

DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT  
College of Business  
Florida State University

**BYLAWS**

**Approved by a majority of faculty**

Revised April, 2015;

Revised May, 2015

Revised October, 2017

**Administrative Correction**

Revised December, 2019

Preamble: Administrative concerns of a University department are secondary to academic matters, but they are nevertheless important for a smooth-running and effective department. The purpose of the following is to formulate a scheme of organization and operating procedures for the Department of Management that will be in keeping with these academic and administrative needs. These bylaws supplement higher authorities such as Florida Statutes, the FSU Constitution, the General Faculty Bargaining Unit Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), and the Faculty Handbook (FH). There is no intent to contradict those authorities in these bylaws, and failure to incorporate their provisions here is intended to avoid excessive duplication and does not diminish the effect of those authorities.

**A. Faculty Membership, Voting Privileges, and Faculty Meetings**

1. The faculty of the Department of Management consists of Specialized Faculty (SF) or Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty (TTF) with at least 50% assignment of responsibilities (AOR) from the Department.

2. The voting membership of the department is defined as all members of the faculty with at least a 50 percent appointment to the department. Unless otherwise specified, committees are comprised of non-administrative faculty members of the department, and a majority of the faculty will constitute a quorum. Decisions shall be made by a majority vote of the faculty conducted by voice vote, secret ballot, or e-mail ballot.

3. Faculty meetings will be held at least once each fall and spring semester and will be presided over by the Department Chair, or a designee. Additional meetings may be called by the Chair or on written request of five voting members. Departmental meetings and the agenda for the meetings will be provided at least 48 hours in advance. Minutes will be kept and made available to all faculty as soon as possible.

## **B. Jurisdiction**

1. 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.
2. The faculty may reflect and deliberate any issue of general interest to the university, college, or department and make recommendations to the appropriate officer or body.

## **C. Department Chair**

1. Appointment of the Chair will be made by the Dean of the College of Business with the advice of the faculty of the Department. Faculty preferences will be determined by secret ballot, with the numerical results reported to the Dean. The Chair is appointed for a three-year renewable term, but also serves at the pleasure of the Dean, and the President of the University.
2. At the request of five or more faculty members, a secret ballot on the continuation of the Chair's service will be held. If a majority of eligible faculty vote "no" on the Chair's continuation, this will be conveyed to the Dean along with a recommendation that the Dean strongly consider immediately terminating the Chair's service as Chair and appointing an Acting Chair. The Dean, with the advice of the faculty, will be encouraged to consider appointing a new Chair for a three-year renewable term as soon as possible.
3. The Chair will be the chief executive officer of the Department, responsible to the University Administration and the faculty and doctoral students of the Department. The Chair will consult with the proper committees on such matters as appointments, promotion and tenure recommendations, salary adjustments, and curriculum, assignment of teaching and research assistantships, staffing department committees, outreach and development, student relations, and general questions concerning allocation of departmental resources.
4. The Chair will be, ex-officio, a nonvoting member of all departmental committees, except that he/she may cast the deciding vote in the event of a tie.
5. The Chair will be 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 will annually provide their views on the Chair's performance to the Dean via the Department Peer Evaluation Committee.

## **D. Associate Chair**

1. The Chair may appoint an Associate Chair to assist in the administration of the Department. If an Associate Chair is appointed, the choice must be ratified by a majority of the faculty and approved by the Dean.
2. The term of appointment of the Associate Chair will be at the discretion of the Chair and the consent of the Associate Chair.
3. The Associate Chair will be the representative of the Chair for those purposes and occasions assigned to him/her by the Chair.

#### **E. Department Committees**

1. 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.
2. The chair appoints faculty to serve on various committees. Unless specifically stated herein, the chair also appoints the chair of each committee.
3. The voting procedure within each committee is normally open and conducted by voice or e-mail 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.
4. The following committees shall be established and empowered:

##### **a) Peer Evaluation Committee**

1. The faculty will annually elect a Peer Evaluation Committee (PEC) consisting of at least four faculty members, all of whom are tenured, where the faculty pool makes this feasible. The Chair will designate one faculty member as the Chair of the PEC. The Committee will provide advice to the Chair for the performance evaluation and recognition of merit of all departmental faculty. The PEC will solicit input from all departmental faculty to use in developing their advice to the Chair. The PEC will also provide feedback to all faculty not at full rank annually and advice on reviews of untenured faculty members.
2. Each faculty member's performance will be evaluated based on her/his evidence of performance relative to his or her assigned duties. The Peer Evaluation Committee will rate each faculty member's performance by placing each faculty member in one of the following annual evaluation categories for each specific area of assigned duties (teaching, research, etc.) and overall ("Overall Performance"). No restrictions exist as to how many faculty members can be placed in a given evaluation category.

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

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

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

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

e) Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations. This describes an individual who fails to demonstrate with consistency the knowledge, skills, or abilities required in his/her field of specialty and/or in completing assigned responsibilities.

The ratings of the faculty Peer Evaluation Committee will be submitted as recommendations to the department Chair and the Dean. 3. The Committee will annually solicit and summarize faculty views on the Chair's performance to provide advice to the Dean.

#### **b). Promotion and Tenure Committee**

1) The Promotion and Tenure Committee is comprised of all tenured faculty members in the department. Untenured, tenure-track faculty and specialized 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. (see Appendix B, Department of Management Annual Evaluation and Merit Evaluation Guidelines).

2) The committee chair shall be elected by a simple majority vote of the Promotion and Tenure Committee at the first faculty meeting of the academic year (normally Fall semester). Only tenured full professors are eligible to serve as the committee chair. The

committee chair shall also serve as 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, see Appendix A.

5) When required and feasible, the faculty will elect a Subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure Committee for specialized faculty that consists of at least three faculty members with the majority being specialized.

#### **c) Doctoral Policy Coordinator(s)**

1. The Chair will appoint Coordinators for doctoral programs. Doctoral Policy Coordinators are responsible for general administration of departmental doctoral programs, including recruiting, admissions, assistantships, academic counseling, curriculum, and comprehensive examinations. The appropriate coordinator also serves as the academic advisor for all doctoral students prior to their selection of a dissertation committee. The appropriate coordinator will also coordinate doctoral examination for the creation and administration of a comprehensive exam to all eligible doctoral students.

2. The Chair will designate the Graduate Coordinators to serve as the department's representatives to the College doctoral policy committee.

#### **d) Graduate Coordinator**

When required, the Chair will appoint a coordinator for master level programs. Graduate Coordinators are responsible for general administration of departmental graduate programs, including recruiting, admissions, assistantships, academic counseling, and curriculum.

#### **e) Undergraduate Committee**

1. This committee is responsible for the review and oversight of all undergraduate programs housed within the department, and it serves as the curriculum committee for undergraduate programs. 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. Minutes of meetings shall be maintained and filed with the department.

2. The faculty will annually elect an Undergraduate Committee consisting of not less than three faculty members, with responsibility for the Department's undergraduate programs. The Chair will designate one faculty member as the Chair of the Committee.

3. The Chair of the Undergraduate Committee will serve as the department's representative on the College's Undergraduate Committee.

#### **e) Faculty Recruiting Committee(s)**

1. Faculty recruiting committees are identified by the Department Chair, and they are charged with identifying, recruiting, and evaluating potential faculty candidates when open faculty lines exist within the department. 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.

2. Recruiting committees shall consist of no less than three faculty members.

**f) Ad Hoc Committees:** Additional committees can be formed by the Department Chairperson, as needed.

#### **F. Summer Teaching**

1. Summer teaching assignments will be based on: 1) the summer teaching budget allocated to the department; 2) the course needs to facilitate the department's programs and accommodate student demand; 3) faculty availability; and 4) equity in rotating summer teaching among eligible faculty. 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 their 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. Doctoral students after completing their first academic year in residence will be expected to support summer teaching (e.g., teaching assistant) and by an instructor of record after passing their comprehensive exam unless it is deemed to not be in the best interest of the student and/or the program.

3. Priority for summer teaching assignments will be based on the following:

a) Priority for graduate courses will be given to tenure-track faculty who (in order of importance): 1) have expertise in the area of the course, 2) have demonstrated proficiency in teaching graduate courses (as determined by the Department Chair), 3) have not taught in the summer (for any reason) in recent years, but were otherwise eligible to teach, and 4) do not have funded summer financial support (e.g., COFRS grants, College summer research grants, International Programs, contract or grants, or other paid service or research assignments), with priority relative to the level of funding received (i.e., those with less funding receive higher priority). Second priority will be given to specialized

faculty who are qualified to teach graduate courses and have demonstrated teaching proficiency.

b) Priority for undergraduate courses will be given to specialized and tenure-track faculty who (in order of importance): 1) have expertise in the area of the course, 2) have demonstrated proficiency in teaching undergraduate courses (as determined by the Department Chair), 3) have not taught in the summer (for any reason) in recent years, but were otherwise eligible to teach, and 4) do not have funded summer financial support (e.g., COFRS grants, College summer research grants, International Programs, contract or grants, or other paid service or research assignments), with priority relative to the level of funding received (i.e., those with less funding receive higher priority).

3. When the priorities outlined above come into conflict, or do not produce a summer teaching schedule consistent with the criteria in Section F.3 (budgetary constraints, course needs, and faculty availability), faculty performance scores (i.e., merit scores) and faculty who have developed, or more recently redeveloped, an online undergraduate or graduate program course will have priority for summer teaching.

**G. Election of Faculty Senate Representatives:** Management Department Faculty Senate representatives are elected at-large from the entire College of Business faculty.

## **H. Faculty Travel**

1. The Department encourages the growth and development of personnel through professional and personal travel. The primary responsibility for appropriate selection of occasions for faculty travel falls to the individual faculty member and the department chair.

2. The University exists to conduct teaching, research, and public service. Expenditures of University funds for travel and entertainment must support this mission, and a business purpose must exist for each instance of expenditure. At the beginning of each fiscal year, faculty will be asked to forecast travel. Submission of a travel forecast does not mean the travel is approved or will be funded. To receive approval and possible full or partial funding, individual travel authorization form requests will be submitted before travel occurs. Travel authorization forms must be signed by the individual and department chair and include a general summary of anticipated expenses.

3. It will be the responsibility of the department chair to ascertain that sufficient funds are available before authorizing travel and reimbursement. No individual will be reimbursed for travel expenses without prior approval from the department. Upon return itemized receipts are required for all expenses, and rationale for extraordinary expenses may be required and denied.

4. As faculty members do not accrue annual leave, all requests for travel during the academic year or assigned coursework must be preapproved even when department funds

are not requested. Additionally, the Department Chair will be notified if classes are cancelled for illness or family emergency.

5. Due to the uncertain nature of the world, all faculty are request to submit itinerary and contact information to the department chair prior to any international travel.

### **I. Amendments**

Any five voting members of the Department may propose an amendment to the bylaws. A proposed amendment must be available to the voting membership at least two weeks prior to the Department meeting where it will be considered. To be adopted, a proposed amendment must receive an affirmative vote by a two-thirds majority of those voting in a secret ballot of the faculty.

### **J. Substantive Change Monitoring and Reporting Policy**

Faculty and staff members are expected to be familiar with and follow the Florida State University Substantive Change Policy as found on the university web site <http://provost.fsu.edu/sacs>.

### **K. Effective Date**

These Bylaws were revised and adopted by a 2/3 majority of the Management faculty on October 13, 2017.

**APPENDIX A**  
**Department of Management**  
**Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines**

This Appendix describes the criteria to be used for performance evaluation and procedures to be used by the Department of Management for the distribution of salary increase funds available for the purpose of rewarding meritorious faculty performance. The criteria and procedures are consistent with the mission and goals of The Florida State University, the College of Business, and the Department of Management, and they comply with and supplement the provisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and the Faculty Handbook (FH). There is no intent to contradict such authorities in these criteria and procedures, and failure to incorporate their provisions here is intended to avoid excessive duplication and does not diminish the effect of those authorities.

**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) progress toward promotion reviews, 3) annual evaluations, and 4) merit evaluations.
3. Evaluations and recommendations regarding promotion and tenure are conducted as outlined in the department's bylaws. Also outlined in the bylaws, the department's Faculty Evaluation Committee conducts evaluations and makes recommendations regarding annual peer evaluations, an annual evaluation of the department chair, peer teaching reviews, progress toward promotion faculty reviews, and annual merit evaluations.
4. The department's evaluative criteria include both qualitative and quantitative aspects of performance that may require judgment and interpretation by faculty peer committees and other evaluators.
5. 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 faculty in the department.
6. 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 management. The following evidence, if provided, must be considered in the evaluation process. The following list does not imply an order of priority.

- **Course Materials and Methodology:** The development of innovative course materials, media, 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; 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 Management 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 following list 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 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 impact 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 following list does not imply an order of priority.

- **Recognized Service:** Membership on department, college and university committees, Faculty Senate and other roles is essential to the operation of the respective units; 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 following list 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.

#### **C. Promotion and Tenure Guidelines – Tenure Track Faculty**

The guidelines presented here are necessarily broad and somewhat difficult to operationalize. 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 the department's bylaws.

The following minimum criteria shall be used in the promotion and tenure process in the Department of Management. 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. Appointment to the rank of **assistant professor** shall be based on demonstrated competency in teaching, service, and the promise of scholarly development, and it requires full documentation of the completion of a doctoral degree.
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. Promotion to associate professor also reflects a judgement on the future potential and contributions of a faculty member.
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 tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor 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 the promotion becoming effective at the beginning of the seventh year.
5. 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 with sufficient justification.
6. The criteria for tenure shall be the same as the promotion criteria to associate professor. Additionally, the faculty member shall demonstrate their ability to continue to make significant professional contributions to the management discipline, the College, the University, and the academic community. Tenure must take place within seven years, as no faculty member may hold the rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor for longer than that without having been awarded tenure. Assistant Professors who do not show potential for promotion to Associate Professor can be expected to be terminated by the Department prior to the expiration of the seven-year limit.

#### **D. Progress Toward Tenure Review Guidelines**

The overall procedures and guidelines for progress toward tenure evaluations are meant to be consistent with those outlined above in Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. 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 Peer Evaluation Committee. The composition and structure of this committee is outlined in the department's bylaws.

1. 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.

2. The department's Peer Evaluation Committee will review all progress toward tenure 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 progress toward tenure 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 progress toward tenure reviews, the thrust of the evaluation is to determine whether the faculty member is making sufficient progress toward promotion and tenure. The department's Peer 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.

#### **E. Promotion Guidelines – Specialized Faculty**

The guidelines presented here are necessarily broad and somewhat difficult to translate into operational terms. The critical point is that each specialized faculty member desiring promotion 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 promotion committee. The following minimum criteria shall be used in the promotion process.

1. Appointment to the rank of **Teaching I** shall be based on competency in teaching, student engagement both inside and outside the classroom, student mentoring, service to the Department, College, and University, as well as connections to industry leaders and industry partners when appropriate.

2. Promotion or appointment to the rank of **Teaching II** shall be based on competency in teaching, student engagement both inside and outside the classroom, student mentoring, service to the Department, College, and University, as well as connections to industry leaders and industry partners when appropriate.
3. Promotion or appointment to the rank of **Teaching III** shall be based on superior competency in teaching, student engagement both inside and outside the classroom, student mentoring, service to the Department, College, and University, as well as connections to industry leaders and industry partners when appropriate.
4. Consideration for promotion to the rank of Teaching II normally occurs in the specialized faculty member's sixth year, with the promotion becoming effective at the beginning of the seventh year.
5. Although the minimum period of time in a given rank is normally six 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 with sufficient justification.

**APPENDIX B**  
**Department of Management**  
**Annual Evaluation and Merit Evaluation Guidelines**

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 so the Department Chair has some latitude in the final determination of merit salary decisions (noted in 8 and 9 below). The department's Peer 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 with appropriate notice.
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 Section B will be included in this report, as well as other performance information deemed important and relevant by the faculty member.
3. The Peer Evaluation Committee will evaluate each faculty member's performance relative to the criteria described in Appendix A. 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.** This describes a faculty member who far exceeds performance expectations during the evaluation period and achieves an extraordinary accomplishment or recognition in teaching, research, or service, which may include several of the following: highly significant research or creative activities; demonstrated recognition of the individual by peers as an authority in his/her field; securing significant external funding; attaining significant national or international achievements, awards, and recognition.

4 = **Exceeds FSU's High Expectations.** This describes an individual who exceeds expectations during the evaluation period by virtue of demonstrating noted achievements in teaching, research, or service, which may include several of the following: high level of research/creative activity, professional recognitions, willingness to accept additional responsibilities, high level of commitment to serving

students and the overall mission of the Department, involvement/leadership in professional associations, initiative in solving problems or developing new ideas.

3 = **Meets FSU's High Expectations.** This describes an individual who demonstrates the requisite knowledge and skills in his/her field of specialty and complete assigned responsibilities in a manner that is both timely and consistent with the high expectations of the university.

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

1 = **Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations.** This describes an individual who fails to demonstrate with consistency the knowledge, skills, or abilities required in his/her field of specialty and/or in completing assigned responsibilities.

Note: No restrictions exist to the number of faculty placed in a given merit category, and 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.

#### Example of Weighted Performance Evaluation Score

Research:	4	(.4)	= 1.6
Teaching:	5	(.5)	= 2.5
Service:	4	(.1)	= 0.4
Admin:	0.0	(0)	= 0
Total Weighted			= 4.5

5. Weighted performance evaluation scores will be provided to the Peer 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."

7. Merit raise allocations will be made in dollar amounts as follows: Category 1 or 2; No Merit (\$0), Category 3; Merit if possible (\$X), Category 4; Merit (\$2X), and Category 5; High Merit (\$3X). 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 (Example: Assume there are four faculty members, one in each rating category, and \$2800 is available. In this case X = \$466 and merit raises will be in the amounts of \$0, \$466, \$933, and \$1400).

8. Upon completion of the evaluation of each faculty member, the Department Chair will present and personally discuss each faculty member's evaluation with the respective faculty member. This discussion will include the Department Chair's perceptions of positive areas of performance, as well as the areas that need improvement.

9. A Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) is required when a non-tenured faculty member receives a "Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations" rating. Tenured faculty members may be placed on a PIP if they receive an overall performance rating of "Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations" on three or more of the previous six performance evaluations.

10. After completing discussions with all faculty, the Department Chair will submit the results of the evaluation process and a narrative explanation to the Dean.

#### **F. 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.