

**Bylaws for the  
Department of Business Analytics, Information Systems & Supply Chain  
College of Business  
Florida State University**

**Record of Substantive Revisions and Amendments to these Bylaws**

**Adopted September 29, 2016**

**Revised January 6, 2020**

**Revised January 12, 2022**

These are the bylaws for the Department of Business Analytics, Information Systems & Supply Chain in the College of Business at Florida State University. These bylaws were last approved on January 12, 2022 by a majority of the applicable voting members of the department and on April 28, 2022 by the College and the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement.

## **Preamble**

### **I. Bylaws**

**A. Adherence with Other Governing Documents.** At all times, department policy shall adhere to and be consistent with all university policies found in the FSU Constitution, the BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement (if applicable to the college), the Faculty Handbook, and the Annual Memorandum on the Promotion and Tenure Process issued by the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement.

#### **B. Bylaws Revision.**

1. These Bylaws may be amended at any meeting of the department faculty where a quorum is present by a two-thirds vote conducted by secret ballot.
2. Any proposed amendment to these Bylaws must be submitted to the department faculty at least two weeks prior to the meeting at which voting is to occur.

**C. Substantive Change Statement.** 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 <https://sacs.fsu.edu/substantive-change-policy/>

### **II. Membership and Voting Rights**

**A. Faculty Membership.** The faculty of the Department of Business Analytics, Information Systems & Supply Chain shall consist of those persons holding full-time appointments at the rank of Teaching Faculty (I, II, or III), Research Faculty (I, II, or III), Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor.

**B. Department Membership.** In addition to the faculty defined in II.A above, the following are members of the Department of Business Analytics, Information Systems & Supply Chain: Adjunct instructors and part-time faculty.

**C. Faculty Voting Rights.** The voting membership of the department is defined as the department chair and all full-time members of the faculty who are assigned and evaluated by the department chair. The department chair, upon simple majority approval of the full-time faculty, may appoint other faculty (e.g., associate deans, visiting or part-time faculty) who have teaching assignments within the Department to voting membership.

**D. Non-faculty Voting Rights.** Adjunct instructors and part-time faculty have no voting rights.

### **III. Department Organization and Governance**

#### **A. Faculty Meetings.**

1. Faculty meetings will be held at least once each academic year. The Department chair, or a designee, shall be the presiding officer. At the request of any voting member, Robert's Rules of Order shall be invoked.
2. Special meetings may be called by the Department chair or by a written request of one-half of the total voting faculty members.
3. All faculty members will be notified of department meetings and the agenda for said meetings at least 3 working days in advance.
4. A simple majority (more than half) of the faculty will constitute a quorum at any regular or special faculty meeting.
5. When electronic voting (email) is used, relevant materials will be emailed to faculty or posted on a website accessible to faculty and announced by email to faculty at least 48 hours before votes are tallied. A simple majority of the faculty will constitute a quorum for such votes.
6. Unless specifically stated herein, decisions shall be made by a simple majority vote of the faculty. Votes cast by voice, secret ballot, or email ballot are considered to be equivalent.

#### **B. Department Chair Selection.**

1. Appointment of the department chair will be made by the Dean of the College of Business with the advice of the faculty of the department. The department chair serves at the pleasure of the Dean and the President of the University.
2. The Department chair is the chief executive officer of the department, responsible to the university administration and the faculty of the department. The chair will consult with the proper committees on such matters as appointments, selection and recruitment of new faculty, promotion and tenure recommendations, salary adjustments, curriculum, assignment of teaching and research assistantships, and general questions concerning allocation of departmental resources.
3. Unless specifically stated herein, the Department chair is an ex-officio (nonvoting) member of all departmental committees. The chair may cast the deciding vote in the event of a tie vote among committee members.
4. The Department chair is evaluated by the Dean of the College of Business for purposes of annual evaluation. To ensure the accountability of the chair to the

faculty, the Faculty Evaluation Committee will review the chair's performance and report the results of its evaluation to the Dean.

### **C. Department Leadership and Committees.**

The department chair serves as the chief administrator of the Department. The chair may at his or her discretion designate other appointees (e.g., program director or coordinator) to effectively administer specific programs within the department.

The department chair appoints faculty to serve on various committees. Unless specifically stated herein, the department chair also appoints the chair of each committee.

The voting procedure within each committee is normally open and conducted by voice or email ballot. However, voting within the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Faculty Evaluation Committee is conducted solely by secret ballot. Voting by secret ballot is available to any other committee if a simple majority of the members of that committee approve it.

The following committees shall be established and empowered. Each of the committees shall meet at least once during the academic year and decisions of these committees are the responsibility of faculty members.

#### **Undergraduate Curriculum Committee**

1. This committee is responsible for the review and oversight of all undergraduate programs housed within the department. The committee is responsible for instituting curriculum changes involving the creation, deletion, and modification of requirements for majors, degree programs, and/or certificate programs. This includes establishing, reviewing, and assessing learning goals and reporting outcomes.
2. This committee consists of faculty having assignments within the undergraduate programs. Adjuncts and other part-time faculty are not eligible to serve on this committee.
3. The department chair may appoint curricular subcommittees consisting of all faculty having assignments in a curricular area.
4. Minutes of the committee meetings shall be maintained by the committee and filed with the department.

#### **Master's Policy Committee**

1. This committee is responsible for the review and oversight of all master's programs housed within the department. The committee is responsible for instituting curriculum changes involving the creation, deletion, and modification of requirements for majors, degree programs, and/or certificate programs. This includes establishing, reviewing, and assessing learning goals and reporting outcomes.

2. This committee consists of faculty having assignments within the department's master's programs. Adjuncts and other part-time faculty are not eligible to serve on this committee.
3. The department chair may appoint curricular subcommittees consisting of all faculty having assignments in a curricular area.
4. Minutes of the committee meetings shall be maintained by the committee and filed with the department.

#### **Doctoral Policy Committee**

1. This committee is responsible for the review and oversight of the department's doctoral programs. The committee is responsible for instituting curriculum changes involving the creation, deletion, and modification of requirements for the doctoral degree, including program structure, program policy, and comprehensive examinations.
2. This committee shall consist of faculty having assignments within the doctoral program (e.g., those actively teaching courses in the doctoral program, those serving as mentors to doctoral students, those serving on department doctoral committees).
3. The Department chair shall appoint a Doctoral Program Coordinator to oversee all aspects of the doctoral program, including recruiting, admissions, assistantships, curriculum, and comprehensive examinations. The coordinator serves as the academic advisor for all doctoral students prior to their selection of a dissertation committee. The coordinator also serves as the chair of the Doctoral Policy Committee and as the department's representative to the College of Business Doctoral Policy Committee.
4. Minutes of all committee meetings shall be maintained by the committee and filed with the department.

#### **Promotion and Tenure Committee**

1. The department's Promotion and Tenure Committee is comprised of all tenured faculty members in the Department. Untenured faculty and specialized (non-tenure track) faculty are not eligible to serve on this committee. Further, the department chair and any faculty members being considered for promotion and/or tenure are not eligible to serve on this committee.
2. The committee chair shall be elected by a simple majority vote of the department faculty (i.e., all tenure track faculty are eligible to vote) in advance of the College Faculty meeting where at-large faculty members are elected to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. Only tenured full professors are eligible to serve as the committee chair. The committee chair shall also serve as the chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee and serve as the department's representative to the College of Business Promotion and Tenure Committee.
3. If the department chair is being considered for promotion and/or tenure, the chair of the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee shall serve

in the department chair's capacity regarding the promotion and/or tenure review of the department chair.

4. The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consider all faculty members at or below the rank of full professor for promotion, tenure, or both (if applicable) each year. In addition, as part of the promotion and tenure process, the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall conduct faculty reviews required by university policy (e.g., reviews for untenured faculty).
5. Evaluations shall be conducted consistent with the promotion and/or tenure criteria and procedures of Florida State University, the College of Business, and the Department of Business Analytics, Information Systems & Supply Chain (see Appendix A, Department of Business Analytics, Information Systems & Supply Chain Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines).

#### **Faculty Evaluation Committee**

1. The Faculty Evaluation Committee is responsible for annual peer evaluations, an annual evaluation of the department chair, peer teaching reviews, untenured faculty reviews, and annual merit evaluations. The department chair uses the advice of this committee as input to each faculty member's annual performance evaluation. The faculty evaluation committee also recommends to the department chair any faculty deserving of special awards (e.g., named professorships) and recognitions of merit and achievements within the university. The committee's evaluation of the department chair is forwarded to the Dean.
2. This committee shall consist of 3-5 faculty members elected by a vote of the faculty with the requirement that the majority of the committee be tenured faculty. The chair of the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee shall serve as the chair of this committee.
3. Evaluations shall be conducted following the evaluative criteria and procedures of the Department of Business Analytics, Information Systems & Supply Chain (see Appendix A).

#### **Ad Hoc Committees**

1. The department chair may establish ad hoc committees as he or she deems necessary to conduct the business of the department. Examples of these committees include, but are not limited to, scholarship, honors, and advising.
2. The department chair is eligible to chair any ad hoc committee.

#### **D. Faculty Senators.**

The department elects Faculty Senate representatives as a part of the College of Business. These representatives are elected at-large from the entire College of Business faculty.

#### **E. Faculty Recruitment.**

When the Department has open faculty lines that have been approved for recruiting, the department chair appoints an ad hoc Faculty Recruiting Committee to oversee recruiting, screening, interviewing, hosting, and evaluating faculty candidates. The committee will consist of a minimum of three faculty members in the department composed of tenure-track faculty for tenure-track positions and specialized faculty for teaching positions. The committee is responsible for ensuring that all department faculty have the opportunity to participate in the interview process and provide feedback on faculty candidates. The recommendations of the Faculty Recruiting Committee are advisory to the department. All hiring decisions are vested with the Department Chair and the Dean of the College of Business.

#### **F. Unit Reorganization.**

Faculty involvement concerning department reorganization is addressed in the College of Business bylaws.

### **IV. Curriculum**

The faculty shall be the basic legislative body of the department. Subject to the laws of the State of Florida, the constitution of the university, and the policies of the College of Business, the faculty shall determine the policies, requirements, curricula, and course offerings for all academic programs within the Department. The Department curriculum committees are given in section III.C.

### **V. Annual Evaluation of Faculty on Performance and Merit**

#### **A. Peer Involvement in Annual Performance and Merit Evaluation.**

Each faculty member's performance will be evaluated relative to his or her assigned duties. Each faculty member's performance will be rated annually using the following university rating scale:

- Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations
- Exceeds FSU's High Expectations
- Meets FSU's High Expectations
- Official Concern
- Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations

The guidelines presented here are specific and operational in nature. The critical point is that the evaluation and merit criteria and procedures must be transparent to all faculty members. This is a faculty-driven process and not a process driven by the department chair. However, the guidelines are structured such that the department chair has some latitude in the final determination of merit salary decisions (noted in 8 and 9 below). The department's Faculty Evaluation Committee (the composition and structure of which is outlined in the department's bylaws) is responsible for these evaluations.



1. During his or her annual evaluation in the prior year, each faculty member receives a written assignment of responsibilities (AOR) from the department chair. The completed assignment form reflects the mix of teaching, research, service, and administrative assignments upon which the faculty member will be evaluated in the subsequent year. Changes to initial assignments may be necessary due to changing needs of the department and College. Faculty will be informed of these changes if and when they occur. Summer teaching assignments follow the guidelines in Appendix B.
2. During the Spring semester, each faculty member will complete an annual performance report for the prior calendar year. The various items of evidence relating to performance described in these bylaws will be included in this report, as well as other performance information deemed important and relevant by the faculty member.
3. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will evaluate each faculty member's performance relative to the criteria described in Section B. Each faculty member's performance will be evaluated relative to his or her assigned duties. After reviewing each faculty member's performance report, each member of the evaluation committee will rate the faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarship/research, and service (three separate evaluations) using the following rating scale:

5 = Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations

4 = Exceeds FSU's High Expectations

3 = Meets FSU's High Expectations

2 = Official Concern

1 = Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations

The evaluations of the faculty evaluation committee will be submitted to the department chair for tabulation.

4. The department chair will average the ratings for teaching, scholarship/research, and service across all members of the faculty evaluation committee, and then weight each score by the assignment of responsibilities for the year being evaluated. This will result in a composite evaluation score for each faculty member.
5. Ranked composite evaluation scores will be provided to the faculty evaluation committee; however, faculty names will be replaced by simple letter designations (i.e., Professor A, Professor B). In addition, evaluation scores from the preceding two years will be made available to the committee. For faculty with fewer than three years of evaluation, merit assessment will be based on the years that are available.
6. Using the collective evidence of ranked evaluation scores over the past three years, the faculty evaluation committee will categorize each faculty member into one of the four merit categories (High Merit, Merit, Merit if possible, No Merit). Meritorious performance is defined as "Performance that meets or exceeds the expectations for the position classification and department/unit."

No restrictions exist as to how many faculty can be placed in a given merit category.

7. Merit raise allocations will be made in dollar amounts as follows: No Merit (\$0), Merit if possible (\$X), Merit (\$2X), and High Merit (\$4X). The amount of X will be determined by dividing the total merit funds available by the sum of merit ratings across all faculty where Merit if possible = 1, Merit = 2, and High Merit = 4. For example: Assume there are four faculty members, one in each rating category, and \$2800 is available. In this case X = \$400 and merit raises will be in the amounts of \$0, \$400, \$800, and \$1600.
8. The department chair and/or the Faculty Evaluation Committee may recommend a merit salary increase for an individual whose salary does not fairly reflect his or her value to the department or college based on market considerations, long-run contributions, or performance of special projects or activities.
9. The department chair may use other criteria should the situation be considered unusual and the application of the preferred guidelines would produce grossly inequitable outcomes.
10. Upon completion of the evaluation of each faculty member, the department chair will present and personally discuss each faculty member's Annual Evaluation Summary Form with the respective faculty member. This discussion will include the chair's perceptions of positive areas of performance, as well as the areas that need improvement.
11. After completing discussions with all faculty, the department chair will submit the results of the evaluation process and a narrative explanation to the Dean.

**B. Criteria for Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty.** See Appendix A.

**C. Criteria for Evaluation of Specialized Faculty.** See Appendix A.

## **VI. Promotion and Tenure**

### **A. Progress Toward Promotion Letter.**

Each year, every faculty member who is not yet at the highest rank for their position will receive a letter that outlines progress toward promotion and/or tenure.

### **B. Third Year Review for Tenure-track Faculty.**

Tenure-track faculty in their third year of service will receive an evaluation of their progress in meeting the department's expectations for promotion and tenure.

Assistant Professors hired July 1, 2019 or later shall receive a tenure review in their third year. Assistant Professors hired before July 1, 2019 and who have not yet had a 2nd-year review may choose between a 2nd and 4th year set of reviews or a 3rd year review. Assistant Professors hired before July 1, 2019 and who have already had a 2nd year review shall have a 4th year review. These reviews are mentoring opportunities during which the department/unit's

Promotion and Tenure Committee shall provide specific feedback and advice reflecting expectations for tenure and how the faculty member is progressing toward meeting those expectations. The faculty member shall meet with the department/unit's chair to discuss the report. Tenure Review Report(s) shall be included in the tenure binder. Assistant Professors hired with credit toward tenure shall have credited years included in the determination of the timing of the third-year review unless an alternative schedule is mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and his or her supervisor.

The overall procedures and guidelines for third year faculty evaluations are meant to be consistent with those outlined in Section C below. As before, the critical point is that each faculty member desiring promotion or tenure in the future must be aware of the rules and criteria that are employed. The participation by each candidate must be an active process with the candidate providing essential information to the department's Faculty Evaluation Committee. The composition and structure of this committee is outlined in Section III. C. above.

1. All assistant professors are required to undergo third year evaluations beginning in the Fall semester of their third year in rank. Evaluative materials are to be collected during the Fall semester and submitted to the department's Faculty Evaluation Committee at the beginning of the Spring semester. The preparation of these materials (i.e., binders) should follow the current guidelines for preparing promotion and tenure binders, except that outside letters are not required.
2. The department's Faculty Evaluation Committee will review all third year binders during the Spring semester and prepare a written report and recommendation to the department chair no later than the end of March. The department chair will add an evaluative statement to the reports and forward the entire package to the Dean. At this point, the Dean will make a decision regarding the renewal or non-renewal of the faculty member's contract.
3. Although the criteria for third year reviews are consistent with those used during promotion and tenure decisions, the evaluation must take the reduced time frame into consideration. At the time of the third year review, the thrust of the evaluation is to determine whether the faculty member is making sufficient progress toward promotion and tenure. The department's Faculty Evaluation Committee is interested in whether the faculty member's performance has the required trajectory to meet the criteria for promotion and tenure with continued effort and additional time.

### **C. Peer Involvement in Evaluation of Promotion and Tenure of Faculty.**

Evaluations and recommendations regarding promotion and tenure are by the department's Promotion and Tenure committee as outlined in Section III. C. above. Also outlined in Section III. C. above, the department's Faculty Evaluation Committee conducts evaluations and makes recommendations regarding annual peer evaluation, an annual evaluation of the department chair, peer teaching reviews, third year faculty reviews, and annual merit evaluations.

#### **D. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure of Tenure-track Faculty.**

The guidelines presented here are necessarily broad and somewhat difficult to translate into operational terms. The critical point is that each faculty member desiring promotion or tenure be aware of the rules and criteria that are employed. The participation by each candidate must be an active process with the candidate providing essential information to the department's promotion and tenure committee. The composition and structure of the department's promotion and tenure committee is outlined in Section III. C. above. The teaching, scholarship/research, and service criteria for promotion and tenure are given in Appendix A.

The following minimum criteria shall be used in the promotion and tenure process in the department. These criteria are in addition to the criteria listed in the current Faculty Handbook and the current annual Promotion and Tenure Memorandum issued by the Dean of Faculties.

1. Promotion or appointment to the rank of **assistant professor** shall be based on demonstrated competency in teaching, service, and the promise of scholarly development. Promotion shall be considered automatic upon completion of the doctoral degree, but full documentation shall be submitted with other promotion materials.
2. Promotion or appointment to the rank of **associate professor** shall be based on demonstrated effectiveness in teaching, research, and service; and recognized standing in the discipline as attested to by required letters from competent scholars outside the University.
3. Promotion or appointment to the rank of **professor** shall be based on superior teaching, service, scholarly research or creative accomplishments of high quality, and recognized standing in the discipline as attested to by required letters from competent scholars outside the University.
4. Consideration for promotion to the rank of associate professor normally occurs in the faculty member's fifth year (or the year in which an equivalent time has been earned for faculty coming from other universities), with the promotion becoming effective at the beginning of the sixth year.
5. Consideration for tenure normally occurs in the faculty member's sixth year (or the year in which an equivalent time has been earned for faculty coming from other universities), with tenure becoming effective at the beginning of the seventh year.

6. Although the minimum period of time in a given rank is normally five years, demonstrated merit, not years of service, shall be the guiding factor. Promotion shall not be automatic, nor may it be regarded as guaranteed upon completion of a given term of service. Early promotion is possible where there is sufficient justification.
7. The criteria for tenure shall be the same as the promotion criteria and, additionally, the faculty member shall demonstrate their ability to continue to make significant professional contributions to the discipline, the College, the University, and the academic community.

**E. Criteria for Promotion of Specialized Faculty.** See Appendix A.

## **Appendix A. Criteria for Evaluation**

This document describes the criteria and procedures used by the Department of Business Analytics, Information Systems & Supply Chain for evaluating faculty performance in four distinct, but related areas: (1) promotion and tenure evaluations, (2) third year performance reviews of untenured faculty, (3) annual faculty evaluations (including the department chair), and (4) decisions regarding the distribution of available salary funds to reward meritorious faculty performance. These criteria and procedures are consistent with the mission and goals of Florida State University, the College of Business, and the Department of Business Analytics, Information Systems & Supply Chain; and they comply with and are supplemented by the provisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and the Faculty Handbook (FH).

### **A. Basic Principles, Requirements, and Assumptions**

1. The criteria and procedures specified in this document or incorporated by reference (the CBA and FH) are the sole basis upon which the department will evaluate faculty performance.
2. The criteria and evaluative procedures are logically related across all four evaluative areas: (1) promotion and tenure, (2) third year reviews, (3) annual evaluations, and (4) merit evaluations.
3. The department's evaluative criteria include both qualitative and quantitative aspects of performance that may require judgement and interpretation by faculty peer committees and other evaluators.
4. The department's evaluative criteria have been established in the spirit of equitable opportunity for all faculty in that the evaluation of each faculty member's performance is based on his or her assignment of responsibilities (AOR). It is in this manner that the evaluative criteria may be applied to both tenure-track and specialized (non-tenure track) faculty in the department.
5. The faculty may change these evaluative criteria and procedures annually. Any changes in evaluative criteria and/or procedures will become effective in the subsequent year.

### **B. Evaluative Criteria**

The Collective Bargaining Agreement and the Faculty Handbook present specific information and standards that will be used to evaluate teaching, scholarship/research, service and/or administration. The following evaluative criteria are based on the above referenced provisions of these documents.

## 1. Evaluative Criteria for Teaching

The purpose of teaching is to impart knowledge and critical thinking skills in the theoretical, practical, and ethical aspects of the discipline. The following evidence, if provided, must be considered in the evaluation process. The listing of evidence that follows does not imply an order of priority.

- **Course Materials and Methodology:** The development of innovative course materials, media, modes of delivery, and methodology.
- **Special Teaching Responsibilities and Related Assignments:** Teaching workshops or seminars; honors courses; adult education courses; in-service courses; DIS; supervised research; membership on masters or doctoral committees; and number of masters or doctoral major professor responsibilities.
- **Out-of-Class Student Contact:** Academic advising – number of students and extent of accessibility to students.
- **Awards or Other Public Recognition:** Department, college, and university awards and other recognition of teaching excellence.
- **Student Evaluations:** Results of teaching evaluative instruments and other independent student input.
- **Peer Evaluations:** Includes only reasonably objective evidence such as from visitation and videotapes.
- **Other Evidence:** Statement of candidate; willingness to assume new teaching assignments and schedules; teaching publications; and other teaching activities that are important to the department or college.

This evidence provides the underlying basis for evaluating teaching performance. In evaluating teaching performance, consideration will be given to the quality and quantity of the total portfolio of teaching activities.

## 2. Evaluative Criteria for Scholarship/Research

The purpose of research and creative activity (hereafter, simply research) is to discover and develop a deeper understanding of knowledge with direct or indirect applicability to the disciplines represented within the department. Research results come to fruition through the communication of knowledge by way of a variety of publication media and oral presentations. Highly selective and rigorously refereed outlets carry more weight in the evaluation process than less rigorous and non-refereed outlets. The following evidence, if provided, must be considered in the evaluation process. The listing of evidence that follows does not imply an order of priority.

- **Scholarly Books:** Monographs; textbooks; edited and/or translated books; bibliographical books; books of readings; casebooks. Consideration must be given to the reputation of the publisher; whether or not publications are refereed; stage of completion of the book; book reviews; frequency of citation of the book by others; and number of copies printed.

- **Journal Articles:** Prestige of journal; whether or not the journal is refereed; importance and contribution of the article to the discipline.
- **Articles in Published Works:** Proceedings of conferences or symposia; technical reports; semi-popular articles; book and other reviews; and abstracts.
- **Related Scholarship:** Papers read at meetings; discussant or chairperson roles at conferences and symposia; invited lectures; editorship and editorial boards for journals; professional scholarship awards; research grants; publication and research referees. Consideration must be given to the reputation of the meeting/activity; whether the publication process is regional, national, or international in scope; and the importance and contribution to the discipline.
- **Other Evidence:** Work in progress; working papers, and other scholarship activities that are important to the department and college.

This evidence provides the underlying basis for evaluating research performance. In evaluating research performance, consideration will be given to the quality and quantity of the total portfolio of research evidence. The evidence of research performance must be interpreted in light of the effort required, methodologies used, difficulty of the research process and the overall importance and contribution to the discipline.

### 3. Evaluative Criteria for Service

The purpose of service is to facilitate the accomplishment of departmental, college, university, community and professional goals. Service incorporates activities which are not considered strictly teaching or scholarship, but which enrich teaching and scholarship and benefit the university community, its stakeholders, and the State of Florida. The following evidence, if provided, must be considered in the evaluation process. The listing of evidence that follows does not imply an order of priority.

- **Recognized Service:** Membership on department, college and university committees essential to the operation of the respective units; partial administrative duties to include serving as a center director and/or program coordinator; activity in professional groups (local, regional, national) such as officer or committee member; non-funded professional advisory service or presentations to community, civic, governmental or other external organizations; representative of department, college, or university at professional meetings; testimony on professional matters to legislative bodies; advisor for student organizations.
- **Other Evidence:** Other service activities, such as external outreach and development, intra-departmental/university relations, and paid services that are important to the department or college.

This evidence provides the underlying basis for evaluating service performance. In evaluating service performance, consideration will be given to the quality and



quantity of the total portfolio of service evidence. The evidence of service performance must be interpreted in light of the importance of the service activities to the department, college and university. The department should not recognize service only in the area of committee work, as opportunities for such service vary among departments and faculty. Service performance should be evaluated in terms of leadership, time, effort, and breadth of service.

#### **4. Evaluative Criteria for Administration**

The purpose of administration is to facilitate faculty performance in teaching, research and service. Administration is deemed to be those activities, normally restricted to department chairs or persons whose major responsibilities are administrative rather than teaching or research. The following evidence, if provided, must be considered in evaluating administrative performance. The listing of evidence that follows does not imply an order of priority.

- **External Outreach:** Fund raising; development of external relations with industry; development of alumni relations.
- **Faculty Relations:** Fairness in dealing with faculty; faculty communications; motivating faculty performance; coordination of faculty activities; recruitment and retention of faculty; accessibility to the faculty.
- **Administrative Activities:** Scheduling course loads; timeliness in performing administrative tasks; effectiveness in allocating resources, and effectiveness in coordinating programs and related activities.
- **Other Activities:** Ability to lead department toward achievement of its goals; effectiveness in representing the department to the dean and other constituencies.

This evidence provides the underlying basis for evaluating administrative performance. The evidence of administrative performance must be interpreted in light of the overall effectiveness of the department and the productivity of its faculty.

#### **5. Amendments**

The department chair or any three voting members of the department may propose amendments to these evaluative guidelines. Proposed amendments must be available to the voting membership at least two weeks prior to the department meeting in which they will be considered. To be adopted, a proposed amendment must receive an affirmative vote by a simple majority of the voting faculty.

### **Appendix B. Summer Teaching Assignments**

1. Summer teaching assignments will be based on (1) the summer teaching budget allocated to the department, (2) the courses needed to facilitate our programs and accommodate student demand, and (3) faculty availability.

- Before making summer teaching assignments, the department chair will consult with each faculty member about his or her desire to teach and their expectations regarding other summer appointments (e.g., internally- or externally-funded teaching, research or service appointments). Every effort will be made to give summer teaching assignments to those desiring to teach.
2. Priority for summer teaching assignments will be based on the following:
    - a) First priority will be given to faculty who do not have other internally funded summer financial support (e.g., COFRS grants, College summer grants, International Programs, contract or grants, or other paid service or research assignments). Priority within this category will be made relative to the level of funding received—those with less funding receive higher priority.
    - b) Second priority will be given to tenure-track faculty who have not taught in the summer (for any reason) in recent years, but were otherwise eligible to teach.
    - c) Third priority will be given to specialized (non-tenure track) faculty.
  3. When the priorities outlined above come into conflict, or do not produce a summer teaching schedule consistent with the criteria in section 5.a (budgetary constraints, course needs, and faculty availability). Faculty performance scores (i.e., merit scores based on teaching, research and service) will be used as a basis for making summer teaching assignments.