

**EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY  
AND  
LEARNING SYSTEMS**

**BY-LAWS AND PROCEDURES**



Revised: 15 November 2010

Revised: 17 February 2012

Revised: 8 February 2013

Revised: 6 May 2015

## Table of Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	3
Mission Statement.....	3
<b>DEPARTMENT BY-LAWS</b> .....	3
I. Overview .....	3
II. Guidelines for EPLS Departmental Governance .....	3
III. The Department Chair.....	5
IV. Guidelines for Hiring New Faculty .....	6
V. Guidelines for Admission of Graduate Students.....	6
VI. Guidelines for Standing Committees.....	6
VII. Guidelines for the EPLS By-laws Committee.....	8
VIII. Guidelines for the EPLS Curriculum Committee .....	8
IX. Guidelines for the EPLS Faculty Evaluation Committee.....	8
X. Guidelines for the EPLS Promotion and Tenure Committee.....	9
XI. Guidelines for the Advisory Council of EPLS Students (ACES).....	10
XII. History of EPLS By-laws .....	11
<b>DEPARTMENT PROCEDURES</b> .....	11
Procedures for Annual Merit Evaluation .....	11
Appendix A: Evaluation Rubric.....	16
Appendix B: Report .....	24
Procedures for Promotion and Tenure .....	25

## INTRODUCTION

### Mission Statement

## DEPARTMENT BY-LAWS

### I. Overview

The Department of Educational Psychology and Learning Systems (EPLS) was founded in 1948 under the title “Education.” By the early 1960s the department was reconstituted and renamed “Educational Research & Testing.” In 1969 three distinct programs existed: Educational Evaluation and Measurement, Educational Psychology, and Instructional Systems Design. During a reorganization of the college in 1978, the department annexed programs in educational foundations and was renamed “Educational Research, Development, and Foundations.” In the mid-1980s history and philosophy of education majors left the department to form an independent department named “Educational Foundations.” As a result, the remaining programs in the department amended the name to “Educational Research.” In 1992, the Sport Psychology major joined the department, and the consolidation of majors resulted in two major program areas in the department: (1) Instructional Systems, and (2) Educational Psychology (consisting of majors in Learning & Cognition, Measurement & Statistics, Program Evaluation (which has since move to another department), and Sport Psychology). On July 1, 2002 the Psychological Services in Education program (later renamed Psychological and Counseling Services) joined the department, and therefore the name of the department was changed to “Educational Psychology and Learning Systems” to better reflect the mission and composition of the programs.

Additionally, the department has connections with the Learning Systems Institute (LSI), a research and development center apart from the College of Education. LSI has faculty lines but not an academic mission in the sense of admitting majors and offering courses. Thus, faculty members in LSI earn tenure and promotion through their academic departments, and EPLS has been the primary academic home for many LSI faculty.

### II. Guidelines for EPLS Departmental Governance

#### A. Program Areas

1. The three program areas of the Department include Educational Psychology, Instructional Systems, and Psychological and Counseling Services.
2. A determination to remove or add a program area would require a vote of the full faculty and adherence to policies and procedures as specified by the college and the university.
3. Each program area will work with the Department Chair to select a program leader who will work with the Chair to coordinate between program areas.

#### B. General Governance

1. The Department Chair and program leaders will be responsible for addressing governance matters.
2. Governance matters will be reviewed periodically by the department chair and program representatives, and findings will be presented to the faculty.
3. The Department Chair will explain and discuss with the program leaders reasons for any recommended actions. The program leaders will inform EPLS faculty members of any changes prior to scheduled voting.

**C. By-laws**

1. The by-laws shall be reviewed annually by the By-laws Committee.
2. Amendments to the by-laws will be submitted to the faculty for review and comment for a period of no less than two weeks.
3. Unanimous consent to accept the proposed amendments will be requested from the faculty; barring such consent the faculty will be asked to discuss and vote on proposed changes at the first convened full faculty meeting that follows the review period.

**D. Voting Eligibility**

1. All tenured or tenure-earning faculty with appointments in the department are eligible to vote.
2. Non-tenure line faculty members with duties and responsibilities associated with the department may be granted voting privileges by vote of the tenured and tenure-earning faculty.
3. Non-tenure line faculty without voting status may be invited to some faculty meetings in ex officio status at the discretion of the Department Chair or the chair of a department committee.

**E. Procedures for Voting by Eligible Faculty**

1. Voting will be undertaken if a majority (i.e., half plus one of the eligible voting faculty less those faculty members on sabbatical or other official leave) of the voting faculty are present at a faculty meeting or have submitted (or will submit) a vote in absentia via email or paper submission.
2. Votes may be submitted entirely via email if the motion to be voted upon is posted on two weeks for review, comments, and suggestion of amendments. After this time the Department Chair will call for adoption and unanimous consent. If there are no objections, the motion will pass. If a faculty member objects, a face-to-face meeting will be called to discuss the motion before voting.
3. Email votes shall be submitted via a verified FSU email address.

**F. Procedures for Calling and Scheduling Meetings of the Full Faculty**

1. Each calendar year two standing meetings will be held, near the beginnings of the fall and spring semesters.
2. Additional meetings may be called at the discretion of the Chair or by petition of 25% of the voting faculty.

3. Except in case of emergencies, faculty shall be given at least one week's notice regarding the date, time, and place of faculty meetings, and due diligence shall be exercised to avoid known scheduling conflicts.

### **III. The Department Chair**

#### **A. Selection of Department Chair**

1. The Department Chair shall be selected by nomination and faculty vote during a biannual full faculty meeting. This selection shall be acted upon pending the final approval of the Dean.
2. The Department Chair will serve for a term of three years. Every three years the faculty will render a vote of confidence in the chair's continued leadership. In the absence of a vote of confidence, a formal vote on a newly nominated chair will take place.
3. There will be no limit on the number of consecutive terms for a Department Chair.
4. If the Chair, through resignation, absence from campus, illness, or other reasons becomes unable to fulfill the Chair's duties, the faculty will, in consultation with the office of the Dean, meet to nominate and vote on a new interim or permanent chair.

#### **B. Duties of the Department Chair**

1. The Department Chair will preside over the biannual full faculty meetings and any other meetings of the full faculty.
2. The Department Chair will represent the interests and opinions of the faculty to the College Dean and to other administrators.
3. The Department Chair will communicate policies, decisions, and other administrative concerns and issues to be deliberated from the administration to the faculty for their consideration.
4. The Department Chair will supervise the duties and performance of the department administrator.
5. The Department Chair will manage the department's budget and maintain appropriate financial records in accordance with university policies and guidelines.
6. The Department Chair will oversee the functioning of the department and will facilitate the progress of the department toward meeting its aspirational goals.
7. The Department Chair will oversee election and/or assignment of faculty to department, college, and university committees in accordance with the by-laws.
8. The Department Chair, in consultation with faculty, has the discretion to make space allocation, procedural, and administrative decisions for all other departmental determinations not specified in these by-laws.

#### **IV. Guidelines for Hiring New Faculty**

- A. Faculty within each program area may submit to the chair formal proposals indicating requests for positions within program areas and may make suggestions regarding the rank of potential hiring lines.
- B. Following the authorization of a position by the Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair and faculty, a search committee and chair will be appointed by the Dean in consultation with the chair.
- C. The search committee will draft a position advertisement in accordance with the policies and procedures of the university and will post this advertisement for at least one month in venues appropriate to the expected responsibilities and qualifications of the position.
- D. Other responsibilities of the search committee will include review of all applicant materials; contacting applicants, their major professors, and recommenders, when appropriate; coordination of on campus interviews; coordination of faculty feedback regarding candidates; and recommendation of a hiring decision to the Chair and Dean.
- E. Faculty input regarding candidates is to be solicited both formally and informally. Faculty members are expected to make an effort to attend the candidates' presentations, and to meet with the candidates during on-campus interviews.

#### **V. Guidelines for Admission of Graduate Students**

- A. Each program area (i.e., Educational Psychology, Instructional Systems, and Psychological and Counseling Services) will develop guidelines and procedures for the recruitment, review, and admission of new part-time and full-time graduate students to its Masters and Doctoral level degree programs.
- B. Each program area may approve differentiated protocols for its subsidiary degree programs.
- C. Each program area will submit recommendations for applicant admission to the Chair, who will make final determination regarding admission in consultation with the program faculty.

#### **VI. Guidelines for Standing Committees**

##### **A. General Guidelines**

The following guidelines for the Department Committees are meant to prevent duplication of effort as much as possible. In addition to the guidelines, it is expected that each committee will develop its own internal procedures to carry out these guidelines in the fairest, most effective, and most efficient way. It is recognized that such procedures will vary from committee to committee, and that

they will be modified from time to time as circumstances change, and as committee members acquire experience and particular committee expertise. However, modifications of purpose will require approval of the department faculty.

**B. Committee Service**

1. As a general rule, during the committee term, no EPLS faculty member should serve on more than two EPLS standing committees.

**C. Replacements on Standing Committees**

1. Replacements (because of illness, resignation, absence from campus, etc.) shall be selected in a manner consistent with the original selection procedure.

**D. Committee Membership**

1. To serve on an EPLS standing committee a person must be an EPLS voting faculty member except in the case of student advisory committee in which case,
  - a. A person must be a degree-seeking EPLS graduate student in good standing.
2. The Department Chair is an ex officio member of all standing and ad hoc committees and is to be kept apprised of their process and progress in completing committee tasks and responsibilities.

**E. Faculty Committee Meetings**

1. Any EPLS Any EPLS faculty member or student may initiate a petition for a faculty meeting, having failed to have a meeting called through the regular channels.
2. An EPLS faculty meeting will be held if one fourth of the EPLS voting faculty members petition for it.
3. An EPLS faculty meeting will be held if one third of the currently enrolled full-time EPLS students petition for it.

**F. Election of Representative to the Faculty Senate**

1. If representatives are needed, faculty members are to be nominated and voted on as departmental representatives at the spring biannual full faculty meeting.
2. Nominations will be in compliance with the university rules regarding eligibility for Faculty Senate.

**G. Reviews**

1. Each committee will be responsible for conducting a yearly review of its procedures. This review ideally should be carried out when the committee is formed as a new committee after the spring full faculty meeting. If necessary, the committee will recommend changes to the EPLS Department Chair.

## **VII. Guidelines for the EPLS By-laws Committee**

### **A. Purposes and Duties**

1. To review, on an annual basis, the by-laws of the department.
2. To ensure that the EPLS by-laws are consistent with the by-laws and policies of the Florida State University and the College of Education.
3. To propose amendments to the by-laws, and to submit them to the full faculty for review and comment for a period of no less than two weeks.

### **B. Committee Membership**

1. Each program will elect one member.
2. Committee members will be elected for a one-year term.
3. The committee shall elect its own chairperson.

### **C. Committee Procedures**

1. The committee will meet at the call of the committee's chairperson.

## **VIII. Guidelines for the EPLS Curriculum Committee**

### **A. Purposes and Duties**

1. To review proposals for new and modified courses and programs for the department.
2. To propose changes in policy regarding courses, advising, and curriculum that are of general import to the department.
3. To develop and review procedures for the evaluation of curriculum matters in the department.

### **B. Committee Membership**

1. Each program will elect one member.
2. Committee members will be elected for a one-year term.
3. The chair of the committee shall serve as the representative to the college Curriculum Committee.

### **C. Committee Procedures**

1. The committee will meet at the call of the committee's chairperson, typically in advance of the meetings of the college Curriculum Committee.

## **IX. Guidelines for the EPLS Faculty Evaluation Committee**

### **A. Purposes and Duties**

1. To design faculty evaluation criteria and procedures for the department.

2. To communicate the evaluation criteria and procedures to the faculty in a timely fashion.
3. To implement the evaluation procedures for the annual evaluation, for merit, and for sustained performance evaluation after every seven years in rank.
4. To advocate, review, and monitor procedures that contribute to professional advancement of untenured and junior members of the faculty, and to monitor performance of tenured faculty.

#### **B. Committee Membership**

1. Each program will elect two members. Faculty will also elect two at-large members from any of the three program areas in the department for a total of eight representatives on the committee.
2. Committee members will be elected for a two-year term.
3. A committee member may not serve more than three consecutive years on this committee (i.e., one complete 2-year term and one partial term as a replacement member) and each faculty member is encouraged to be a committee member at least every five years.
4. The chairperson will be named by the Department Chair from among committee membership.

#### **C. Committee Procedures**

1. The committee will meet at the call of the committee's chairperson.
2. All candidates for annual evaluation, graduate faculty status, and merit pay within EPLS shall be reviewed by the committee.
3. The committee may report on its work to the EPLS faculty at a meeting of the faculty.
4. The committee will follow the Board of Governors, University, and College of Education regulations and guidelines.
5. The Department Chair will discuss with the committee any anticipated action which is contrary to the committee's recommendations.
6. Additional guidelines for the duties and responsibilities of the Faculty Evaluation Committee for the Annual Review are specified in the separate procedures sections regarding each of these duties.

### **X. Guidelines for the EPLS Promotion and Tenure Committee**

#### **A. Purposes and Duties**

1. To design criteria and procedures for tenure and promotion in the department.
2. To communicate the criteria and procedures to the faculty in a timely fashion.
3. To implement the evaluation procedures for departmental promotion and tenure.

## **B. Committee Membership**

1. Each program area will elect two representatives.
2. The members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be tenured members of the department faculty.
3. Committee members will be elected for a two-year term.
4. A committee member may not serve more than three consecutive years on this committee (i.e., one complete 2-year term and one partial term as a replacement member) and each faculty member is encouraged to be a committee member at least every five years.
5. The chairperson will be named by the Department Chair from among the committee membership.

## **C. Committee Procedures**

1. The committee will meet at the call of the committee's chairperson.
2. All tenure-earning faculty shall have their second- and fourth-year review binders reviewed by the committee. If the College or University changes the procedures for review of progress towards tenure, the committee shall adapt their schedule to follow the College or University procedure.
3. All tenured Associate Professors are eligible to have their progress towards the rank of Full Professor evaluated by the committee. This review shall be performed automatically 3 years after a faculty member is promoted by FSU from Assistant to Associate Professor. It may also happen upon written, including email, request from the candidate to the chair of the committee.
4. The committee may report on its work to the EPLS faculty at the end of each term.
5. The committee will follow the Board of Governors, University, and College of Education regulations and guidelines.
6. The Department Chair will discuss with the committee any anticipated action which is contrary to the committee's recommendations.
7. The committee will develop and review departmental guidelines for evaluating nominees for promotion and tenure, and for second- and fourth-year review, to be specified in the separate procedures sections regarding each of these duties.
8. The committee will follow the guidelines specified in the separate procedures sections regarding each of these duties.

# **XI. Guidelines for the Advisory Council of EPLS Students (ACES)**

## **A. Purposes and Duties**

1. To represent the interests of EPLS students to the department.
2. To comment on departmental policies, procedures and practices, which influence students' lives and activities. (Examples are: grading policies,

quality of instruction, support for students, fellowship awards, coordination and scheduling of courses.)

**B. Committee Membership and Procedures**

1. Each program area will be represented by at least one degree-seeking student on the council. The students will be elected annually by the currently enrolled degree-seeking students.
2. The student members of ACES shall decide on procedures for choosing their own representatives, and establishing their own rules for council governance.
3. The Department Chair shall appoint a faculty member to advise the council, and to act as liaison between the council and the faculty members.
4. Each calendar year the ACES shall make a progress report of its activities at the end of the fall term.

**C. Liaison**

1. One student designated by the ACES shall serve on the College of Education Student Advisory Council.
2. ACES may invite EPLS standing committee representatives to meet with the ACES.

**D. Review of Procedures**

1. The ACES will be responsible for conducting a yearly review of its procedures. This review ideally should be carried out when the council is formed as a new council in the spring of each year. If necessary, the ACES will propose recommended changes to the EPLS Department Chair and program representatives.

**XII. History of EPLS By-laws**

Department Established: 1948

By-laws Adopted: 2003

Revision Adopted: January, 2011

Second Revision Adopted: February, 2012

Third Revision Adopted: February, 2013

Fourth Revision, Not Yet Adopted

**DEPARTMENT PROCEDURES**

**Procedures for Annual Merit Evaluation**

**I. Overview**

The Florida Administrative Code and the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the State University System of Florida and the United Faculty of Florida direct that faculty and professional staff shall be evaluated for merit at least once annually. The Faculty

Evaluation Committee of the Department of Educational Psychology and Learning Systems (EPLS) has developed the following set of procedures for meeting that directive.

## **II. Eligible Faculty**

1. All faculty members who receive their salary from the Department, including faculty appointed less than full time, will be required to participate in the merit evaluation procedure.
2. Department faculty members whose salaries are determined by other units may participate at their option.

## **III. Membership on the Faculty Evaluation Committee**

1. A committee of eight faculty members from the department will constitute the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC).
2. Membership of the committee is to include two faculty members from each of the department's three programs (Educational Psychology, Psychological and Counseling Services, and Instructional Systems), and two at-large members from any of the three programs. The current Department Chair is not eligible for membership.
3. The members of the FEC from the three programs are elected by their respective program faculty, whereas the at-large members are elected by the entire EPLS faculty.
4. The FEC then splits into two subcommittees of 4 members each, one of which is to review the areas of Teaching and Service, and the other is to review Research.
5. Faculty members are elected to the committee for a two-year term, and may serve no more than three consecutive years (i.e., one complete 2-year term and one year as a replacement committee member). Every full-time faculty member will be expected to serve at least once within any five-year period. The Department Chair will appoint the chair of the committee from among the elected members.
6. Guidelines regarding the composition of the Faculty Evaluation Committee within the EPLS By-laws supersede the guidelines herein; attention should be given to periodically aligning these documents as necessary.

## **IV. Areas to be Evaluated**

1. The Faculty Evaluation Committee is to evaluate the relative productivity of each faculty member in the areas of *teaching*, *research*, and *service* as noted above.
2. Evidence of the quality and quantity of this productivity is to be contained in the Annual Professional Achievement Record. The APAR is to contain evidence of productivity for the prior calendar year.
3. Each faculty member is responsible for preparing her or his APAR for review by the evaluation committee. Specific content and format of the APAR is given in the attached Format for Annual Professional Achievement Record. As noted in the attachment, the APAR is to include an up-to-date vita, and may include additional evidence of productivity.

## **V. Timetable for the Evaluation Process**

1. Individual faculty members are to submit their Annual Professional Achievement Records by February 1 of each year or other agreed upon date per the specifications of the Department Chair and the College. Faculty shall be given at least one month's notice of any change in date.
2. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will review the APARs and conduct an evaluation according to the procedures outlined below. The committee chair will present the evaluations to the Department Chair by a date set by the Department Chair and the College.

## **VI. Evaluation Procedures**

### **A. General Guidelines**

1. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will provide independent ratings of productivity in teaching, research, and service. That is, ratings of performance in one area, such as teaching, are not to influence the rating in another area, such as research.
2. To help bring about independent ratings, each committee member is to complete the ratings of all faculty members in one area before beginning ratings in subsequent areas. To facilitate independent reviews between areas, each faculty member's APAR is to be separated into sections pertaining to teaching, research, and service. Each of these may contain a section designated 'Additional Evidence' for items of a discretionary nature.

### **B. Evaluation Process and Rubric**

1. The evaluation process takes into consideration that
  - a. Different faculty have different responsibilities and contributions in the teaching, research, and service areas, and
  - b. Productivity in each area reflects both quality and quantity of work.
2. The primary task of the Faculty Evaluation Committee is to assess the relative productivity of each faculty member in each of the three areas. The specific evaluation rubric by which faculty members shall complete these ratings is included in Appendix A (Annual Evaluation Rubric).
3. The evaluation of each faculty member is to reflect the productivity of that member, taking into consideration both quantity and quality of products.
4. Each committee member will rate all eligible faculty members, but will not rate him or herself.
5. Overall ratings are to be used to control the distribution of merit salary increases. As such, only those faculty members whose merit pay is determined by the EPLS department will receive overall ratings. These will be determined by the Department Chair based on the three median area ratings provided by the committee.

6. The overall rating for a faculty member is a weighted aggregate of ratings received in teaching, research, and service. The weights which determine the overall rating should represent the faculty member's best estimate of the relative importance of the contributions that she or he made in the three different areas.
7. The eligible faculty member will submit weights for the coming year to the Department Chair for approval in a meeting taking place sometime during March or April, and the chair must approve them. Minimum weights for the teaching, research, and service areas will be 30%, 30%, and 5%, respectively. Exceptions to the minimum weights are appropriate in special circumstances (e.g., course buy-out, department chair and other administrative appointments).
8. It is expected that these evaluation weights will tend to follow the faculty assignment percentages on the Assignment of Responsibilities, but they do not necessarily have to be equal to those assignment percentages.
9. If appropriate due to changing circumstances, the evaluation weights may be revised, with approval by the chair, early in the Fall semester of the academic year.
10. The overall rating for each faculty member is derived by multiplying the median ratings in each area by the individual's weights for those areas and rounding to the nearest tenth. For example, if a faculty member's median ratings in teaching, research, and service are 2.5, 3.0 and 2.0, respectively, and their negotiated weights are 55%, 30%, and 15%, the overall ratings would be  $(.55)(2.5) + (.30)(3.0) + (.15)(2.0) = 2.575$ , rounded to 2.58.

### **C. Special Faculty Circumstances**

Non-tenured or non-tenure-earning faculty are to be evaluated by their Supervisors (e.g., Department Chair, Principal Investigator) in accordance with the rules and specifications set by the College or the alternative hiring unit (e.g., LSI) and the University.

### **D. Feedback to Faculty**

1. By March 1, or other date agreed upon by the Department Chair and College, the chair of the committee provides the Department Chair with the following for each faculty member:
  - a. The individual rating scores assigned, and
  - b. The median ratings awarded in teaching, research, and service.
2. In individual meetings, the Department Chair is to inform each faculty member of the ratings awarded by the committee in teaching, research, and service.
  - a. The Department Chair will discuss the adequacy of the individual's productivity in these three areas.
  - b. This discussion is expected to reflect the Department Chair's evaluation of the department's overall productivity in each area and the contribution of the faculty member to this overall productivity.

- c. If at all possible this review will occur within four weeks of the conclusion of Spring Break.
3. The faculty member will be given a copy of summary statistics for the department for both his/her overall rating and his/her ratings for the teaching, research, and service areas.
4. Following the distribution of the committee's ratings, any faculty member may request feedback from the committee regarding his or her strengths or weaknesses, and how she or he might improve future performance. Such a request should be made within 10 workdays of receipt of the Faculty Evaluation Committee's ratings, and should be made directly to the chairperson of the committee.
5. Upon receipt of the request for feedback, the chairperson of the Faculty Evaluation Committee will appoint a four-person subcommittee consisting of at least one representative from each of the three programs in the department, and one at-large member from the department.
  - a. The four subcommittee members will review the Annual Professional Achievement Record; discuss the record, as desired, with other committee members; and meet with the faculty member to discuss the record.
  - b. This feedback process is neither an appeal nor a grievance procedure, and thus is not designed to challenge or defend numerical ratings already assigned by the committee. In contrast, this process is aimed at assisting a faculty member to improve future performance.

#### **E. Faculty Appeal Process**

1. There are two levels of appeal in the evaluation process:
  - a. *Level 1.* Each faculty member will receive a copy of the Faculty Evaluation Summary Record which indicates his or her median ratings in teaching, research, and service, and the weighted, aggregated overall rating. If a faculty member believes the rating in any area does not reflect his or her relative performance as documented in the APAR, the faculty member may appeal the rating by explaining in writing to the Chair of the department the basis of disagreement as provided in the Faculty Handbook and Collective Bargaining Agreement. Based on the rating information and the faculty member's appeal, the Department Chair will provide a written response to the appeal within two weeks.
  - b. *Level 2.* If merit pay is available, each faculty member will, prior to the beginning of the next academic year, receive an indication of his or her merit increase that should be related to the ratings received in the peer review. If a faculty member believes that the merit increase does not correspond to their rating, the merit increase may be appealed to the dean or grieved via the official university procedure.

#### **F. Merit**

1. Merit will be based on a three year rolling average of the overall ratings for each faculty member. If a faculty member has been at FSU for fewer than 3 years, a one- or two-year average will be used, as appropriate.
2. The Chair will rank order faculty using their rolling averages. The Chair will then classify the faculty into either three or four categories, at the discretion of the Chair, or into categories determined by higher level administrative units of the university.
3. The rankings and categories will be transmitted to the Dean.
4. To facilitate the faculty member's review of her or his merit raise the Chair will distribute in a timely manner a table that provides the mean across three years of the overall ratings of each faculty member, listed in descending order, with faculty names removed.

#### **G. Annual Review of Merit Evaluation Process**

1. Each fall the Faculty Evaluation Committee will review the Procedures for Annual Merit Evaluation of Faculty each year, and recommend changes as seem appropriate to the faculty for consideration and a vote.
2. Changes require endorsement of two-thirds of the faculty voting. Changes may be brought to the faculty at any time, but all changes will apply to the next evaluation cycle.

#### **H. Sustained Performance Evaluation**

1. This shall occur once every seven years after a faculty member's last promotion or tenure decision, or at a different interval set by the college or university.
2. The Chair shall create the sustained performance evaluation by summarizing the past six years' worth of Merit Evaluations.

### **Appendix A: Evaluation Rubric**

#### **Educational Psychology and Learning Systems Annual Faculty Evaluation Rubric**

##### **Procedures**

The evaluation procedure will include the following steps and elements each year:

1. Faculty will complete and submit the self-report APAR documentation of activity and products representing the work of the preceding calendar year in areas of teaching, research, and service. These will be completed in January and February of each year, per the dates and deadlines set each year by the College, EPLS Faculty Evaluation Committee, and the Department Chair.
2. Using the attached rubric, Faculty Evaluation Committee Members will review the forms and statements submitted and provide each faculty member a score in one or more of the three areas of Research, Teaching, and Service, as assigned to them by the Evaluation Committee Chair. The committee will meet to discuss the ratings, particularly in cases where the scores given are

disparate, to arrive at a consensus rating. The committee's discussion will remain confidential. All discussions and consensus scoring will take place before scores are reported to the Department Chair.

3. Ratings on each of the three areas will be reported by the Faculty Evaluation Committee to the Department Chair, and ultimately, in the Chair's letter, to the individual faculty member.
4. The Chair may modify ratings submitted by the committee based on additional information not available to the committee. If ratings are modified in this way, it will be made explicit in the report to the faculty member.
5. The ratings to be reported on the FSU Annual Evaluation Summary Form shall be determined using the Chair's final ratings, according to the following table:

<b>Rating from Evaluation Rubric (X)</b>	<b>Performance Category</b>
$1 \leq X < 1.5$	Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations
$1.5 \leq X < 2$	Official Concern
$2 \leq X < 2.5$	Meets FSU's High Expectations
$2.5 \leq X < 3$	Exceeds FSU's High Expectations
3	Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations

### **Guiding Principles for the Evaluation Rubric**

The evaluation rubric incorporates some explicit distinction of expectations for junior faculty (traditionally designated as those without tenure), and more senior faculty; particularly those at the Professor level. Any junior faculty member can request to be evaluated using the senior faculty criterion if they think it will be to their advantage. Further, in light of the diversity of faculty roles, joint appointments, and range of research fields, the rubric also incorporates a broad range of 'equivalencies' (typically represented within sentences divided by ';' or more explicitly by 'OR') so it is evident to both the submitting faculty member and the Evaluation Committee what can and should be considered in the various score ranges.

Within the structure of the rubric, with rating options ranging from 1-3, all faculty are considered to 'default' into a rating of 2. Review of the submitted materials in accordance with the rubric would then determine whether faculty should be considered underperforming (and thus potentially be lowered to the 1.5 or 1 rating) or exceeding expectations, (and thus potentially be elevated to the 2.5 or 3 rating). These decisions would be made independently across the three separate areas of teaching, research, and service. A specific line item in the self-report APAR forms may not list each possible element in the rubric; any additional elements may be included under the Other Evidence section of each form.

## Teaching

### To be considered:

- Courses taught on and off campus. Number of students and credit hours. SPCI form summary pages for each course taught.
- Numbers of graduate and undergrad advisees, masters theses chaired, doctoral students chaired, master/doctoral committees, number of undergraduate and graduate DIS/Supervised Research enrollees, other advising responsibilities.
- New course development and/or teaching innovations (inclusive of courses/workshops/online tutorials, and other instructional materials developed and delivered as part of grant-funded projects). Note that where not specifically requested on the evaluation forms, evidence of these activities should be included under the “Other Evidence” section for Teaching.
- Examples of special assistance to affirmative action students, students with disabilities, international students.
- Recruitment efforts related to undergraduate and graduate students.
- Mentoring activities that involve guiding students in professional activities related to teaching, research skills, publications, or conference presentations.
- Personal statements and letters from current and former students, as well as others with knowledge of teaching performance.

### Evaluation Rubric:

Rating	Teaching
1	Consistently low (i.e., 1’s and 2’s) SPCI ratings in courses taught within evaluation period, evidence of not meeting expectations of teaching responsibilities in accordance with <i>expected</i> role and number of courses (i.e., as assigned by AOR and to be specified as needed by faculty in their submission materials); minimal advising and mentoring activities. Note however, that in the event a faculty member has consistently low SPCI ratings, but also meets one or more criterion for ratings in the 2 or 3 range, then a higher rating may be appropriate and can be assigned.
2	Evidence points to meeting of expected involvement in teaching activities; evidence of new and/or innovative approaches to teaching; SPCI evaluations are positive and satisfactory; Evidence of active advising and guidance committee responsibilities; evidence of positive mentoring outcomes; Overall picture is one of fairly solid contributions in the teaching area within this ranking range.
3	Nomination for or awarding of a teaching award; Inclusion on the Provosts 90% list for teaching excellence; Receipt of a training grant for specialized undergraduate or graduate training; Evidence of novel contributions to curriculum such as development of new courses or substantially new material for a course; Evidence of exceptional support for students such as particularly high numbers (“high” to be indicated and explained within the narrative provided by the faculty member) of chaired theses/doctoral committees (for senior faculty), advising support to high numbers of students via chairing or committee membership for thesis or doctoral committees (for junior faculty who have not yet had time to accumulate students), high numbers of supervised research advisees, high

numbers of Teaching Assistants supervised, or for any rank considerable support for student participation in writing and presentations (e.g., papers submitted or published or conference presentations co-authored with students); For senior faculty, evidence of knowledge transmission (as related to teaching) in paper presentations, journal and/or magazine articles, and books, or evidence of knowledge generation as evidenced by research proposals and grant applications related to post-secondary teaching. Additionally, there may be evidence of successful competition or application for teaching and training grants. For all faculty members, evidence of regular group meetings focused on building students' conceptual or analytic skills and knowledge also would be considered. Overall, there is evidence of considerable involvement and leadership in teaching-related activities.

## Research

### To be considered:

- Collaborative or independent research finished or in progress, inclusive of conduct/supervision of field work/data collection where appropriate and of writing manuscripts in progress or under review (if not published during calendar year, list under Other Evidence).
- Grant proposals in progress, submitted, or awarded/ongoing (only the latter would be listed as a grant for the year, in the designated slots, the others to be listed as Other Evidence. Grants should be designated as competitive or noncompetitive and the amount listed.)
- Publications: Papers published and/or in press, designated by whether or not they were peer reviewed. Books, edited books, and/or book chapters. (Note that those published during the evaluation period will be located in the designated area on the research form, but those in press will be listed under Other Evidence.)
- Published book and/or article reviews, editorial columns.
- Proceedings papers.
- Publication of a new assessment measure (either within a published manuscript or as a stand-alone publication).
- Papers presented at regional, national or international conferences.
- Interim and final research reports submitted.
- Technical reports and/or monographs, inclusive of instructional manuals/websites/etc. created as part of a research grant.
- Distinctions and/or awards related to research or scholarship.
- Invited addresses at the state/regional, national or international level.

### Evaluation Rubric:

#### Rating Research/Scholarship

- 1 Limited evidence of research/scholarship activity this past year. No published peer-reviewed papers, books, or book chapters, few or no conference presentations. Little indication of anything in the way of research or scholarship activity in progress (e.g., manuscripts under review, grant applications in revision, conference presentations submitted for the following calendar year).
- 2 Evidence of working collaboratively or independently doing research or producing scholarly products; work may involve data gathering and/or analysis, theoretical contributions, or literature analysis as evidenced by published papers, chapters, books, or presentations (particularly under peer review); evidence of articles and/or paper presentations accepted and/or pending; research proposals funded or pending or in revision; overall the picture is one of ongoing efforts to do scholarly work and make contributions to one's field. For either rank, receipt of a noncompetitive but empirical grant would qualify for consideration at this level. Typical expectation for junior faculty would be 2 publications per year (peer-reviewed) or a combination of 1 peer-reviewed publication and numerous competitive conference presentations and non-peer reviewed publications and evidence of future publications or grants in progress (i.e., in press or under review). Typical expectations for senior faculty would be 2-3 or more peer-reviewed publications per year, or a combination of 1-2 peer-reviewed publications and multiple non-peer reviewed publications and/or numerous competitive conference presentations, or evidence of future publications or grants in progress (i.e., in press

or under review).

- 3 Evidence of state, national, and perhaps even international recognition; record of publication in reputable journals, books with chapters by major figures in a field, and papers at national meetings; publications may range from journal articles to book chapters, to books; evidence of providing leadership and effective coordination of major research projects and/or scholarly undertakings. Evidence of exceeding expectations at the *junior* level would include 3 or more peer-reviewed publications, and/or one or more competitive grants received, and/or editing a published book or journal special issue, and/or an invited address at a national/international conference. Evidence of exceeding expectations at the *senior* level would be 5 or more peer-reviewed publications, and/or a combination of multiple peer-reviewed and non-peer reviewed publications, and/or receipt of one or more competitive grants and/or multiple invited addresses at national/international conferences, and/or editing a published book or journal special issue.

## Service

### To be considered:

- To the profession, e.g., editorship, editorial board membership, proposal review committees for funding or presentations, ad hoc reviewing for journals.
- To the institution, e.g., committee work at the Department, College, or University level, and work on organization and/or staff development at any of three above levels.
- To the community, e.g., participation in service to particular groups, institutions, or organizations; in-service or consultative involvement to public schools and related groups; involvement in professional activity with various federal, state, local, or international agencies, boards, or other groups to advance the quality of education; organizing or implementing an institutional, local, regional, state, national, or international conference, workshop, or seminar relevant to educational issues and concerns.

### Evaluation Rubric:

#### Rating Service

- 1 An absence of much evidence indicating either interest or involvement in service-related activities -- e.g., activity in local/state/national educational groups; not meeting expectations given role in department, college, or university service activities.
- 2 *Junior faculty:* provides some degree of consultation, in-services, and other support for local or state or national groups or agencies; completes at least one ad hoc review for peer reviewed journals, sits on/participates in at least one committee at the department, college or university level.  
*Senior faculty:* provides substantial degree of consultation, in-services and other support to local or state groups or agencies or some degree of such support to national or international groups or agencies; participates actively in at least one committee at the department, college or university level.
- 3 *Junior/senior:* receipt of a noncompetitive/non-empirical grant (to provide technical assistance or training and professional development materials, for example).  
*Junior faculty:* provides substantial consultation, in-services and other support to local or state or national groups or agencies and/or provides some degree of such support to national or international groups or agencies; completes multiple ad hoc reviews for peer reviewed journals or sits on an editorial board for a journal; actively participates in multiple departmental, college or university committees; reviews conference submissions for a professional association and/or chairs/organizes a conference symposium or event.  
*Senior faculty:* provides substantial consultation, in-services, and other support to national or international groups or agencies; sits on the editorial board of several journals and/or serves as an editor of a peer reviewed journal; reviews grant proposals for funding agencies; chairs departmental, college or university committees and/or has a leadership role within the department (chair, associate chair, program coordinator); has a leadership role in a professional organization and/or organizes or delivers a conference/major workshop/faculty seminar for a professional organization or the university. Overall, faculty at this level tends to be in more positions of influence and power than is usually the case for those in the mid-range ranking.

### Further Elaboration on the Rubric Ratings for Grant/Contract Awards

For the purposes of precision in ratings, we have indicated that grants are to be evaluated along 3 parameters: Competitive/Noncompetitive and Empirical/Non-Empirical (i.e., whether or not data that could result in a publication or presentation are used as part of the grant objectives), and, where the committee deems it appropriate to discriminate, PI or Co-I standing. Each grant listed on the evaluation materials should identify the status of these three parameters in the description provided, and faculty should provide in their reporting some detail regarding the work allocation associated with their role. The Table below summarizes the rating scheme that applies (also included in the rubrics above).

The table below also details the category (Research, or Service or Teaching) under which each grant should be included based on its type and focus, so not all grants automatically get awarded credit under Research, but all grants should be considered somewhere.

The rating values indicated in the table would be assigned in that area if no other criteria for a *higher* rating were met. The current system awards higher automatic ratings for competitive grants, but enables higher ratings to be awarded for particularly large, important, or impactful noncompetitive grants as evaluated by the committee based on explanation in the faculty materials provided.

<p>Noncompetitive Empirical</p> <p>To be evaluated under <b>Research</b> PI or Co-I Standing consistent with at least a 2 rating</p>	<p>Competitive Empirical</p> <p>To be evaluated under <b>Research</b> PI or Co-I Standing consistent with a 3 rating</p>
<p>Noncompetitive Non-Empirical</p> <p>To be evaluated under <b>Service</b> or <b>Teaching</b> as most appropriate PI or Co-I Standing consistent with at least a 2 rating</p>	<p>Competitive Non-Empirical</p> <p>To be evaluated under <b>Research</b> or <b>Service</b> as best appropriate. PI or Co-I Standing consistent with a 3 rating</p>

## Appendix B: Report

### Example Report

Calendar Year 20XX  
Faculty Evaluation Summary Record  
For (insert name)

#### Ratings from Individual Raters

Teaching	3	3	2	2
Research	3	3	2.5	2
Service	3	3	3	2

#### Median Ratings and Overall Rating

Area	Weight	Median Ratings
Teaching	0.55	2.5
Research	0.30	2.75
Service	0.15	3
Overall		2.4 (rounded)

## Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

All promotion and tenure policies, procedures, and criteria used by the EPLS Department are in compliance with the policies of the University, Board of Trustees, BOT-UFF, and the College of Education.

**Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Faculty in Tenure-Earning Positions.** The following departmental policies and procedures govern the Promotion and Tenure process for faculty hired in tenure-earning positions. Faculty are normally considered for tenure in the 6<sup>th</sup> year of service in a tenure-earning position. The time points discussed below are adjusted for tenure earning faculty members who have prior-service credit granted at the time of initial employment.

**Orientation of First-Year Faculty to the Promotion and Tenure Process.** In the first semester of employment, faculty in tenure-earning positions receive printed information governing promotion and tenure including policies, procedures, and guidelines of the University, Board of Trustees, BOT-UFF, the College of Education, and the EPLS Department. The Department Chair meets with tenure-earning faculty to review the departmental promotion and tenure policies and procedures, including the Third Year Review. And, throughout the first year of employment, the Department Chair periodically meets with tenure-earning faculty to discuss their progress toward promotion and tenure, particularly in the areas of research and teaching.

**Negotiating the Research and Teaching Assignment of Responsibilities (AOR).** Prior to the start of each academic year, a tenure-earning faculty member is required to submit to the Department Chair his or her research goals and specific products or outcomes (e.g., submit articles to specific journals; collect data; present paper at national conference) for the upcoming academic year. The Department Chair then meets **or** communicates with each faculty member to negotiate the Assignment of Responsibilities (AOR) which has three primary components: 1) Research and Scholarship, 2) Instruction, and 3) Service. (See section on Assignment of Responsibilities, and College guidelines on AOR allocations.)

Once the annual assignment including the research goals and specific outcomes have been approved, the information is entered into Omni, and follows the assignment and approval process through Omni, eventually being submitted to the COE Dean's office for approval. If for any reason the COE Dean disagrees with the assignment, the AOR is returned for further negotiations between the Department Chair and the faculty member until the AOR is approved by both the Department Chair and COE Dean's office.

**Maintaining an Updated Vita and Promotion and Tenure Binder.** The Department Chair advises tenure-earning faculty in their first semester of employment to prepare an initial vita and maintain a binder (similar to the one required for the promotion and tenure process) with documentation of the faculty member's performance in the three assigned areas of responsibility during the tenure-earning years. Examples of the types of documents maintained in the binder include an updated vita, Assignment of Responsibility forms, summary results of SUSSAI/SPCI evaluations each semester, copies of journal articles submitted, accepted, or published including transmittal correspondence, copies of course outlines and course assignments, evidence of service to an academic program, the EPLS department, the COE, and the university. The Department Chair and Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Administration can provide tenure-earning faculty with model vitae. Sample binders are available in the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement.

**Scheduling Peer Evaluation of Teaching.** At least once each academic year tenure-earning faculty should have a formal peer evaluation of their teaching conducted by a tenured faculty member. The

Department Chair can provide tenure-earning faculty with names of possible peer evaluators. It is the responsibility of the faculty candidate to schedule a day and time with the peer evaluator to conduct the review. Faculty members shall be notified at least two weeks in advance of the date, time, and place of any direct classroom observation or visitation by the Department Chair made in connection with promotion and/or tenure.

**Annual Faculty Evaluation as it Relates to Promotion and Tenure.** In the spring semester of each year, tenure-earning faculty are formally evaluated by the Department Chair and the department's Evaluation Committee (see Procedures for Annual Merit Evaluation of Faculty, page 11) to determine progress being made toward tenure and/or promotion.

**Second- and Fourth-Year Reviews.** During the second and fourth years of employment, tenure-earning faculty are required to undergo a formal evaluation process similar to a promotion and tenure review. For these reviews, a faculty candidate is evaluated by the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department Chair, and the Dean of the College.

In the spring semester of the second and fourth years, the faculty candidate meets with the Chair of the Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee to discuss the preparation of a binder similar to the binder for promotion and tenure. The Associate Dean for Faculty Development in the College provides the faculty candidate with model binders to follow. With the guidance of the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the faculty candidate is expected to complete the Third Year Review binder in the spring semester in lieu of the standard annual evaluation report (APAR). This binder contains everything, in the same format, as the binder submitted for promotion and tenure, with the exception of external letters. It also serves as the annual report for the year when it is submitted.

During the spring semester, the Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee independently reviews the binder in the same manner as if the faculty candidate were being reviewed for promotion and/or tenure. The Committee then meets to formulate evaluative feedback as to whether the faculty candidate is making sufficient progress toward tenure. If the Committee makes the decision that insufficient progress is being made toward tenure, the Committee then provides the faculty member with specific recommendations. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee is responsible for providing faculty with these recommendations both orally, and in writing. A copy of the Committee's written recommendation is also submitted to the Department Chair.

**Identifying External Reviewers.** In the fourth year of employment, the Department Chair advises tenure-earning faculty to begin identifying external reviewers (see section below) for the formal promotion and tenure process.

**Preparing Promotion and Tenure Binders.** In the summer of the fifth year of employment, tenure-earning faculty who are nominated for tenure and/or promotion are actively engaged in compiling documents and data for their promotion and tenure binders. The Department Chair meets with faculty as needed to provide policy or procedure information including deadlines governing the promotion and tenure process. The Department Chair also encourages faculty candidates to attend the university sponsored promotion and tenure workshops conducted by the Office of Faculty Advancement and Development and the Associate Dean for Faculty Development in the College.

**Soliciting External Reviewers.** The Department Chair has the responsibility of soliciting external reviewers to evaluate faculty candidates. These individuals are asked to provide an objective assessment of the candidate's standing in the field and an evaluation of the quality of the candidate's contributions to their field, as well as any comments concerning teaching and service if known to the outside reviewer. The Department Chair also requests that the outside reviewer state whether or not he or she would support promotion and/or tenure for the candidate at FSU and whether or not the reviewer would support

promotion and/or tenure for this individual if he or she were a candidate at the reviewer's institution.

The Department Chair is required to solicit a minimum of three evaluative letters from outstanding scholars who are tenured, have attained the rank of full professor, and are employed at a college or university (other than FSU) deemed as a peer institution of Florida State University. The Department Chair may request the names of possible external reviewers from the candidate as well as from faculty in the candidate's academic program. Peer reviewers who do not meet these qualifications must be justified in writing as having an equivalent national or international standing by the Department Chair or the COE Dean. A copy of the external reviewer's evaluation is placed in the candidate's promotion and tenure binder.

**Complying with University Requirements.** The Department Chair is also responsible for ensuring that promotion and tenure binders are prepared in compliance with department, COE, and university requirements. The Department Chair assigns responsibilities to office staff to assist faculty in assembling promotion and tenure binders. Office staff are required to comply with established department, COE, and university requirements for preparing binders and discharge their responsibilities in a professional manner. A faculty candidate is asked to be respectful of the office staff and provide accurate information for the binder in a timely manner.

**Faculty Candidate's Responsibilities.** Faculty candidates are responsible for compiling documents and data for their promotion and tenure binders. They are also in charge of seeing that the binder is complete before it is submitted for review to the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee and to the next higher level of review to the COE's Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate's signature on the cover sheet certifies that the binder is complete, meaning that the candidate has had an opportunity to assist in its preparation and that all materials in the binder are valid and accurate. Once the cover sheet is signed, no materials may be added. The department's Promotion and Tenure Committee is responsible for nominating and voting on faculty candidates for promotion and tenure as described in the section below.

**Department Chair's Review.** After tenure and promotion decisions are made by the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee (see section below) and the department's tenured faculty (if required), the Department Chair provides the next level of review. The Department Chair is required to review the binders of faculty nominated for tenure and/or promotion and prepare an objective assessment of the candidate. The Chair is required to state in the letter whether or not he or she would support promotion and/or tenure for the candidate at FSU.

The Chair's letter is placed in the binder and a copy is given to the faculty candidate. The Department Chair informs faculty candidates in writing that they may attach a response to the Chair's evaluative letter to be included in the promotion and tenure binder before the binder is sent to the COE Promotion and Tenure Committee.

**Certifying Promotion and Tenure Binders.** Before binders are submitted to the COE Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department Chair meets with faculty candidates to review the binder/s and sign the Summary Cover Sheet(s). The Department Chair's signature on the cover sheets certifies that he or she has discharged his or her duty to prepare the binder in compliance with University policies and procedures. The signature of the faculty candidate signifies that he or she has had an opportunity to review the binder and certify all materials in the binder as valid and accurate. It is the Department Chair's responsibility to submit promotion and tenure binders to the COE Dean's Office in a timely manner.

### **Promotion and Tenure Committee**

The promotion and tenure committee provides one of the most important ways in which faculty

participate in the governance of the Department and the University. At Florida State University, faculty do not apply for promotion or for tenure; they are nominated for promotion and for tenure by the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee. This nomination of faculty for tenure and for promotion strongly impacts the quality of teaching, research, and service at Florida State University.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee serves in a fact-finding capacity by independently reviewing and evaluating faculty credentials for promotion and tenure decisions. Those elected to serve the Promotion and Tenure Committee are among the most experienced and qualified faculty in the department.

**Evaluating and Nominating Faculty Candidates for Promotion and Tenure.** Annually during the Spring semester, the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee independently evaluates selected faculty members on the progress each is making toward earning tenure or promotion, or both, if applicable. The Committee is required to evaluate the files of untenured faculty submitting 2<sup>nd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> year binders, as well as tenured associates on their 3<sup>rd</sup> year after promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. In addition, department faculty who have not yet earned tenure and/or attained the rank of professor may request (in writing) an evaluation from the chair of the promotion and tenure committee. The evaluation is focused on the faculty member's performance in the three assigned areas of responsibility (research and scholarship, teaching, and service), specifically offering suggestions for how to best achieve the next rank.

Once the committee members independently review faculty files, they meet as a Committee to formulate evaluative feedback and make nominations of faculty for promotion and/or tenure. If the Committee makes the decision that insufficient progress is being made toward tenure and/or promotion, the Committee then provides the faculty member with specific recommendations. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee is responsible for providing faculty with these recommendations both orally, and in writing. A copy of the Committee's written recommendation is also submitted to the Department Chair.

Faculty who are nominated for promotion are required to prepare binders and go through formal review by the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee, Department Chair, COE Promotion and Tenure Committee, Dean of the COE, university's Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the university's Provost. Faculty nominated for tenure are also formally reviewed and voted on by the tenured faculty of the department.

**Voting of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.** During the fall semester, the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee independently reviews the binders and formally votes for faculty candidates of promotion and/or tenure. At the Promotion and Tenure meeting, committee members may ask questions for clarification of the documents presented in a candidate's binder, but may not discuss information that is not contained in the binder. A committee member may not advocate for or against a candidacy; all members exercise their own independent evaluations of each record. The Committee votes by secret ballot for final decisions regarding tenure and promotion. The issues of promotion and tenure are voted for separately.

Each candidate for promotion and/or tenure is notified in writing by the committee Chair of the compiled advice of the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee. The reason that is cited most frequently for any negative secret ballot from committee members is recorded on the *Reasons for Negative Committee Review Ballots* form(s). Only the official reasons for a negative ballot designated by the University Committee may be used. The department's Promotion and Tenure Committee considers a tie ballot to be neither positive nor negative. When there is a tie, the binder is forwarded to the next level of review without advice, unless the candidate requests that the binder not be forwarded.

The Chair of the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee is responsible for scheduling and chairing meetings, administering the balloting, and documenting the results of the voting for the next

level of evaluation. For faculty seeking promotion, the next level of review after a decision by the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee is with the Department Chair. A faculty member who is not recommended for promotion or for tenure may appeal that negative decision through the University appeals process.

**Tenure Nominations by the Tenured Faculty.** For tenure-earning faculty, the next level of review after a decision by the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee is with the tenured faculty of the department. The tenured faculty have an opportunity to independently review the binders of the tenure candidates for a given period of time, usually one week. Then, the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee calls a meeting of the tenured faculty to discuss the binders of faculty candidates and conduct balloting for (or against) a tenure nomination. The vote of the tenured faculty is done by secret ballot. Results of the tenured faculty balloting are indicated on the *Summary Cover Sheet for Tenure* and does not include reasons for negative ballots. (Note: the tenured faculty are not involved in evaluating and nominating faculty candidates for promotion). The vote of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the vote of the tenured faculty (if appropriate), and the binders of the faculty candidates are then submitted to the Department Chair for the next level of review.

**Voting Abstentions.** A faculty member who accepts election to the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee is committed to reviewing and evaluating all files considered by the committee. Abstentions (refusals to ballot) should occur only for reasons of recusal, such as being unable to provide an unbiased assessment of a candidate due to extensive collaborative research or having a personal relationship with the candidate. Failure to ballot due to absence from campus during the review process is recorded as "absent not voting," not as an "abstention." Abstentions and absences are listed separately on the *Summary Cover Sheet(s)*.

**Eligibility and Composition of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.** The promotion and tenure committee has six tenured members, two from the Instructional Systems program, two from the Educational Psychology program, two from the Psychological and Counseling Services program, as described in section X.B..

### **Eligibility for Promotion and Tenure**

**Eligibility for Tenure.** Faculty members serving in tenure-earning positions (Associate Professor and Professor) are eligible for nomination for tenure by the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee and by the department's tenured faculty. The Assistant Professor position is an untenured position and faculty at this rank must be promoted to Associate Professor before being tenured. Typically an assistant professor is considered simultaneously for promotion and tenure during the 6<sup>th</sup> year of service. Faculty not recommended for promotion and tenure by the 6<sup>th</sup> year are terminated by the University at the end of seven years. A faculty member may be considered for tenure during the 5<sup>th</sup> year of tenure-earning service provided he or she has submitted a written request and obtained the COE Dean's approval. Approval of the written request shall be placed in the candidate's promotion and tenure binder.

**Eligibility for Promotion.** Normal time-in-rank to be considered for promotion is during the fifth year of service in that rank. However, consideration for early promotion is possible any time prior to the 5<sup>th</sup> year when sufficiently justified by demonstrated merit.

**Candidate Withdrawal from Promotion/Tenure Process.** A candidate may withdraw his or her binder within five working days of being informed of the results of the vote by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and/or the vote by the tenured faculty, regardless of the results of the vote. The candidate may withdraw his or her binder not only when it receives compiled negative advice, but also when it receives a tie or compiled positive advice (with split positive and negative ballots). If the candidate does not exercise this option to withdraw his or her binder from further consideration, the binder is submitted to the next

level of review (COE's Promotion and Tenure committee). The candidate's request for withdrawal from the promotion/tenure process must be in writing and submitted to the Department Chair.

### **Criteria**

Criteria used to determine recommendations for promotion, for award of tenure, and for merit increases in salary for faculty members are designed to be consistent with statutory requirements, the Operating Manual of the Board of Regents, and Florida State University policies as reflected in the SUS-UFF agreement.

The criteria on which recommendations are to be based are:

- (a) Teaching effectiveness;
- (b) Evidence of productive scholarship in the field of educational research and development; and
- (c) Service to the University, the community (local, state, national), and the profession or discipline.

Objective measures will be employed in determining how well faculty meet these criteria. Such measures may include data obtained from human sources, and may not be limited to numerical counts of physical objects. Objectivity is considered to be achieved by measures which are (a) free as possible from personal bias, (b) valid in the predictive sense in accordance with best available evidence, and (c) internally valid in the sense of constituting their own criteria for the behavior described.

### **Specific Criteria**

#### 1. Teaching Effectiveness

Evidence of teaching effectiveness will include the following:

- (a) Statement of assigned teaching responsibilities
- (b) Student evaluations of performance
- (c) Appraisals of teaching effects by students, former students, faculty colleagues, or others, as contained in letters or other documents, solicited or unsolicited
- (d) Evidence of effort and creativity in developing instruction within the sphere of the faculty member's teaching responsibilities.

Details include:

- (a) Assigned teaching responsibilities. Statements of assigned teaching responsibilities are given consideration primarily as a framework describing the faculty member's work within the department within which the various indicators of teaching effectiveness are to be assessed. They will include listings of course assignments, and individual study offerings, student advisees, and thesis and dissertation advisees with indications of "major advisor" assignments.
- (b) Student evaluations. Judgments or estimates by students will constitute one source of evidence of teaching effectiveness of the faculty member. Besides students questionnaires applicable to assembled classes, questionnaires or rating forms administered by the faculty member for assessment of his performance in various modes of individual instruction are appropriate when the responses are derived from an adequate student sample.

When answers to student questionnaires are examined the following considerations will apply in

achieving objectivity:

(1) Responses associated with course (or set of students) will be examined and assessed with reference to the objectives and manner of conduct of that course. (For example, if the course is conducted as a seminar, student responses relevant to teaching by this means are appropriate, but student responses pertaining to lecturing are not appropriate.)

(2) Emphasis will be placed upon the student responses which assess faculty member performances known to be observable, as opposed to those reflecting how the student feels. (An example of the first would be responses to the question, "How frequently did the instructor confer individually with students?" An example of the second would be, "How happy did you feel while attending class?")

(3) Consideration of student responses concerning teaching effectiveness is to be done on the basis of response (or averages or responses) to individual questions, each of which will be individually assessed. Different responses will not be summed to obtain a numerical total.

(c) Appraisal of effects of teaching. Evidence which describes critical incidents of the effects of the faculty member's teaching on other individuals will be considered in assessing teaching effectiveness. Such evidence may come from unsolicited or solicited letters, memoranda, or other documents describing incidents in which capabilities learned as a result of the faculty member's teaching have been put to use in productive ways. Documents may originate with students, former students, faculty colleagues, or others. Such incidents may be considered to have considerable predictive validity, but their freedom from personal bias and ulterior motives need to be carefully judged. Criteria for assessing these evidences of teaching effectiveness will include:

- (1) Specificity of the incidents reported (as contrasted with general impressions).
- (2) Breadth of effect, as indicated by variety of critical incidents and the probable spread of their influence.

## 2. Productive Scholarship

Productiveness in scholarly work is considered to embrace the total spectrum of research, development and evaluation as described under Article 10 in the SUS-UFF Agreement. A program devoted to the development of knowledge and to the education of professional men and women who will engage in the various activities encompassed by educational R & D must pursue goals in all areas of this field.

Evidence of productive scholarship may come from a variety of sources, including the following:

- a. Scientific and technical articles and books contributing to the advancement of knowledge in the faculty member's chosen field of specialization, profession, or discipline.
- b. Orally delivered reports presented to professional associations or groups.
- c. Documents describing research and development efforts in a programmatic sense, including funded projects proposals.
- d. Reports of research and development efforts typically having limited distribution, such as project progress, technical and final reports, or locally reproduced reports.
- e. Original articles of a semi-popular nature, having the purpose of disseminating technical or scientific information.
- f. Developed materials or procedures, or descriptions of them, which involve applications of theory or empirically-based findings intended for use in the improvement of educational practices.

Criteria to be used to assess productive scholarship, applicable to any or all of these categories of output, are as follows:

- (1) The extent to which the faculty member has contributed to the publication, report, or other document, and the nature of this contribution, as originator, designer, co-worker, writer, etc.
- (2) The breadth and amount of scholarly effort, as exhibited by the variety of sub-fields in which research and development has been conducted, as well as by the number of products.
- (3) The originality and quality of scholarly products, as indicated by such criteria as publication in journals employing referees, or working with publishers who submit manuscripts for editorial review, etc.
- (4) The influence of the member's scholarly work, as indicated by such criteria as frequency of reference by other investigators and writers, reprinting, foreign translations, etc.
- (5) The importance of the scholarly work, as judged by its potential effects in producing a substantial increase in the advancement of knowledge. (In terms of this criterion, for example, a publication reporting a valid generalization based upon evidence is rated more highly than a programmatic paper or a semi-popular article. As another example, a published article recording theory or empirical results is rated more highly than an oral report at a professional meeting.)

### 3. Service to University or Community

- 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, departments, or departmental units. Service to the University will also include advising and counseling students and supervising student interns.

Criteria for assessment of this factor are as follows:

- (1) The amount of effort and time involved
  - (2) The breadth of such service, in terms of variety and organizational levels within the University.
  - (3) Leadership exercised, as indicated by chairmanships, assigned committee responsibilities, etc.
- 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 other departments, which are in addition to assigned teaching responsibilities.
    - (2) Within the local community-talks or speeches to local service groups, parent-teacher organizations, school faculty meetings; consult with local schools.
    - (3) Within the state-cooperative work with schools, the State Department of Education; lectures and talks to school faculties, teacher organizations, state-wide service

- organizations.
- (4) Within the nation-lectures and speeches to national organizations, including professional meetings; consultation with groups or organizations sponsoring educational R & D efforts of national scope; service as a member of reviewing panels or boards for federal agencies engaged in educational and R & D activities
  - (5) International activities-educational and educational research activities in the form of lectures, consultations, or contracted work with agencies of other countries. Talks and speeches at international congresses of a professional nature.
- c. Services to the profession evidenced by such activities as the following: (1) functions performed (beyond simple membership) in professional and scientific organizations; (2) holding office in such organizations, including chairmanships and memberships on boards and committees; (3) service as editor, consulting or reviewing editor for professional journals having state, national, or international distribution.

Criteria for assessment of service in all categories are as follows:

- (1) Extent and variety of activities
- (2) Estimated effectiveness, in accordance with evidence available
- (3) Degree of importance of the activity, in terms of its potential impact.

Approved by:

Dr. Russell Almond, Parliamentarian

Dr. Betsy Jane Becker, Department Chair