutes adopted by the Florida legislature. These Bylaws shall be in accord with the Bylaws of the College of Education.

#### Definitions

**Article III: Definitions**

**Section III.1.** Faculty – All Faculty with an appointment of 50% or more in the School; inclusive of tenured, tenure-earning, and Specialized Faculty.

**Section III.2.** Voting Faculty – All Faculty in the bargaining unit with an appointment of 50% or more in the School; inclusive of tenured, tenure-earning, and Specialized Faculty with the following exceptions: only Faculty holding tenure will vote on issues concerning tenure and promotion of non-Specialized Faculty and only tenured faculty will vote on Emeritus status. Faculty holding courtesy or visiting appointments are not a part of the Voting Faculty.

**Section III.3.** For all issues except for an issue of tenure, a quorum will consist of the majority of Voting Faculty. For issues pertaining to tenure, a quorum will consist of the majority of tenured Voting Faculty. In either case, a majority is more than half of the Voting Faculty.
### Secret Ballot

Section III.4 A secret ballot may take the form of a physical paper ballot or an electronic ballot (e.g. via Qualtrics or an alternative tool approved by the university). In order for an electronic ballot to be considered secret, it must be constructed so that votes of respondents are anonymous, each respondent can vote only once, and completion of voting is not recorded. The process for secret ballot voting must provide an opportunity for all Voting Faculty to cast a vote.

### Implementation and Amendment of the Bylaws

**Article IV: Implementation and Amendment of the Bylaws**

**Section IV.1.** Each member of the Faculty shall be given a copy of the Bylaws. All pages shall be numbered and dated. The Director shall ensure that a current copy of the Bylaws are posted on the School SharePoint site and provided to the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement.

**Section IV.2.** All Faculty associated with the School are professionally and ethically obligated to adhere to the spirit, policies, and procedures set forth in these Bylaws.

**Section IV.3.** In Fall Semester of every year ending in a 4 or a 9, an Ad Hoc Committee of at least three Faculty shall be formed by the Advisory Committee. This Committee will review and update the Bylaws of the School with input provided by Faculty. At the first Spring semester Faculty Meeting, proposed amendments shall be presented for discussion. Final voting on the proposed amendment(s) will be completed by secret ballot two weeks after the discussion. A two-thirds vote of the Voting Faculty is needed in order to adopt the amendment(s).

**Section IV.4.** An amendment to the Bylaws may be proposed at any time by placing it on the Meeting agenda, but discussion of the same must be approved by a quorum of the Voting School Faculty. Notice of the discussion must be provided to Faculty at least seven calendar days prior to the Meeting. This discussion may take place in a regularly-scheduled Faculty Meeting or in a Faculty Meeting called for the purpose of discussing the amendment. The vote shall be by secret ballot completed two weeks after the discussion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business of the Organization</th>
<th><strong>Article V: Business of the Organization</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                              | **Section V.1.** The business of the School Voting Faculty shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following:  
  • govern the School according to the School Bylaws;  
  • approve amendments to School Bylaws;  
  • adopt, delete, and/or modify policies (which are maintained by the STE Director on a central, University-approved location made available to faculty, e.g. SharePoint);  
  • receive and discuss reports from representatives on School, College, and University Committees and to take appropriate actions;  
  • receive and discuss reports (including budget reports) from the Director and staff; and  
  • participate in and make recommendations regarding School reorganization, realignment of programs, and other changes in the purpose and functioning of the School. |
| Faculty Meetings             | **Section V.2.** Meetings of the Faculty will be scheduled for the academic year within the first two weeks of the Fall semester. The first Meeting will be scheduled by the Director. The Advisory Committee will present a schedule for remaining Meetings throughout the year for approval by Faculty. |
| Order of Business            | **Section V.3.** The first order of business at each Meeting shall be the disposition of the minutes of the preceding Meeting. A report by the Director of all School-level budgets (e.g., School, SRAD, Foundation, Auxiliary, Distance Learning) will occur at each Faculty Meeting. The budget reports will consist of a report of initial allocations and rationales, expenditures to date, and projected expenditures. |
| Recording Secretary          | **Section V.4.** The Director will designate someone from the staff to serve as the Recording Secretary at all School Meetings. The Recording Secretary, or a designee, shall post the minutes on the School SharePoint site within one week of the Faculty Meeting and announce their availability by e-mail immediately after the minutes have been posted. |
| Presider and Parliamentarian | **Section V.5.** During the first Faculty Meeting of each academic year, the Voting Faculty shall elect a member from the Voting Faculty to serve as the Presider and another member of the Voting Faculty to serve as the Parliamentarian at all School Faculty Meetings. Both will serve during the Fall semester in which they were elected and the subsequent Spring and Summer semesters. The Presider and the Parliamentarian shall not be the Director. In the event that the Presider or Parliamentarian will be absent from a School Faculty Meeting, the Presider and/or Parliamentarian will appoint a substitute to assume their role at the Meeting they are unable to attend. |
| Parliamentary Authority      | **Section V.6.** The parliamentary authority shall be *Sturgis Rules of Order*, latest edition. The School shall provide the Parliamentarian and the Presider the latest edition of *Sturgis Rules of Order*. |
### Announcement of Meetings

Section V.7. The Presider, or his/her designee, shall announce Meetings by memo and/or e-mail at least two weeks in advance to solicit agenda items. A tentative agenda will be sent out one week before the Meeting and further agenda items will be solicited from the Faculty before the final agenda is sent out at least 24 hours before the Meeting. Items may be added to the agenda at the Meeting by a request of any member of the Voting Faculty and approved by a quorum of the Faculty.

### Call for Special Meetings

Section V.8. Call for special Meetings shall be made directly to the Director by the submission of a written request from a member of the Voting Faculty to the Director. Upon receipt of a written request, the Director shall schedule the special Meeting within two weeks of the request.

### Emergency Decisions

Section V.9. Emergency decisions may be made by the Voting Faculty during the Summer term on the condition that all faculty are notified and one-fourth of the Voting Faculty are available to meet and discuss the issue. Decisions made during the Summer will be terminated at the end of the Summer and will be introduced for reconsideration by the full Voting Faculty at the first Faculty Meeting of the subsequent Fall semester. Within 24 hours of the emergency Summer Meeting, the Director will inform all Faculty of the decisions made in the emergency Meeting.

### Roles

#### Director’s Duties

Section VI.1.a. The Director shall serve in a leadership position facilitating the decisions made through Faculty governance, supporting Faculty development, coordinating the activities of the School, presenting Faculty ideas to college and university-level administration, and adhering to the School Bylaws. Additional duties include:

- assuring equity in assignments as specified on AORs, including committee and other service assignments
- allocating resources (e.g., assistantships, adjunct appointments, capital outlay, expense funds) in an equitable and transparent manner across Majors, Programs, and Faculty
- acting as School representative (or shall ask the Faculty to serve as representative) to officers and bodies outside the School
- maintaining the Bylaws and policies of the School on a central, University-approved location made available to faculty, e.g. SharePoint
- adhering to and enforcing policies and Bylaws therein
- overseeing Committee efforts, activities, and participation as appropriate
- processing appointments for graduate Faculty status in accordance with the current FSU Faculty Handbook, Collective Bargaining Agreement between FSU Board of Trustees and the United Faculty of Florida, the College of Education Policies and Procedures Manual, and the School Policies and Procedures Book
- providing written reports for faculty reviews
- processing votes for Emeritus faculty
- recruiting new Faculty in accordance with the current FSU Faculty Handbook, Collective Bargaining Agreement between FSU Board of
| Director’s Term of Office | Trustees and the United Faculty of Florida, the College and School policies and procedures  
• publishing a list each year of Faculty and their Committee and/or organization responsibilities after the procedures established in the Bylaws to identify Committee membership have been followed  
• writing and distributing to Faculty an annual report, to be prepared over the summer and disseminated to Faculty at the first Meeting of the new school year. This report is to include:  
  o a list of School accomplishments as related to goals established by Faculty  
  o data documenting equity in assignments across Faculty (including an explanation of the need for any differences in assignments on AORs; e.g. descriptive statistics regarding typical number of committees within the university, descriptions of variation in teaching and supervisory loads, descriptions of outcomes associated in relation to varying percentages of research assignments)  
  o data documenting equitable distribution of resources across faculty and programs (e.g. waivers, TAs, GAs, and RAs). |
| Vacancies of the Director | Section VI.1.b The Director’s term of office is three years, renewable for three years by a vote of two-thirds of the Voting Faculty. If the Director does not receive the necessary two-thirds vote for continuation, then the procedure for selecting a Director as specified in the COE and School Bylaws (Section VI.1.c) will be initiated. The current Director may be a candidate for the position. |
| Recall or Vote of No Confidence | Section VI.1.c When a vacancy of the Director position occurs or is anticipated, the Advisory Committee will form an Ad Hoc Committee develop a plan for replacement of the Director and then meet with the Dean to discuss the plan. At least one member of the Advisory Committee will serve on the Ad Hoc Committee. |
| STE Coordinator | Section VI.1.d Any five members of the Voting Faculty may at any time initiate a petition asking for a vote of no confidence for the Director. The petition will be forwarded to the Advisory Committee. Upon receipt of the petition, the Advisory Committee will submit a secret ballot to the Voting Faculty within two weeks of the request. Upon a two-thirds vote of no confidence in the School in the Director’s administrative performance by Voting Faculty members in the School, a search shall be initiated under the provisions consistent with College of Education Bylaws. A Search Committee for a new Director will be selected as specified in Article VI.1.c of the School Bylaws. |
### Section VI.3

The primary responsibility of the Associate Director is to oversee non-certification graduate programs in the unit. Specific duties include attending and guiding graduate studies committee meetings; coordinating non-teacher certification graduate program curriculum planning and mapping; working with program faculty to secure instructors; IEP reporting for non-certification graduate programs; providing QER assistance; approving graduate-related paperwork (including that related to DIS, Supervised Research, Programs of Study, Extended Support Packages (ESPs)); managing tuition waivers and Graduate Assistant/Research Assistant (GA/RA) annual reviews; monitoring GA instructional progress; reviewing prospectuses; providing graduate recruiting support; reviewing admissions decisions; revising and approving graduate program handbooks; overseeing graduate bulletin edits; reviewing doctoral student progress; filling in for Director in absences; and assisting with new graduate student orientation.

### Term & Selection of Associate Director

Each Associate Director will serve a term of 2 years. In the second year, the Director will solicit volunteers for the next Associate Director; the Associate Director will be selected by the Director in consultation with faculty, the STE Advisory Committee, and the Dean.

### Section VI.4

The Program Leader shall serve in a leadership position facilitating the operation of each degree-awarding and/or teacher preparation academic program in STE. The Program Leader coordinates all decision-making and activity among students, staff, faculty, and OPS employees assigned to the program.

### Responsibilities of the Program Leader

- Coordinating activity and correspondence between the program and the Director, the Dean’s office, and OASIS
- Monitoring and managing curriculum, courses, field experiences, and instruction in the academic program
- Advising and mentoring incoming, current, and alumni students
- Actively participating in recruitment efforts
- Assisting with GA appointments
### Article VII. Committees

#### Section IX.1 Prior to the development of the Assignment of Responsibilities (AOR), the Director shall solicit volunteers during a Faculty Meeting to serve on standing committees as identified in Article IX.2. Also before the development of AORs, the Director will inform Faculty of vacancies on Committees for which membership is determined by election as identified in Article IX.2.

#### Section IX.2. Standing Committees of the School are as follows:

- **Committees whose representative is determined by program or major:**
  1. Student Affairs Committee
  2. Graduate Studies Committee
  3. Online Graduate Programs Committee

- **Committees whose representative is elected by the School:**
  4. Advisory Committee
  5. Promotion and Tenure Committee
  6. Annual Evaluation and Merit Committee
  7. Curriculum Committee

- **Appointed Committee:**
  8. Technology Committee

#### Section IX.3. The Student Affairs Committee will be responsible for promoting a culture of high standards for students within the School. Responsibilities include recruitment, retention, community relations, and grade appeals as needed. This includes organization of the School’s monthly colloquium series. This may involve selection of students for School-wide scholarships, fellowships and awards; and identification of students for both internal and external awards and recognitions (excluding doctoral support packages and graduate tuition waivers). When needed, the Committee will advise the Director and College administrators regarding strategies for student retention. The Committee will also work to promote and maintain positive relations with public school systems and other educational programs in the areas surrounding Florida State University in relation to combined degree programs and research. Three members of the Committee will be selected to serve on the STE Grade Appeals Screening Committee as needed. These members will be selected by a process in which the chair of the Committee solicits volunteers and selects from among those who will serve.

#### Section IX.4. The Graduate Studies Committee will be responsible for curricular and student issues related to graduate programs. The Graduate Committee will, in coordination with program Faculty, develop admission procedures. The Committee will be responsible for doctoral admissions and for student appeals related to doctoral programs. In addition the Graduate Committee will be responsible for developing policies related to doctoral courses (scheduling, identifying and developing new
Online Graduate Programs Committee

*Section IX.5. Online Graduate Programs Committee. The Online Graduate Programs Committee will be responsible for curricular and student issues related to approved online programs. Faculty members on the Online Committee will include one representative from each approved online major. Faculty teaching core courses should be represented. The Online Committee, in coordination with program Faculty, develop and/or monitor admission criteria, ensure quality of core courses, monitor recruitment, admission and retention, plan two-year course offerings, and advise on use of budgets generated by online fees. The committee will also be responsible for responding to issues related to online learning from the University Distance Learning Committee and the University Graduate Policy Committee.*

Advisory Committee

*Section IX. 6. Advisory Committee. A Committee consisting of Faculty elected by the voting Faculty. Committee composition will be one (1) Specialized Faculty, one (1) Assistant Professor; one (1) Associate Professor, and two (2) full Professors. The Committee will advise the Director in relation to issues of academic, budget, curriculum, personnel, policy, staffing, and/or student issues. The Advisory Committee shall function as an advisory body, and make recommendations for School policy to the Director based on Faculty input. It shall have as its charge the welfare of the School.*

The Chair of the Advisory Committee will be elected by Voting Faculty. The election by secret ballot will take place during the first Faculty Meeting of each Fall semester. The Chair of the Advisory Committee or the Director may call Meetings; however, it is the responsibility of the Chair of the Advisory Committee to call a minimum of two Meetings per semester. Minutes of the Advisory Committee Meetings shall be posted to the School SharePoint site within one week of the Meeting.

The Advisory Committee shall organize, monitor, and tabulate the results of all elections and shall report results of elections to the Faculty.

Each spring semester, the Advisory Committee will solicit feedback from the faculty on the Director’s performance for the academic year. The Advisory Committee Chair will compile the feedback and share it with the Director.

Promotion and Tenure Committee

*Section IX.7. Promotion and Tenure Committee. All members of the Promotion and Tenure (P & T) Committee shall be tenured Faculty and elected by a quorum of Voting Faculty of the School by secret ballot. The membership of the P & T Committee will be, at a minimum, equal to one Faculty member for each ten Voting Faculty members. This number is exclusive of the Director.*

The P & T Committee shall choose a Chair and Co-Chair. The Chair and Co-Chair of the P & T Committee shall serve as the representatives on the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.
### The P & T Committee

The P & T Committee shall carry out promotion and tenure deliberations in accordance with School, College and University guidelines for tenure-earning, tenured, and Specialized Faculty. The Committee is responsible for conducting third year reviews of tenure-earning faculty, and for reviewing and considering candidates for tenure and/or promotion.

The P & T Committee will review and update, if necessary, the School Promotion and Tenure guidelines each year. A majority vote of a quorum of the Voting Faculty shall be required for changes in the P & T criteria. The vote will be conducted by the Chair of the P & T Committee and will be by secret ballot.

The Director will assure that current promotion and tenure criteria are posted on the STE SharePoint site.

### Section IX.8. Annual Evaluation and Merit Committee

Five members of the Voting Faculty (one of whom must be Specialized Faculty) will be elected by a quorum of the Voting Faculty by secret ballot to serve on the Annual Evaluation Committee. The election is to be conducted before the development of the required AOR draft of each year. Members of the Annual Evaluation and Merit Committee will not be eligible to serve more than two consecutive terms.

The Annual Evaluation and Merit Committee shall establish criteria for evaluation of School Faculty (i.e., tenure-earning, tenured, and Specialized Faculty) with input from the Voting Faculty. Criteria for evaluation established by the Committee shall be in accord with University policies and will evaluate teaching, service, and/or scholarly activity with consideration for the Assignment of Responsibilities (AOR) percentages in each area.

The Annual Evaluation and Merit Committee will conduct annual evaluations of all Faculty. The evaluation process will result in recommendations for merit pay and/or discretionary pay decisions and will serve to inform the Director of the Committee’s perspective of a Faculty Member’s contributions to the School.

Each Faculty member will be informed in writing by the Annual Evaluation and Merit Committee of his/her scores on teaching, scholarship, and/or service and justification for the scores that are shared with the Director. Evaluation data will be forwarded in writing to the Director and included as part of the required annual Faculty evaluation process, including letters (i.e., progress toward promotion and/or tenure and annual evaluation).

The Director will assure that procedures for conducting annual evaluations, including the process for merit pay recommendations, are posted on the STE SharePoint site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Curriculum Committee</strong></th>
<th>Faculty involvement in the sustained performance evaluation process will be conducted in accordance with university policy and the Collective Bargaining Agreement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology Committee</strong></td>
<td>Section IX.9. Curriculum Committee. The Curriculum Committee is responsible for all matters in the School that relate to curricular issues as mandated by university committees (e.g., course approval, common course numbering, university curriculum issues, distance learning, library, honors programs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terms of Committee Assignment</strong></td>
<td>Section IX.10. Technology Committee. The Technology Committee will be responsive to technology needs of the School and advise the Director on a technology plan and purchases as related to Faculty welfare. In addition, the Committee will organize and approve the School’s submissions for University, College, and the School’s technology fund applications. The Chair will serve on the College Technology Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Decisions</strong></td>
<td>Section IX.11. Committee members serve three-year terms beginning in the Fall semester immediately following their appointment or election.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Membership</strong></td>
<td>Section IX.12. Decisions of the Annual Evaluation and Curriculum Committees are the responsibility of faculty members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ad Hoc Committee Formation</strong></td>
<td>Section IX.13. Unless specified otherwise in these By-laws, each Committee shall have a minimum of five Committee members. Each Committee shall be representative of the academic diversity of the School. The Chair of each Committee will be determined by committee membership, unless otherwise specified in the Bylaws. If elected, a faculty member may choose to decline to serve on an elected committee; in this instance the faculty member receiving the second largest number of votes will be asked to serve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section IX.14. Ad hoc committees will be formed in the School only when existing committees as described in the School’s bylaws cannot fulfill the purpose(s) of the proposed ad hoc committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Director, in consultation with the Advisory Committee, is responsible for the formation of ad hoc committees. Prior to the formation of an ad hoc committee, the Director will consult with the Advisory Committee to determine if an existing School committee is appropriate to fulfill the purpose of the proposed ad hoc committee. If it is determined that the ad hoc committee is needed, the Director will inform all School Faculty of the formation of the ad hoc committee and solicit volunteers to serve on the ad hoc committee.

The ad hoc committee will be disbanded when it has fulfilled its assigned purpose.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COE and University Committees</th>
<th>Section IX.15. Assignments to College- and University-level Committees, including Faculty Senate, will be made in accordance with College and University policies and procedures.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Term Committee Vacancies</td>
<td>Section IX.16. When a mid-term vacancy occurs in a committee whose members are elected, a faculty member will be elected by secret ballot to fill the vacancy for the remainder of the term. When a mid-term vacancy occurs in committees whose membership is appointed, a Faculty member will be appointed to fill the vacancy for the remainder of the term according to Section VI.3. This policy will apply only if the committee will meet during the remainder of the term being filled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policies and Procedures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article X. Policies and Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section X.1.</strong> The Director will ensure that current School policies and procedures are posted to the School SharePoint site. Historical documents should be clearly identified and maintained in the same location for reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section X.2.</strong> School policies and procedures may be added, deleted, or modified by a majority vote of the Voting Faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section X.3.</strong> The Director, or Director’s designee, will review the School’s SharePoint annually to assure that all materials are current.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section X.4.</strong> FSU Substantive Change Policy: Faculty and staff members are expected to be familiar with and follow the Florida State University Substantive Change Policy as found on the University web site <a href="https://sacs.fsu.edu/substantive-change-policy/">https://sacs.fsu.edu/substantive-change-policy/</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section X.5.</strong> Unit reorganization. There are times when it is necessary to reorganize units within the College or University by combining, creating, or removing majors and/or programs. When such reorganization impacts programs or majors within STE, all faculty will have verbal and written input into any changes in unit reorganization before any such reorganization takes place. The STE Advisory Committee will collect this input as well as the results of a vote from faculty and present it to the appropriate administrators (those overseeing the reorganizational effort).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section X.6 Faculty recruitment.</strong> The Director shall recommend to the Dean a Search Committee to handle the business of recruiting faculty vacancies when they are announced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Whenever possible, the chair of a search for a tenure-track faculty member should be a tenured faculty member, and the chair of a search for a specialized faculty member should be a senior specialized faculty member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Whenever possible and appropriate, the committee should be representative of faculty from all ranks. Suggested committee composition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission of the Department

The School of Teacher Education (STE) strives to provide programs of excellence serving undergraduates, graduates, and advanced graduates by teaching, advising, and providing professional role models. The STE is committed to high quality personnel preparation programs, service to the state of Florida, Region, and Nation, and research/scholarship to influence audiences of researchers, teachers, parents, policy-makers, and administrators.

Teacher education is a central responsibility of our programs at all degree levels. As programs situated in a research institution, central activities include the research and development of model programs and the inquiry that improves learning. Our goal is to prepare educational leaders who will contribute to the betterment of a pluralistic, global society in the context of the state of Florida’s needs for an educated, global-minded citizenry.

The mission is accomplished by:
- Implementing personnel preparation programs that are comprehensive and that prepare practitioners to implement state-of-the-art research-based practices;
- Conducting high-quality research in authentic settings; and
- Translating research to practice through service to the profession at the local, state, national and international levels.

Criteria

Criteria used to determine recommendations for promotion and for award of tenure for faculty members are designed to be consistent with statutory requirements. Criteria used in our evaluation and the process used to reach our decision also are consistent with those stated for the College of Education, Florida State University, and contained in the UFF agreement.

Though all tenure-track faculty members in the STE ordinarily carry assignments in all three areas of teaching, service, and research or creative activity, the percentages of effort assigned to each of these activities vary among faculty. The candidate’s annual assignments of responsibilities (AOR) for the periods under review will be considered in the course of evaluation for promotion and tenure. However, candidates may be evaluated for promotion and tenure on performance in teaching, service, or research and creative activity that extends beyond the activities delineated in the annual assignment. Similarly, annual evaluations of performance are not determinative of whether a candidate has met criteria for promotion and tenure.
Teaching

Teaching is the work that faculty do to ensure that those with whom we work increase their understandings of the complexities of teaching and learning, that they grow cognitively, and that they develop greater appreciation and value for learners of all backgrounds and abilities. Effective teaching is central to faculty promotion and tenure in the STE. Effective teaching is the creation by a teacher of an environment conducive to learning in which students: (1) are positively influenced to want to learn, (2) are provided adequate opportunities for learning to occur and (3) demonstrate new knowledge and skills.

The STE believes that faculty should demonstrate high standards in teaching. In order to uphold that goal, we also strive to engage in teaching practices that challenge our students to think beyond their comfort zones, and to extend themselves beyond the cognitive levels where they are when we first meet them. Teaching includes the candidate’s responsibilities in regular classroom and online instruction, independent study, thesis and dissertation direction, academic advisement (e.g., doctoral advisement, et al.) and consultation with students. Non-credited workshops, in-service programs for practicing professionals, supervision of student teachers, and guiding field-based practice in education and human service would fall within the category, as would the production of course materials, audio-visual aids, course web sites and the creation and improvement of instructional techniques and techniques for evaluating student outcomes. In each of these important roles, we believe that teacher educators should serve as role models for prospective teachers.

Faculty members who are seeking promotion to associate professor and tenure should have a record of teaching that demonstrates a positive pattern of student and peer (i.e., other faculty) evaluations. When faculty members have weak student evaluations, they will meet with the Director of the STE to develop an improvement plan. The STE Director will monitor the implementation of the plan.

Promotion to Full Professor

Faculty who are seeking promotion to professor are expected to continue to uphold the highest standards in teaching, with positive trends in their teaching evaluations. In addition, these faculty members are also expected to help assistant professors as they develop course syllabi, create new courses etc., for the improvement of programs. Any anomaly will be addressed with a teaching improvement plan, through consultation with the STE Director, who will monitor the progress of the teaching improvement.
Scholarship

Scholarship is the work that we do to raise questions, engage in research that searches for explanations, and disseminate answers to a variety of audiences and for a variety of purposes, in order to advance understandings and improvements in teaching and learning in the disciplines served by faculty in our unit.

Consistent with our policy on faculty evaluation, the faculty recognizes acceptable research in line with that defined in 1990 by Ernest Boyer for the Carnegie Foundation in *Scholarship Reconsidered*.

“...The most important obligation now confronting the nation’s colleges and universities is to... recognize the full range of faculty talent and the great diversity of functions higher education must perform” (p. xii).

“Surely, scholarship means engaging in original research. But the work of the scholar also means stepping back from one’s investigation, looking for connections, building bridges between theory and practice and communicating one’s knowledge effectively to students” (p. 16).

“Here, then, is our conclusion. What we urgently need today is a more inclusive view of what it means to be a scholar—a recognition that knowledge is acquired through research, through synthesis, through practice, and through teaching” (p. 24).

The department believes that faculty who are seeking tenure and/or promotion demonstrate their scholarship in the disciplines related to the STE in a variety of ways:

- Publication of research-based articles in internationally or nationally refereed journals;
- Work on grants in the area(s) of expertise;
- Publication of books, chapters, or articles in published works;
- Presentation at Internationally or Nationally-Refereed Conferences
- School and Community-Based Applications
- Other kinds of scholarship

1. Publication of research-based articles in internationally or nationally-refereed journals including:

   (a) Journals for audiences of researchers
   (b) Journals for audiences of teacher educators, teachers, and parents
   (c) Journals for audiences of policy makers and administrators

The assumption we make is that the articles are research-based, and that the scholarship is original, conducted by the faculty member who is being considered for promotion and tenure. However, the primary readership of the journal should not determine the quality of the candidate’s contribution to the body of knowledge. In the STE, one of our goals is to effect change in practices; frequently, the most effective means of effecting change is to speak directly
to practitioners, teachers and families, and thus publishing our research in language and venues that are accessible to society is valuable. [Note: This is not meant to imply, however, that candidates who exclusively publish in practitioner-based journals would be successful in their petition for promotion and tenure. Instead, candidate’s who either publish exclusively for audiences of researchers or exhibit a balance in publication venues (thus illustrating both direct research acumen and the ability to communicate original research findings to multiple audiences) would have commensurate success potential in their petition.]

2. Work on grants in the area(s) of expertise including:

   (a) Research and model demonstration grants
   (b) Service grants in which teachers work with the faculty members to learn, implement, and evaluate the effectiveness of new methods and strategies
   (c) Personnel preparation grants that train practitioners and prepare leaders in education and human services

Grant activity in education often requires a great amount of time spent in classroom or school-based settings with numbers of teachers from one or more schools or school districts. Because of our mission to improve education and human services, we highly value the outcomes of productive research, model demonstration, service, and personnel preparation grants. When faculty members spend time with any of these grants, and can produce evidence that the time being spent is effective in terms of the goals of the grant, whether the evidence is a published article, a conference presentation, or a product related to particular improvements denoted by the specific aims of the grant itself, the STE considers the grant activity valuable.

3. Publication of books, chapters, or articles in published works

Because books frequently are considered by those outside of the academy as the hallmark of scholarship, and are thus viewed as the most prestigious and authoritative word on a subject, we recognize that the publication of an academic book or chapter (as author or editor), including a reference book, textbook, or other text that is related to his or her area of expertise, makes a valuable contribution to a faculty member’s reputation as a scholar and to his or her body of scholarship. Other examples of scholarship in this category also include: anthologies; proceedings of conferences or symposia; technical reports; original articles of semi-popular nature, having as their purpose the dissemination of technical or scientific information; book reviews, newspaper articles/reviews listed separately; encyclopedia articles; and abstracts.

4. Presentations at Internationally and/or Nationally-Refereed Conferences

The STE recognizes the value of disseminating ideas through highly selective conferences, where faculty members have the opportunity to interact with other scholars, and become acquainted with others who are interested in topics similar to their own. Related scholarship: papers read at national or international professional meetings; papers read at regional professional meetings; discussant or chairman roles at conference or symposia; invited lectures
5. School, Community, and Agency-Based Applications

The STE recognizes work in schools, community settings, and related agencies (e.g., Florida DOE) in which teaching, learning, and assessment occur, including projects in which faculty members design, coordinate, observe, assess, and evaluate efforts involving pre-service and in-service teachers, care-givers, administrators, and other related service personnel, for example, as appropriate and necessary to research in disciplines within the school. Evidence might include:

- High quality performance assessment(s) that is/are data driven, analytic/reflective in character, and peer reviewed (e.g., Florida DOE Program Reports, NCATE Standards, Annual Progress Reports to Funding Agencies, or other technical documents).
- Documentation of the positive impact(s) of consultative activity designed to improve public school effectiveness [e.g., development of curricular interventions resulting in school improvement, higher AYP scores, improved school district/building level state test scores, etc.]

For promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, faculty will have engaged in the types of scholarship described in the section above and established their research agenda.

Promotion to Full Professor

In accordance with Florida State University standards, we believe that those seeking promotion to full professor are expected to have established a national or international identity as a scholar. We believe that the reputation may be achieved primarily through the impact made by a faculty member’s journal publications or through research her/his grant activity; however, we recognize that those faculty members who are able to establish a record that includes a balance of scholarly activities are those who are best able to achieve the kind of national reputation that is the standard for professor status.
Service

The STE believes that faculty who are seeking promotion to professor demonstrate standing in their fields through service to organizations at the national and/or international level, having achieved leadership position(s), through election or appointment, in one or more of those organizations, and having earned a record of success in the role(s). In addition, faculty seeking promotion to full professor are expected to serve the department, college, and university actively. Although there are few formal departmental committees, these faculty members should be recognized for their contributions to their programs and to the department as a whole.

Service is the work that faculty do to further the mission of the department, college, university, community, and our professions. The STE believes that faculty members who are seeking tenure serve best by establishing positive records as teachers and scholars. Therefore, their service should be directed toward those goals until they are tenured and promoted to the level of Associate Professor. Their service, until promotion to Associate and tenure, should be focused on professional development through attending state, regional, and national conferences at which they interact with experts in their academic fields. They will also be encouraged to take advantage of university opportunities that are provided for enhancement of research or teaching, such as first year assistant professor grants and technology workshops. As demonstrated on their Assignments of Responsibility (AOR), their service on department, college, and university committees will be limited to those that match closely their teaching and research interests.

Service may include:

a) **Service to the University** is considered to be rendered by membership on committees convened to perform administrative support, advisory and decision-making functions necessary to the operation of the University or any of its component divisions, schools, department or departmental units.

b) **Service to the community** encompasses a broad variety of activities, generally educational in nature, within the University, the local community, the state, the nation, or other countries of the world. The following are examples of such activities:

   (1) Within the University—lectures or seminars involving other departments or having a campus-wide orientation; consultations on scholarly and instructional matters with others departments, which are in addition to assigned teaching responsibilities.

   (2) Within the local community—talks or speeches to local service groups, parent-teachers organizations, consultation with local schools and other programs, and service on boards of local organizations.

   (3) Within the state—work with the State Department of Education; lectures, talks, or service to community colleges or other universities, professional organizations, state-wide service organizations.
(4) Within the nation-service as a member of reviewing panels or boards for federal agencies engaged in educational, human service, or R & D activities; service on boards and committees of national organizations

(5) International activities-educational activities in the form of consultations, or contracted work with agencies of other countries.

(c) **Service to the profession** is evidenced by such activities as the following:

1. Functions performed (beyond simple membership) in professional organizations
2. Holding office in such organizations, including chair, and memberships on boards and committees
3. Service as editor, consulting or reviewing editor for professional journals having state, national, or international distribution
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The School of Teacher Education (STE) strives to provide programs of excellence serving undergraduates, graduates, and advanced graduates by teaching, advising, and providing professional role models. The STE is committed to high quality personnel preparation programs, service to the state of Florida, Region, and Nation, and research/scholarship to influence audiences of researchers, teachers, parents, policy-makers, and administrators.

Teacher education is a central responsibility of our programs at all degree levels. As programs situated in a research institution, central activities include the research and development of model programs and the inquiry that improves learning. Our goal is to prepare educational leaders who will contribute to the betterment of a pluralistic, global society in the context of the state of Florida’s needs for an educated, global-minded citizenry.

The mission is accomplished by:

- Implementing personnel preparation programs that are comprehensive and that prepare practitioners to implement state-of-the-art research-based practices (i.e., high quality teaching);
- Conducting high-quality research, service, and/or scholarly activities/projects in authentic settings; and
- Translating research to practice through service and/or scholarly activities/projects to the profession at the local, state, national and international levels.

Specialized Faculty includes Teaching Track, Instructional Support Track, Research Track, and Research Support Track faculty. Specialized Faculty are critical individuals who contribute to the mission of the STE primarily through high quality teaching, service, and, to a lesser degree, scholarly projects/activities/research.

Promotion Criteria

Specialized Faculty promotion decisions shall take into account the nature of assignments on Annual Assignments of Responsibilities (AORs). Assignments may include teaching, service, and/or scholarly activities/projects/research.

In relation to teaching activities (for all specialized faculty with a teaching assignment listed on the candidate’s AOR), the following will be considered:

- Summaries of data from Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPOT) or Student Perceptions of Courses and Instructors (SPCI) in terms of:
  - Evidence of well-planned and delivered courses and
  - Evidence of overall teaching effectiveness
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Specialized Faculty promotion decisions shall also take into account:

- Letters from faculty members who have conducted peer evaluations of the candidate’s teaching,
- Proven ability to teach multiple courses within a discipline/major (as delineated on the candidate’s AOR),
- Teaching or advising awards and/or nominations for University Teaching Awards (as individuals are only eligible to be awarded every 5 years), and
- Other teaching-related activities, such as instructional innovation, involvement in curriculum development, authorship of educational materials, and participation in professional organizations related to the area of instruction.

Per the university policy on course evaluations, the following courses do not require administration of course evaluations: dissertation, thesis, directed independent study, practicum, summer courses, distance learning, online courses, hybrid courses, fieldwork, undergraduate courses with fewer than 10 students, and graduate courses with fewer than 5 students (https://distance.fsu.edu/docs/admin_docs/CourseEvaluationPolicy.pdf).

Specific to Specialized Faculty with Teaching Assignment(s),

- Evidence of well-planned and delivered courses:
  - Promotion to Teaching/Instructional Support/Research/Research Support Faculty II candidate receives more than 70% student responses to “Overall course content rating” as satisfactory to excellent (formerly good, very good, and excellent)
  - Promotion to Teaching/Instructional Support/Research/Research Support Faculty III candidate receives at least 70% excellent ratings for “Overall course content rating” on all rated courses

- Evidence of overall teaching effectiveness:
  - Promotion to Teaching/Instructional Support/Research/Research Support Faculty II candidate receives more than 70% student responses for overall teaching effectiveness as satisfactory to excellent (formerly good, very good, and excellent)
  - Promotion to Teaching/Instructional Support/Research/Research Support Faculty III candidate receives at least 70% excellent ratings for overall teaching effectiveness on all rated courses

If selected ratings for overall teaching effectiveness or overall course content fall below these criteria in the three years immediately preceding application for promotion, a candidate may still be eligible for promotion if, in the opinion of the STE Promotion and Tenure Committee, the ratings do not accurately assess the overall course content or teaching effectiveness of the candidate for teaching assignment(s) on the AOR. Multiple sources of evidence should be considered. However, overall course content or teaching effectiveness ratings may not consistently fall below the criteria.

In relation to service activities, the following will be considered:

Specialized Faculty may further the mission of the department, college, and university by engaging in service to the University, COE, STE, community, and the professional field.
• **Service to the University and COE** is considered to be rendered by membership on committees convened to perform administrative support, advisory, and decision-making functions necessary to the operation of the University or any of its component divisions, schools, programs, departments, or departmental units.

• **Service to STE** is identified and defined by other service and administrative activities as described on AORs. Such service may include (but is not limited to) engaging in program coordination, program approval/accreditation, recruitment, establishing relationships with local school districts and other community agencies, and assisting with departmental and program administrative tasks.

• **Service to the community** encompasses a broad variety of professional activities within the local, state, regional, national, and international communities. Examples of such service activities include talks, speeches to local service groups, parent-teacher organizations, consultation with schools and other entities, and service on organizational boards.

• **Service to the field** may include service as a member of reviewing panels or boards for federal, state, and local agencies engaged in educational and/or human service activities; service on boards and committees of professional organizations; and educational activities such as consultations or contracted work with educational or related agencies.

The evaluation of service activities for purposes of promotion will be based on documentation of successful completion of service activities specified on the AOR during the promotion evaluation period. Successful completion of service activities not specified on the AOR also will be considered.

Specialized Faculty promotion decisions shall also take into account:

• Evidence of exemplary performance of service activities as documented by letters from colleagues inside and outside the University,

• Service awards, and

• Completion of service beyond what is required on the AOR.

**In relation to research and scholarly activities/projects, the following will be considered:**

Specialized Faculty may, but are not required to, engage in scholarly projects/activities/research to advance understandings and improvements in teaching and learning in their disciplines and/or research interests. These activities may include (but are not limited to) presentations at local, state, regional, national and international levels (refereed/non-refereed) conferences; publication of research-based or practitioner articles in refereed journals; work on grants; and publication of books, chapters, or articles in published works.

The evaluation of research and scholarly activities/projects for purposes of promotion will be based on documentation of successful completion of these activities/projects specified on the AOR during the evaluation period. Successful completion of research and scholarly activities/projects not specified on the AOR also will be considered.

Specialized Faculty promotion decisions shall also take into account:

• Presentation of an invited or keynote presentation at a national or international event,

• Receipt of an award recognizing scholarly contributions,

• Award of an external or internal grant, and
• Completion of research and scholarly activities/projects beyond what is required on the AOR.

In addition, promotion decisions for Specialized Faculty shall also take into account:

1. Annual evaluations,
2. Annual Assignments of Responsibility (AOR),
3. Fulfillment of the department/unit written promotion criteria in relation to the assignment in the supervisor’s letters, and
4. Evidence of sustained effectiveness relative to opportunity and according to assignment in the supervisor’s letter

Promotion Process

The Director of the School of Teacher Education (STE) shall be notified of the eligibility of Specialized Faculty in the unit who are eligible for promotion consideration by the COE Dean’s Office. The Director then notifies the individual faculty of his or her eligibility. If the faculty member wishes to proceed, the Director may not withhold the opportunity to undergo review. The STE considers all Specialized Faculty who are eligible for promotion each year [Note: Although the period of time in a given rank is normally five years, demonstrated merit, not years of service, is the guiding factor. Promotion, however, is neither automatic nor guaranteed as a result of the completion of a given term of service.].

The promotion committee for Specialized Faculty shall consist of the duly elected Promotion and Tenure Committee for STE (as defined in the bylaws) with the addition of the Specialized Faculty member elected to the STE Advisory Committee (thus fulfilling the need to include at least one peer on the committee as delineated by collective bargaining) and an additional Specialized Faculty selected by the collective group of Specialized Faculty. Upon review by this extended committee, the committee recommends action on the candidate by secret ballot and prepares a report of the Committee’s recommendations.

The Director of STE independently reviews the binder of each prospective candidate and recommends action to the Dean, taking into account both the vote of the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee and its recommendations. The Dean considers these recommendations, independently reviews the binder, and submits her/his advice concerning the eligibility of the candidate to the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement [Note: The Dean may place a letter of evaluation on the record of achievement as reflected in the binder].

Candidates will be informed of the results of the recommendations at each level of review. Candidates may withdraw their file from consideration within five working days of being informed of the results of the review at any level of consideration. Candidates must, should they choose to withdraw, notify in writing (through the STE Director and Dean) the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement.

Promotion Binder

Promotion binders for all Specialized Faculty shall include:

1. Professional Curriculum Vita
2. AORs
3. Annual evaluations
4. Chair/supervisor’s annual letter of appraisal toward promotion
5. Letters of recommendation (from faculty members who have conducted a peer evaluation)

In addition to the above, promotion binders for all Teaching Track and Specialized Faculty with Teaching Responsibilities shall include:

1. Two or three letters from faculty members who have conducted a peer evaluation of the candidate’s teaching.

In addition to the above, promotion binders for all Instructional Support Track faculty shall include:

1. Two or three letters from faculty members who have reviewed the faculty member’s service in support of instruction and teaching if applicable.

In addition to the above, promotion binders for faculty members in the Research Track shall include:

1. Three letters of recommendation from faculty members of higher rank outside the University that attest to the quality of the candidate’s research and/or other creative activities and her/his recognition in the field.
2. Descriptions of the contracts and grants for which the candidate has served as Principle Investigator (PI) or co-PI since the last promotion or initial appointment, as appropriate, including: the title of the project, the funding agency, the list of PI and Co-PIs, any other institutions involved, and the FSU share and amount of funding.

In addition to the above, promotion binders for faculty members in the Research Support Track shall include:

1. Two or three letters from faculty members who have reviewed the faculty member’s service in support of research.
2. If the duty assignments over the period since last promotion included a research component, the binder shall also include evidence of the quality of the research.
According to the FSU Faculty Handbook with regard to Annual Evaluation, "[t]he basic purpose of the evaluation is to acknowledge performance; to communicate performance effectiveness; to aid in improving performance in assigned duties; and if necessary, to develop a performance plan to assist in correcting deficiencies for the employee not meeting performance expectations" (p. 74). Further, the "evaluation is based upon the assigned duties and will consider the nature of the assignments and quality of the performance…" (p. 74). Meritorious performance for the purposes of distribution of funds allocated for merit-based salary increases are defined as "performance that meets or exceeds the expectations for the position classification and department/unit" and “must establish distinctive levels of merit reflecting the differences in performance” (p. 38, Collective Bargaining Agreement: 2016-2019). Criteria and procedures must be consistent with the criteria for faculty evaluation. All faculty members will be reviewed for merit.

For Annual Evaluation the following materials will be provided to the Committee by each faculty member:

1. Vita (using FEAS) with annotated items for the review period;
2. AORs for the year being reviewed;
3. Brag Sheet – One (1) page (single spaced, 1"-margins, 12-point Times New Roman or Arial) for each area of assigned responsibilities (e.g., Teaching, Research, and/or Service);
4. SPCI report for courses taught during the review period (only those that meet the university criteria for teaching evaluation should be included); and
5. One item of evidence that relates to the brag sheet.

The approved rubric for the faculty category (i.e., Tenured/Tenure-Track, Specialized) will be used to provide the department chair/director a review of performance. The annual evaluation of faculty will be based on peer review by the elected members of the annual evaluation and merit committee. Evaluation materials will be independently reviewed and rated by three committee members using a five-point scale (does not meet expectations = 1, official concern = 2, meets FSU’s high expectations = 3, exceeds FSU’s high expectations = 4, significantly exceeds FSU's high expectations = 5. The mode of the scores will be recorded and reported. In cases where there is no mode the remaining committee members will review the materials. Typically, all discrepancies between scores will be discussed at the committee meeting. Committee members WILL NOT review his/her own materials.

The judgements of faculty performance in teaching, research, and service will be based on the criteria listed on pages 3-11.

The following procedures will be used to determine merit levels for the School of Teacher Education:
Step 1: Annual Evaluation and Merit Committee uses annual evaluation categorizations as a starting point for determining merit: Categorizations of performance for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service from each faculty member’s annual evaluation (based on the recommendation of the STE Annual Evaluation and Merit Committee) will be used as a starting point for this process. In particular, categorizations will be assigned initial numerical values as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does not Meet FSU’s High Expectations</th>
<th>Official Concern</th>
<th>Meets FSU’s High Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations</th>
<th>Significantly Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 2: Committee considers faculty input on categorizations of performance as described in the faculty member’s report provided for annual evaluation and percent assigned based on the AORs for the year under consideration:

a. Any faculty member whose committee evaluation resulted in a “Does not meet FSU’s High Expectations” or “Official Concern” is not eligible for merit.

b. Weighting: Teaching, research, and service will be used to weight merit scores. The AOR weights assigned to each sum to 100%, and the weights must also sum to 100% for merit, but faculty can request that the AOR weights be distributed differently for merit rankings (e.g. if someone thinks they spent more time on service than their AOR acknowledged, they could request that their service score receive more weight for the purpose of merit). Requests for merit weights for teaching, research, and service must be (a) included in annual evaluation materials, (b) include a rationale, (c) sum to 100%, and (d) must individually be within ±10% of the weight given to that category on the faculty member’s AOR.

c. A composite score will be calculated for each person using the following formula:

\[
\text{composite score} = \% \text{ AOR Teaching} \times \text{evaluation score} + \% \text{ AOR Research} \times \text{evaluation score} + \% \text{ AOR Service} \times \text{evaluation score}
\]

NOTE: Any redistribution of weight for a category will be used in calculating the composite score.

This composite score will be provided to the department chair for merit decisions.

Two separate lists of scores will be provided to the chair, one for specialized faculty and one for Tenure/Tenure-Track.
Teaching

Does Not Meet Expectations

A faculty member who failed to fulfill teaching assignment on the AOR.

A faculty member whose teaching is not acceptable. The faculty member is judged as having significant problems by his/her peers and is failing to meet the minimum teaching expectations. Some indications of unacceptable teaching from peer and student evaluations may include:

- the faculty member makes no effort to improve teaching;
- the faculty member does not seem prepared for classroom activities;
- does not seem current on the subject matter;
- shows little enthusiasm for the subject matter or classroom interaction;
- does not return graded examinations and assignments in a timely manner;
- does not manage the classroom well;
- is not available to students, etc.

This level of performance often leads to student complaints judged as significant by peers and the department chair/director and by teaching evaluations consistently below the department and college averages.

Official Concern

The activities listed below define the minimum expectations for teaching. A faculty member who earns an “official concern” rating may meet the minimum expectations for teaching, but his/her teaching still needs improvement and observation. This level of performance occasionally leads to student complaints judged as significant by peers and the department chair/director and by teaching evaluations below the department and college averages.

Failure to meet the following minimum expectations, as judged by department peers, will be used as evidence for a rating of “official concern”:

- Having an appropriate syllabus (as defined by the department, college, and University), which is distributed at the first meeting of the class.
- Meeting with the class at the scheduled times, unless there are extenuating circumstances.
- Incorporating current STE and COE requirements into appropriate courses as defined by the College, department, or program.
- Adhering to college policies regarding student evaluations and obtaining satisfactory student evaluations in all courses taught, without consistent serious problems as judged by department peers.
- Being available in his/her office during posted office hours (as specified by University policy), unless there is an unavoidable conflict.
- Returning graded examinations and assignments with comments in a timely manner.
- Submitting course grades in a timely manner.
• Providing assigned advisees with academic advising that is judged as effective by department peers.

**Meets FSU’s High Expectations**

A faculty member judged as “meeting FSU’s high expectations” has fulfilled the teaching assignment as outlined on the AOR. In addition, a faculty member judged to be at this level performs satisfactorily based on student evaluations and peer review of the relevant teaching materials. Teaching evaluation scores are typically near the department and college averages. In addition to meeting the minimum expectations for teaching (as outlined above), the faculty member is judged (by peers) as providing a positive learning environment which is conducive to student learning.

Satisfactory performance at this level is typically demonstrated through activities such as:

• Showing evidence of continuous improvement of existing course content and delivery for all courses taught as judged by department peers.
• Being prepared for the classroom (addressing the topic/content area, demonstrating preparation through logical and informative lectures, class exercises/tasks, or other related pedagogical tools). Note: This could be measured by peer review or through student evaluations.
• Participation in a faculty development initiative focused on teaching improvement requiring low levels of time, effort, or formality (e.g., 1-hour workshop, having a colleague observe a class and provide informal feedback, etc.).
• Developing new courses or revising existing courses (e.g., submitting new course proposal to the COE curriculum committee).
• Sharing of teaching best practices from conferences or workshops with department or program colleagues.

**Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations**

A faculty member judged as “exceeding FSU's high expectations” has fulfilled the teaching assignment as outlined on the AOR. In addition, a faculty member in this category is recognized by peers and students in valid documented evaluations as an above average teacher. Typically, this would be interpreted as teaching evaluations that are above the department and college averages.

In addition to meeting the minimum expectations for teaching, a significant level or number of activities such as those listed below can be used as evidence of exceeding FSU’s high expectations for teaching.

• Having teaching evaluations judged by department peers as above average.
• Participating effectively in a teaching improvement effort involving classroom visitations with feedback.
• Participation in multiple faculty development initiatives focused on teaching improvement.
• Preparing a course that he/she is teaching for the first time.
• Effectively teaching extremely large sections.
• Participating effectively in an effort targeting the integration of disciplines.
• Demonstrating significant incorporation of active and applied learning in courses taught.
• Effectively supervising Thesis/Dissertation committees.
• Student placement or recruitment activity judged as significant by department peers.
• Effectively supervising Independent Study/Internship judged as significant by department peers.
• Having a larger than normal number of assigned course preparations per year.
• Receiving department or college teaching award/ recognition.
• Being nominated for a university teaching award.
• Being readily available to students at times other than posted office hours for discussion and advising.
• Participating in peer review of teaching by colleagues or outside experts.

**Significantly Exceeds FSU's High Expectations**

A faculty member who is clearly excellent in the classroom compared with his or her colleagues. This person exhibits many of the following traits:

- attends seminars or colloquia for improvement;
- tries new pedagogical methods and technologies in the classroom;
- shares successful techniques with colleagues;
- receives teaching evaluations **consistently higher** than department and college averages.

A faculty member that receives a significantly exceeds rating typically includes regular peer review of teaching in his/her annual development activities.

In addition to meeting the minimum expectations for teaching, a significant number or level of activities such as those listed below can be used as evidence of teaching excellence:

- Teaching evaluations judged by department peers as excellent.
- Receiving a University teaching award or other teaching award judged as significant by department peers.
- Developing and successfully delivering a new, standalone course at the request of the department or college in support of the department or college mission judged as being significant by department peers and department chair/director.
- New contributions to interdisciplinary/interdepartmental curriculum integration judged as significant by department peers and chair/director.
- Attendance at seminars or colloquia for improvement of teaching.
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• Participation in faculty development initiatives focused on teaching improvement judged as significant by department and college peers.
• Participating in peer review of teaching by colleagues or outside experts.
• Positive mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students as judged by department peer (e.g., co-authoring papers, co-presenting at professional meetings).
• Receiving a mentoring award from the University or other mentoring award judged as significant by department peers.

Research / Scholarship

For purposes of categorizing research contributions, each discipline will maintain a journal list organized into four levels as follows:

1. Elite Journals – the top 3-5 journals in the field, typically rated as “A” journals.
2. Top Journals – the next 10-15 journals that are considered to be high quality journals or journals that are the top journals of discipline sub-specialties (“best-in-class”). These are typically “B+” to “A-” journals.
3. High Quality Journals – the next 20+ journals that are solid journals in the field. These are typically “B”-level journals.
4. Acceptable Journals – the remaining journals in the field.

In all cases these are to be peer or editor-reviewed publication outlets. The journal lists should be reasonably consistent with peer institutions or colleges / programs with similar missions.

Activity Reporting Times

Unless noted otherwise, intellectual contributions should be counted as follows:
• Books, book chapters, instructional software, and monographs in the year of copyright, acceptance date, or publication date. The faculty member must clearly state which date is to be considered.
• Journal publications in the year of formal acceptance or publication date. The faculty member must clearly state which date is to be considered.
• Papers presented in the year the meeting is held.

The minimum expectations for research include:
• Submission of manuscript to peer-reviewed or editorial board reviewed journal.
• Submission of manuscript or instructional software to publisher.
• Submission of paper (proposal) to peer-reviewed academic or professional meeting.
• Documented progress on or completion of a manuscript/working paper.
• Attendance at a research development workshop, seminar, or conference. The faculty member should describe the impact of the development activity in the narrative.
• Submission of an external grant proposal.
• Invited published paper.

The criteria listed above will be considered evidence that the faculty member is meeting expectations in the area of research. However, there should also be evidence that the faculty member is **building a record of scholarship** that includes publishing work in refereed outlets as described above.

**Does Not Meet Expectations**

A faculty member failed to fulfill research assignment as outlined on the AOR.

- No evidence of research activity.
- Did not fulfill AOR research assignment.

**Official Concern**

A faculty member who exhibited a pattern of effort that fails to build upon a record of scholarship.

A faculty member who does not meet **at least one** of the following criteria will be rated as having an official concern:

- Submission of manuscript to peer-reviewed or editorial board reviewed journal.
- Submission of manuscript or instructional software to publisher.
- Submission of paper (proposal) to peer-reviewed academic or professional meeting.
- Documented progress on or completion of a manuscript/working paper.
- Attendance at a research development workshop, seminar, or conference. The faculty member should describe the impact of the development activity in the narrative.
- Submission of an external grant proposal.
- Invited published paper.

**Meets FSU’s High Expectations**

A faculty member who fulfilled the research assignment as outlined on the AOR and is on a trajectory that meets criteria as defined in the STE and university P & T guidelines during the evaluation period.

Achievement of **at least one** of the following (or equivalent accomplishment):

- Submission of scholarly work (e.g., journal manuscripts, book chapter) that builds on faculty member’s record of scholarship and judged as significant by peers and department chair/director.
- Submission of external research grant proposal judged as being significant by peers and department chair/director.
- Presentation of peer-reviewed paper, workshop, symposia, poster-session, etc., at an acceptable academic or professional conference or meeting.
• Published/presented invited paper(s) judged by peers as requiring significant effort or having a significant impact based on quality or publication outlet.
• Publication of a paper in peer-reviewed meeting proceedings or book.
• Publication of chapter in scholarly book, professional book, or textbook.
• Publication of book review in peer-reviewed journal.
• Publication of editorials or research comments in professional or academic publication.

**Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations**

Evaluation at this level is earned by achievement of one of the following (or equivalent accomplishment):

• Publication of a High-Quality (level 3) Journal article.
• Publication of two Acceptable (level 4) Journal articles.
• Publication of a new edition of a scholarly book, professional book or textbook judged as significant by department peers and chair/director.
• Publication of instructional software judged as significant by the faculty’s peers and department chair/director.
• Funding of external research grant judged as significant by department peers and chair/director.
• Publication of a book chapter in an edited volume judged as significant by department peers and department chair/director.

**Significantly Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations**

Evaluation at this level is earned by achievement of one of the following (or equivalent accomplishment):

• Publication of an Elite Journal (level 1) article.
• Publication of one Top Journal article (level 2)
• Publication of a new scholarly book, professional book, or textbook judged as significant by department peers and chair/director.
• Publication of book chapter in edited volume judged as highly significant by department peers and chair/director.
• Funding of external research grant judged as highly significant by department peers and chair/director.
• Invited or keynote presentation at a national or international event.
• Received an award recognizing scholarly contributions.

**Service**

**Does Not Meet Expectations**

There is no evidence of professional activity at this level. The faculty member does not meet many of the Official Concern expectations for Service.
Official Concern

Fulfilled service assignment on the AOR but was non-participatory and/or consistently failed to meet deadlines.

Failed to meet minimum expectations.

The minimum expectations for service include the following activities:

- Serving on a college committee, demonstrating regular attendance and contributing to the work and activities of the committee.
- Effective service on department committees as rated by the chair of that committee.
- Regular attendance at department and college meetings.
- Being a member in a professional organization.

Meets FSU’s High Expectations

In addition to meeting the minimum expectations for service, a significant level or number of professional or service activities can be used as evidence of satisfactory performance such as the following:

Professional Activity

- Attendance at one professional meeting.
- Participation in a professional development activity. Professional activities are those activities which contribute to the teaching and/or research capabilities of the faculty member.

Service

- Community service judged as significant by department peers and department chair/director.
- Effectively serving on one or more active (i.e., the group met at least once during the year or that the position required considerable effort) University and/or college committees judged as being significant by department peers and chairs/departments.
- Serving as a session chair or serving in a voluntary capacity at a significant national or regional conference.

Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations

In addition to meeting the minimum expectations for service, a significant level or number of activities such as those listed below can be used as evidence of above average performance. A faculty member earning this rating for service will meet the minimum expectations for service and typically be engaged in some service activities such as:
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Professional Activity
- Organizing a conference workshop, session, or panel judged as significant by department peers and chairs/directors.
- Book and manuscript reviewing judged as significant by department peers.
- Attendance at multiple professional conferences.
- Holding an office or serving as a member on an active committee or board of a professional organization (i.e., the group met at least once during the year or that the position required some work).
- Serving as a discussant in a significant national or regional conference judged as significant by department peers and chair/director.
- Serving on the editorial board of a journal.
- Effectively mentoring a faculty member.

Service Activity
- Effectively chairing an active department committee or task force that is judged as significant by department peers.
- Effectively leading a special department project judged as significant by the department chair/director.
- Effectively serving as advisor to an active club or student organization.
- Recruiting activity judged as significant by department peers.
- Community outreach efforts judged as significant by department peers.
- Participation on a department or University committee that required a significant amount of time and effort.
- Engaging in an above average number of service activities (not listed on AOR).

Significantly Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations

A significant level and number of professional or service activities listed below can be used as evidence of excellent performance. A faculty member earning a significantly exceeds rating in service will meet the minimum expectations for service and typically be engaged in some “meets” and “exceeds” service activities. A faculty member earning a “significantly exceeds” rating for service must also be engaged in some internal service activities for the department or college.

Professional Activity
- Effectively serve as the editor or assistant editor of a peer-reviewed journal.
- Organizing and successfully delivering a professional development program (or similar activity).
- Reviewing grants for a federal agency.
- Effectively serving as an officer in or chairing a significant state or national or international committee as judged by department peers.
- Organizing and successfully presenting a conference workshop, session, or panel judged as outstanding by department peers.
- Providing promotion and/or tenure review for another institution.
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Service

- Effectively chairing a college committee.
- Effectively serving as advisor to a significantly active club or student organization, where a significant time commitment is required (e.g., working with a student group on a major project as determined by the members of the student group).
- Serving effectively as a program leader without release time.
- Effectively chairing an active University committee or task force.
- Engaging in a significant number of unreported service activities judged a significant by department peers.
School of Teacher Education

Annual Evaluation for Specialized Faculty

According to the FSU Faculty Handbook with regard to Annual Evaluation, “[t]he basic purpose of the evaluation is to acknowledge performance; to communicate performance effectiveness; to aid in improving performance in assigned duties; and if necessary, to develop a performance plan to assist in correcting deficiencies for the employee not meeting performance expectations” (p. 74). Further, the “evaluation is based upon the assigned duties and will consider the nature of the assignments and quality of the performance…” (p. 74). Meritorious performance for the purposes of distribution of funds allocated for merit-based salary increases are defined as “performance that meets or exceeds the expectations for the position classification and department/unit” and “must establish distinctive levels of merit reflecting the differences in performance” (p. 38, Collective Bargaining Agreement: 2016-2019). Criteria and procedures must be consistent with the criteria for faculty evaluation. All faculty members will be reviewed for merit.

For Annual Evaluation the following materials will be provided to the Committee by each faculty member:

1. Vita (using FEAS) with annotated items for the review period;
2. AORs for the year being reviewed;
3. Brag Sheet – One (1) page (single spaced, 1”-margins, 12-point Times New Roman or Arial) for each area of assigned responsibilities (e.g., Teaching, Research, and/or Service);
4. SPCI report for courses taught during the review period (only those that meet the university criteria for teaching evaluation should be included); and
5. One item of evidence that relates to the brag sheet.

The approved rubric for the faculty category (i.e., Tenured/Tenure-Track, Specialized) will be used to provide the department chair/director a review of performance. The annual evaluation of faculty will be based on peer review by the elected members of the annual evaluation and merit committee. Evaluation materials will be independently reviewed and rated by three committee members using a five-point scale (does not meet expectations = 1, official concern = 2, meets FSU’s high expectations = 3, exceeds FSU’s high expectations = 4, significantly exceeds FSU’s high expectations = 5. The mode of the scores will be recorded and reported. In cases where there is no mode the remaining committee members will review the materials. Typically, all discrepancies between scores will be discussed at the committee meeting. Committee members WILL NOT review his/her own materials.

The judgements of faculty performance in teaching, research, and service will be based on the criteria listed in the rubric.

The following procedures will be used to determine merit levels for the School of Teacher Education:
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• **Step 1: Annual Evaluation and Merit Committee uses annual evaluation categorizations as a starting point for determining merit:** Categorizations of performance for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service from each faculty member’s annual evaluation (based on the recommendation of the STE Annual Evaluation and Merit Committee) will be used as a *starting point* for this process. In particular, categorizations will be assigned initial numerical values as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does not Meet FSU’s High Expectations</th>
<th>Official Concern</th>
<th>Meets FSU’s High Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations</th>
<th>Significantly Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• **Step 2: Committee considers faculty input on categorizations of performance as described in the faculty member’s report provided for annual evaluation and percent assigned based on the AORs for the year under consideration:**

a. Any faculty member whose committee evaluation resulted in a “Does not meet FSU’s High Expectations” or “Official Concern” is not eligible for merit.

b. Weighting: Teaching, research, and service will be used to weight merit scores. The AOR weights assigned to each sum to 100%, and the weights must also sum to 100% for merit, but faculty can request that the AOR weights be distributed differently for merit rankings (e.g. if someone thinks they spent more time on service than their AOR acknowledged, they could request that their service score receive more weight for the purpose of merit). Requests for merit weights for teaching, research, and service must be (a) included in annual evaluation materials, (b) include a rationale, (c) sum to 100%, and (d) must individually be with ±10% of the weight given to that category on the faculty member’s AOR.

c. A composite score will be calculated for each person using the following formula:

\[
\% \text{AOR Teaching} \times \text{evaluation score} + \% \text{AOR Research} \times \text{evaluation score} + \% \text{AOR Service} \times \text{evaluation score} = \text{composite score}
\]

NOTE: Any redistribution of weight for a category will be used in calculating the composite score.

This composite score will be provided to the department chair for merit decisions.

Two separate lists of scores will be provided to the chair, one for specialized faculty and one for Tenure/Tenure-Track.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHING</th>
<th>Does not Meet FSU’s High Expectations</th>
<th>Official Concern</th>
<th>Meets FSU’s High Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations</th>
<th>Significantly Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fulfilled teaching assignment on AOR.</td>
<td>Fulfilled teaching assignment on AOR.</td>
<td>Fulfilled teaching assignments on AOR.</td>
<td>Fulfilled teaching assignment on AOR.</td>
<td>Fulfilled teaching assignment on AOR.</td>
<td>Fulfilled teaching assignment on AOR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>More than 50% rating of (1) and/or (2) on teaching evaluations in one or more courses (with number of respondents &gt; 10) in the evaluation period</td>
<td>More than 50% 3s, 4s, and 5s for overall instructor rating (item 13 on SPCI) for each course and each semester a teaching evaluation is completed for courses meeting guidelines for evaluations</td>
<td>Between 0.5 and 1.0 standard deviations (s.d.) above the department mean of overall instructor rating (item 13 on SPCI) for each course and each semester a teaching evaluation is completed for courses meeting guidelines for evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 1.0 s.d. above department mean of overall instructor rating (item 13 on SPCI) for each course and each semester a teaching evaluation is completed for courses meeting guidelines for evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td>Shows a pattern of chronically low achievement as evidenced by consistently being rated poorly.</td>
<td>AND</td>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Failed to respond to official concerns as identified in previous evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td>At least 2 of the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td>At least 1 of the list in the “Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations” column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T1. Mentored UG and/or Grad student(s) as evidenced by supporting documentation (e.g., conferences, presentations, publication, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T2. Developed a new course, approved by department &amp; college curriculum committees</td>
<td></td>
<td>Received a teaching, mentoring /or advising award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T3. Served as committee member and/or university representative on thesis or dissertation committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T5. Mentored a Graduate Teaching Assistant (e.g., meet regularly, planning, evaluating)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T6. Had one or more new course preparations, or made substantial revisions to an existing course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T7. Delivered a professional development activity(s) for teaching that was at least 3 cumulative hours (e.g., webinars, workshops, conference presentation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T8. Attended a professional development activity for teaching that was at least 3 hours and provided evidence of incorporating the PD into teaching/position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T9. Received ratings of 70% on item 4 on the SPCI (critical thinking) across all courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T10. Received ratings of 70% for item 9 on the SPCI (meaningful feedback) across all courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does not Meet FSU’s High Expectations</th>
<th>Official Concern</th>
<th>Meets FSU’s High Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations</th>
<th>Significantly Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failed to fulfill research assignment on AOR.</td>
<td>Fulfilled research assignment on AOR. AND Exhibited a pattern of effort that fails to build upon a record of scholarship.</td>
<td>Fulfilled research assignment on AOR and is on a trajectory that meets criteria as defined in the STE and university P&amp;T guidelines during the evaluation period.</td>
<td>Fulfilled research assignment on AOR. AND At least 1 of the following: R1. Published scholarly work (with a FSU byline) R2. Published as single author in a refereed venue R3. Published work with a graduate student in a refereed venue R4. Present a referred paper at a national or international conference R5. Presented at a state, regional, national, and/or international conference R6. Sponsored a scholar and produced a product R7. Received an internal or external award for research</td>
<td>Fulfilled research assignment on AOR. 2 or more from the list in the “Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations” column</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R8. Keynote/plenary (not invited speaker) speaker (include letter of invitation from conference chairs or program listing)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>Official Concern</th>
<th>Meets FSU’s High Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations</th>
<th>Significantly Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failed to fulfill service assignment on AOR.</td>
<td>Fulfilled service assignment on AOR.</td>
<td>Fulfilled service assignment on AOR and participates in program and departmental meetings.</td>
<td>Fulfilled service assignment on AOR.</td>
<td>Fulfilled service assignment on AOR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
<td>At least 1 of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was consistently non-participatory.</td>
<td></td>
<td>At least 2 or more of the following:</td>
<td>S15. Chair or co-chair for a department, college, or university committee, or QER committee, that meets on a regular basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td>S1. Served on Department or College Committee (including ad hoc) that meets at least twice per semester</td>
<td>S16. Chair or co-chair for a professional organization established committee that meets at least twice a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chronically failed to meet deadlines</td>
<td></td>
<td>S2. Served on a professional organization committee</td>
<td>S17. Chair or co-chair for a professional organization conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S3. Served on a Faculty Senate approved committee</td>
<td>S18. Leadership role (e.g., President, President-elect, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, Executive Board) for a professional organization that meets at least twice a year, or for which ongoing (e.g., monthly, quarterly) duties are maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S4. Reviewed conference proposals (more than 1) and/or reviewed manuscripts for journal (more than 1)</td>
<td>S19 Served on editorial board for refereed journal (include journal name and list of board members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S5. Served on a Quality Enhancement Review (QER) committee for external program review (e.g., GPC or UPC subcommittee)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S6. Provide services (not paid for by an external source) for accreditation processes for organizations such as FLDOE, CAEP, or Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs)</td>
<td>AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S7. Sponsor education related university recognized student organization (RSO)</td>
<td><strong>At least 2</strong> from the list in the “Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations” column</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S8. Nominated and/or received a service award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S9. Provided P &amp; T reviews (one or more) for other institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S10. Served as an official mentor for a faculty member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S11. Served on a community project or committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S12. Participated a minimum of two recruitment events/activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S13. Exceptional contribution in a service area as documented by evidence provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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