Revised 4/03/95; 04/27/98; 12/11/00; 8/27/01; 4/19/04; 8/30/04; 1/5/05; 12/06; 9/17/07; 2/25/08; 4/21/08; 8/24/09; 3/18/13; 1/06/14; approved by the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement, May 2014; revised 10/30/17; 8/27/18; 2/4/19; 11/27/2019; 12/9/19; 2/17/20; 10/5/20; approved by the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement, 10/9/20

BYLAWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

Section A. Membership

1. Membership in the Department of English shall include: (a) full-time faculty in tenured or tenure-earning positions, (b) specialized faculty, and (c) temporary or part-time appointees, including those who serve as teaching or research assistants. All members shall have the privilege of the floor in department meetings.

2. The right to vote shall be limited to faculty members in tenured or tenure-earning positions. But Specialized Faculty will also vote on matters affecting annual evaluation and promotion of Specialized Faculty.

Section B. Authority

The authority of the department over its academic program resides in its voting memberships. Any recommendations regarding the reorganization of the department/unit as a whole must be subject to approval by the full faculty. The Dean of the college invests the Chair with authority over budgetary policy and administrative staff.

Section C. Department Meetings

1. The Department of English shall meet in regular session once each month during the regular academic year. The dates of meetings shall be established by the Chair in consultation with the Executive Committee, and the times designated shall be free of conflicting departmental activities.

2. Additional sessions shall be called by the Chair or her/his designated representative (a) on her/his own initiative, (b) on the request of the Executive Committee, or (c) on the written request of six voting members.

3. The Chair shall normally preside at department meetings. In the absence of the Chair, another voting member designated by the Chair shall preside.

4. The Chair shall prepare the agenda for each meeting and distribute copies

to the members prior to the meeting.

5. Half or more of the voting membership of the department shall constitute a quorum at any departmental meeting.

6. Meetings shall be conducted in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order, latest revision, except as otherwise provided in these bylaws.

7. At the first meeting in the fall term, a Secretary shall be elected for a one-year term from the voting membership. The Secretary shall be eligible for re-election. Nominations shall be made from the floor, with election by simple majority. The duties of the Secretary shall be:

   a. To record the minutes of department meetings;

   b. To prepare, receive, and count ballots in department elections;

   c. To aid the Chair in conducting business relative to the meeting.

   In the absence of the Secretary, the Chair shall appoint a voting member of the department to act as secretary. Minutes shall be distributed to all members, and made available to others upon request. Copies shall be kept on file in the department office. The first order of business at each meeting shall be the disposition of the minutes of the preceding meeting.

8. Each voting member of the department shall be expected to attend all department meetings, unless excused by the Chair. The secretary shall record in the minutes the names of all voting members absent from each meeting, indicating those excused by the Chair

Section D. The Chair

1. Procedure for Selection of the Chair

   a. Pending the expiration of a regular term of the chair or upon the office becoming vacant from some other cause, the Executive Committee shall initiate the procedure for establishing a ten-member (nominating) Chair Selection Committee.

      i. The Executive Committee, with the consent of the Dean, shall request the department, in the spring term before the beginning of the third year of an incumbent chair's term, to elect eight faculty members, including at least one non-tenured member, and a first and second alternate member.

      ii. request the Dean to appoint a member from outside the department;

iii. request the Advisory Council of English Students to elect a student member who shall serve in an advisory capacity as a non-voting member of the committee.

If the office of Chair becomes vacant prior to the expiration of an incumbent's term, the Executive committee shall consult with the Dean about the appointment of an interim chair and to determine the earliest time to start the process for selection of a chair as specified in the Bylaws.

b. The Selection committee shall, in the spring term, solicit nomination of candidates from within the department and determine which nominees are willing to become candidates for the position of Chair.

c. During the nomination process, members of the department may propose to the Selection Committee discussion with the Dean of circumstances that would warrant consideration of candidates from outside the department. If such an outside search is deemed appropriate, the Selection Committee and the Executive Committee shall jointly serve to administer and conduct the search.

d. After candidates for the position of chair have been determined, the Selection Committee shall

i. Arrange for the candidates to interact formally with the faculty, students and staff of the department, including forums for presentation and audience questions, and for responses from each group to the candidates;

ii. Conduct an informal poll of the department faculty on the candidates and make known the results to the faculty;

iii. Make a formal nomination, subject to approval by a majority vote of the voting membership of the department in a secret ballot;

iv. Submit the name of the candidate endorsed by the department to the Dean.

2. The Term of Office of the Chair

The Chair's term of office shall be three years, normally beginning in August. The Chair shall be eligible for renomination and reappointment.

3. Procedure for Removing a Chair from Office

The department may recommend to the Dean that a Chair be removed from office. Such an action must be taken according to the following procedure:

a. A motion calling for removal must be introduced by three or more voting members in an official meeting, with notice of the business of the meeting having been given to members at least two weeks in advance.

b. To be adopted, the motion for removal must be supported by a two-thirds majority of the voting membership in a secret ballot, conducted by mail by the Secretary of the department faculty, who will report the vote to the membership of the department.

4. Authority and Duties of the Chair.

a. The Chair shall serve as the chief administrative officer of the department.

b. The Chair shall call and preside over the department meetings and prepare the agenda for the meetings, as provided in C. 1-4.

c. The Chair shall appoint for one-year, renewable terms any officers needed to administer departmental affairs. S/he shall report to the department as soon as practicable, normally at the beginning of the fall term, the names and duties of such appointees.

d. The Chair, in conjunction with the Executive Committee, shall establish Committees for the conduct of departmental affairs, as provided in Section G.

e. The Chair shall call and preside over meetings of the Executive Committee on a regular basis, at least once monthly.

f. The Chair shall regularly report to the Executive Committee and the department the actions being formed in administering department affairs.

g. The Chair, serving as principal financial officer of the department,

i. shall supervise receipts and expenditures of all monies;

ii. in conjunction with the Executive Committee, shall prepare an annual budget;

iii. in consultation with the Executive Committee, shall prepare an annual financial report to be presented to the members of the department at the end of each fiscal year.

h. The Chair, in conjunction with the Executive committee, shall supervise and coordinate the recruiting of new faculty members.

i. The Chair, in conjunction with the appropriate committees of the department, shall coordinate all segments of the academic program, such as degree requirements, curricular offerings, and catalog announcements. The Chair shall determine and supervise, in consultation with appropriate committees, such matters as the scheduling of classes and the assignment of faculty. The Chair provides each tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty member with his or her annual assignment of responsibilities. The Chair shall also determine and supervise the teaching loads and administrative assignments of specialized faculty members.

j. The Chair, in conjunction with the Faculty Evaluation Committee and in accord with the faculty member's assignment of responsibilities and the CBA, performs an annual evaluation of each faculty member and recommends salary adjustments to the dean. If the chair’s recommendations differ from those of the evaluation committee, both sets of recommendations shall be forwarded to the dean.

k. The Chair annually provides each faculty member who has not achieved the highest rank possible a written evaluation of his or her progress toward promotion and, if applicable, tenure.

l. The Chair or a designee shall serve as liaison officer and departmental representative to officers and bodies outside the department.

Section E. The Executive Committee

1. The Executive Committee shall be the principal coordinating committee of the department.

2. The committee shall consist of nine voting members (the Chair and eight other faculty members), three appointed by the Chair (usually but not necessarily the Associate Chair, the Director of Graduate Studies, and the

Director of Undergraduate Studies), the Directors of the three programs (Literature, Creative Writing, and Rhetoric and Composition) elected by their respective program committees, and two faculty elected at-large, at least one of whom should be non-tenured. The appointed members shall be appointed for one-year, renewable terms. The elected members shall serve one-year terms and shall be eligible for re-election.

3. A Vice-Chair, appointed by the Chair from the membership of the Executive Committee, may, in the absence of the Chair, call and preside over meetings of the committee.

4. The committee shall meet on a regular schedule, normally once monthly, depending on the existence of agenda items (see D.4.e.).

5. Meetings of the committee shall be held only when a majority, including at least one elected and one appointed member, are present.

6. The committee shall function both as a decision-making and an advisory body. On matters on which the committee serves in a decision-making capacity, the Chair may veto the decision arrived at by a vote of the committee but must report such a veto at the next department meeting. The department faculty shall have the authority to override such a veto by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting in a secret ballot.

    a. The Executive Committee shall function as a decision-making body on such matters as:

        i. The establishment of committees other than those specified in the bylaws, exclusive of committees overseeing budgetary policy or administrative staff;

        ii. the recruitment of faculty; see also Appendix III, Hiring Procedures.

        iii. the implementation and supervision of the academic program approved by the department;

        iv. the planning and implementation of the summer program in accord with the department Summer Teaching Policy and the CBA;

        v. the implementation of orders and guidelines from officers and bodies outside the department, unless otherwise provided in these bylaws.

b. The Executive Committee shall function as an advisory body in implementing departmental and committee policies.

Section F. The Faculty Evaluation Committee

1. The function of the Faculty Evaluation Committee is the evaluation of faculty members in terms of performance in teaching, research or other creative activity, and service and administration. The Committee will conduct the annual merit evaluation, and the annual performance evaluation, in accord with each faculty member's assignment of responsibilities. In addition, for the third year reviews of tenure-track Assistant Professors required by the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the tenured members of the Evaluation Committee will function as a subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Likewise, for the advisory annual promotion reviews of Associate Professors required by the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the tenured Professors on the Evaluation Committee will function as a subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Evaluation Committee shall employ evaluative criteria and procedures approved by the Department. These evaluations will be conducted in accordance with College and University procedures and procedures specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The Committee will also assist the chair in the annual evaluation of specialized faculty members for annual merit and for progress toward promotion following the procedures in Appendix J of the CBA, including a peer component agreed upon by a majority vote of the specialized faculty and by the Executive committee.

2. a) The Committee shall consist of ten standing faculty: nine tenured or tenure-earning members, and one Specialized Faculty member. b) One of those nine faculty shall be the Chair of the Department, who shall serve as chair of the Committee. c) At least two of the nine, exclusive of the Chair, shall hold the rank of Professor. d) At least two of the nine shall hold the rank of Associate Professor. e) At least two of the nine shall hold the rank of Assistant Professor, unless all (or all but one) eligible Assistant Professors decline to serve on the Committee in a given year. Assistant Professors who are on research leave in the spring term of a given evaluation cycle shall automatically be excluded from serving on the Evaluation Committee within that cycle. No untenured faculty member may serve more than once while untenured. f) One tenured member of the Committee shall not have served on the Committee within the past five years. g) No member of the Committee (with the exception of the Chair) shall serve on the Committee for more than two consecutive years. h) No faculty member shall be eligible for membership on the Committee in any given year if his/her most recent annual performance evaluation has included an assessment of "Official Concern" or " Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations" for any one of the evaluation categories (Research, Teaching, Service, or, if relevant, Administration). i) Additional committee members, up to the requisite number of ten, shall be elected at large from the eligible standing faculty. j) All members except the Chair

shall be elected by secret ballot. k) Faculty whose evaluations are conducted by the Chair alone or by other University administrators are ineligible for election. l) The election of the Evaluation Committee for the year will take place at the first faculty meeting of the academic year.

3. The Committee will evaluate faculty achievement for a three-calendar-year span. An orientation meeting will be held in January in order to allow adequate time for reading materials before the final report to the Dean in April. Following the reading of materials and initial scoring, the Evaluation Committee will meet as a whole. A committee member who is being discussed will be absent at the time. Committee members must also recuse themselves from discussion and voting on their spouses/partners or other faculty where there are circumstances that would prevent a faculty member from voting objectively. See Appendix I for Annual Evaluation Procedures.

4. The Committee shall make recommendations regarding the annual merit raise for each faculty member. The Chair shall convey the recommendations to the Dean. In accordance with the CBA, if the Chair disagrees with the recommendations of the committee, both the Chair's recommendations and the committee's recommendations shall be conveyed to the Dean and to the committee. They will also be communicated to the affected faculty member(s). In consultation with the committee, the Chair will write letters each year to all tenured and tenure-track faculty below the rank of Professor and to all specialized faculty below the highest level in their category, apprising them of their progress toward promotion and/or tenure.

Section G. Promotion and Tenure Committees

All tenured faculty shall constitute a committee to vote on tenure. All Associate and Full Professors shall constitute a committee to vote on promotion to Associate Professor. All Full Professors shall constitute a committee to vote on promotion to Full Professor. The tenured members of the Evaluation Committee shall constitute a subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure Committee for the purpose of the third year reviews of Assistant Professors. The members of the Evaluation Committee holding the rank of Professor shall constitute a subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure Committee for the purpose of the advisory annual review of Associate Professors for promotion. All tenure-track, and all Specialized Faculty (at the rank of Lecturer III), shall constitute a subcommittee to vote on promotion to Lecturer III. All tenure-track, and all Specialized Faculty (at the rank of Lecturer II or Lecturer III), shall constitute a subcommittee to vote on promotion to Lecturer II. The Chair shall convey the recommendations to the appropriate officers and committees outside the department. See Appendix II for Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Guidelines.

Section H. Program Committees

1. The faculty who participate in the Department's three graduate tracks (Literature, Creative Writing, and Rhetoric and Composition) will comprise for each program

a committee of the whole and, through a process that includes a vote by secret ballot, select annually a program Director. Each program Director will serve at the discretion of the chair, who may, if circumstances warrant, remove a Director or veto the decision of the program committee. Program Directors will be authorized to call program meetings, conduct program affairs, and will represent the program on the department's Executive Committee.

2. Faculty who participate in more than one of the Department's three graduate tracks may select, normally on the basis of their primary graduate teaching commitment, the program committee in which they wish to participate as a voting member. No faculty may vote in a given year on more than one program committee.

3. Program committees must elect their Directors for the upcoming academic year sufficiently in advance of each Director's period of service that the Department can make adjustments in teaching assignments prior to university deadlines for course offerings. Normally, this means elections of Directors must occur prior to January 15.

Section I. Curriculum Committee

Each year, the Executive Committee appoints an Undergraduate Committee and a Graduate Committee, which serve as first-level department curriculum committees. Recommendations from these committees about the curriculum go to the department for approval.

Section J. Editing Writing Major Committee

Each year the Executive Committee appoints an Editing-Writing-Media Major Committee. This committee will address questions and issues related to the major.

Section K. Other Committees

The Chair, in conjunction with the Executive Committee serving in a decision-making capacity, shall establish such additional committees as seem needed to conduct the affairs of the department. The functions and membership of each committee shall be made known to the department as soon as practicable in the fall term of each year. See Appendix III for Hiring Committee Procedures.

Section L. Faculty Senator

The department will elect its faculty senators and alternates at such times as specified by the constitution of the Faculty Senate

Section M. Amendments to the Bylaws

Any three voting members of the department may propose an amendment to these bylaws. A proposed amendment must be made available to the voting membership at or before a department meeting that occurs at least two weeks prior to the date of the meeting at which a

vote on adoption is to be taken. To be adopted, a proposed amendment must receive an affirmative vote by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. In the event of an emergency, a proposed amendment may be adopted at the same meeting in which it is presented if it receives an affirmative vote by a three-fourths majority of the members present and voting. All voting on proposed amendments shall be conducted by secret ballot.

Section N. Faculty and staff members are expected to be familiar with and follow the Florida State University Substantive Change policy as found on the university website http://provost.fsu.ed/sacs

The department bylaws adhere to and are consistent with University policies found in the FSU Constitution, the BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Faculty Handbook, and the annual Promotion and Tenure letter.

Appendix I: Annual Evaluation Procedures

Appendix II: Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Procedures

Appendix III: Hiring Committee Procedures

Appendix I

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MERIT EVALUATION

Overview

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) specifies two evaluations of faculty every spring term: an annual performance evaluation and a merit evaluation. The Evaluation Committee conducts these two evaluations simultaneously. By departmental choice, both evaluations cover a three-year span (the three immediately preceding calendar years; for all faculty employed fewer than three years, the period of evaluation will be the period of employment at FSU). For both evaluations, faculty members submit a set of materials designated in the CBA as the "Evidence of Performance" (EOP), the format and contents of which are determined by the department (see below). For both evaluations the evaluation committee assesses the faculty's work in relation to written benchmarks (see below) in three areas of evaluation: service (for administrators, the area is service and administration combined), teaching, and research. These policies are effective January 1, 2013; the Evaluation Committee will implement them in spring 2014.

The Annual Performance Evaluation.

For the annual performance evaluation, each member of the department Evaluation Committee evaluates each faculty member in the three areas of performance and assigns a recommendation of one of five ratings in each area, as specified in the CBA:

1. Substantially exceeds FSU's high expectations.
2. Exceeds FSU's high expectations.
3. Meets FSU's high expectations.
4. Official Concern
5. Does not meet FSU's high expectations.

To rate a faculty member in a category in any area of evaluation requires 6 votes of the 9 person committee (since committee members recuse themselves from evaluation of their own cases and of their spouses/partners or other faculty where there are circumstances that would prevent a faculty member from voting objectively. 5 of 8 votes are needed to place them in a category; in any exceptional situation where only 7 votes are cast, a supermajority is 5). In any case where a person does not initially receive at least 6 votes placing him or her in a category, the case will be discussed and revoted (by secret ballot) until at least 6 votes of the committee agree on the category for each evaluation area. If at least 6 votes have not been achieved after three revotes, the Chair will break the deadlock.

The final overall performance evaluation is based on the results in the three evaluation areas. The results of the annual performance evaluation (the results in each area and the overall result) are reported to the faculty member and to the university on the "Annual Evaluation Summary Form" (Appendix F in the CBA).

The Merit Evaluation

For the merit evaluation, each committee member evaluates each faculty member in the three areas of evaluation and assigns a recommendation of one of five ratings in each area (with this exception: the Teaching area has only four categories: Exceptional Merit, Merit, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory.

1. Exceptional Merit
2. High Merit (n.b.: this category excluded in Teaching area)
3. Merit
4. Satisfactory
5. Unsatisfactory

To rate a faculty member in a merit category in any area of evaluation requires 6 votes of the 9 person committee (since committee members recuse themselves from evaluation of their own cases, 5 of 8 votes are needed to place them in a merit category; in any exceptional situation where only 7 votes are cast, a supermajority is 5). In any case where a person does not initially receive at least 6 votes placing him or her in a merit category, the case will be discussed and revoted (by secret ballot) until at least 6 votes of the committee agree on the merit category for each evaluation area. If at least 6 votes have not been achieved after three revotes, the Chair will break the deadlock.

The final overall recommendation for merit is based on the combined results from each of the three evaluation areas. The committee will combine the results using a weighting formula based on the percentages assigned to service, teaching, and research (see below). The committee as a whole reports the results of the annual merit evaluation to each faculty member and to the dean in a memo summarizing the overall merit evaluation, evaluation in each area, and significant discussion. The work of drafting these memos for each faculty member will be divided equally among the committee members. There is no predetermined proportion of faculty in any area of the scale.

The "Evidence of Performance" (EOP) document includes:

1. an updated CV in the University P&T format for the three previous calendar years (or term of service at FSU):

2. a one-page list of research items

3. a one-page list of teaching items, including courses taught and service on graduate committees

4. a one-page list of service and administrative items

5. university-generated chart of responses to SPCI #13 for three-year period

6. one set of high range (90%+) SPCI forms (if available) and one set of SPCI forms for one undergraduate course and one graduate course from the 0%-89% range

7. a printout of the online grade archive summary sheet for the SPCI forms turned in

8. one undergraduate course syllabus and one graduate course syllabus
9. sample research materials, not to exceed the space of 9X12 expandable file

Outline of the annual evaluation process

Organizational meeting

Evaluation of individual faculty members begins with an organizational meeting of the evaluation committee. Benchmarks and procedures for annual performance evaluation and for merit evaluation should be reviewed and discussed.

Evaluation Phase 1

Committee members individually read the EOP documents and *through reference to the benchmarks* assign to each faculty member a tentative recommendation from each of the two rating scales in all three areas of performance. For annual performance evaluation, a rating of one of the following in each area of evaluation: Service (or for administrators Service and Administration), Teaching, and Research:

1. Substantially exceeds FSU's high expectations.
2. Exceeds FSU's high expectations.
3. Meets FSU's high expectations.
4. Official Concern
5. Does not meet FSU's high expectations.

For merit evaluation, a rating of one of the following in each area of evaluation: Service (or for administrators Service and Administration), Teaching, and Research, with this exception: the Teaching Area has only four categories (Exceptional Merit, Merit, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory):

1. Exceptional Merit
2. High Merit (n.b.: this category excluded in Teaching area)
3. Merit
4. Satisfactory
5. Unsatisfactory.

Evaluation Phase 2

The committee will meet for at least one hour for discussion after members have had an opportunity to read files and before votes are submitted . At this meeting the chair will assign each member of the committee an equal number of cases for which he or she will draft the merit evaluation memo. If clarification regarding individual files is necessary, committee members can request that the chair solicit additional information. Following this meeting, each committee member finalizes his or her recommendations and submits them to the chair.

Evaluation Phase 3

The committee holds one or multiple meetings with the following agenda:

Merit Evaluation

The chair provides a tabulation of voting results in all three areas (how many votes of Exceptional Merit, High Merit [n.b.: not a category for Teaching], Merit, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory at this time each faculty member has received) and opens discussion of those cases where 6 votes (or 5 votes in the case of a member of the committee) do not place the faculty member in any one category, starting with Service, then Service and Administration, then Teaching (note that the Teaching area has only four categories:

Exceptional Merit, Merit, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory), and then Research.

Discussion should be of material included in the EOP and should not involve the introduction of anecdotal information not otherwise available to committee members. The exception to this restriction is the chair, who has the responsibility, when needed, to contextualize the information in the file. In those instances where a super majority has not been achieved, a revote (by secret ballot) must be taken until the case gets at least 6 votes (or the appropriate number to constitute a super majority) placing it in a merit category for this evaluation area. If a super majority has not been achieved after three revotes, the chair will break the deadlock. Discussion proceeds alphabetically by rank: Assistant, Associate, Full.

At the end of this process, the committee will have reached a determination for the merit evaluation of each faculty member in each area of evaluation. For the overall merit evaluation, see "Evaluation Phase 5" and "Tabulation System" below.

Annual Performance Evaluation

The chair provides a tabulation of voting results in all three areas (how many votes of each annual performance evaluation category [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.] each faculty member has received in each area) and opens discussion of those cases where 6 votes (or 5 votes in the case of a member of the committee) do not place the faculty member in any one category, starting with Service, then Service and Administration, then Teaching, and then Research.

Discussion should be of material included in the EOP and should not involve the introduction of anecdotal information not otherwise available to committee members. The exception to this restriction is the chair, who has the responsibility, when needed, to contextualize the information in the file. In those instances where a super majority has not been achieved, a revote (by secret ballot) must be taken until the case gets at least 6 votes (or the appropriate number to constitute a super majority) placing it in a category for this evaluation area. If a super majority has not been achieved after three revotes, the chair will break the deadlock. Discussion proceeds alphabetically by rank: Assistant, Associate, Full.

At the end of this process, the committee will have reached a determination for the annual performance evaluation of each faculty member in each area of evaluation. For the overall annual performance evaluation, see "Evaluation Phase 5" and "Tabulation System" below.

Evaluation Phase 4

In addition, the committee or its subsets (functioning as subcommittees of the Promotion and Tenure Committee) will also meet separately from the annual performance evaluation and merit evaluation deliberations to discuss cases of third-year review, progress toward promotion, early promotion, and promotion.

Evaluation Phase 5

In preparation for the next meeting, the chair tabulates the results of phase 3 according to the system explained below under the heading "Tabulation System" and brings this tabulation to the meeting. Each member of the committee, after seeing the tabulated results, then drafts merit evaluation memos to the faculty members he or she has been assigned and submits these memos to the chair for approval or revision and forwarding to faculty.

Communication with Faculty Members

Each faculty member will receive a memo from the committee about the merit evaluation, reporting the overall evaluation, evaluation in each area, and significant discussion. The memo will not indicate actual amounts of merit raises, but it will indicate the award as either no raise at this time for merit (includes both Unsatisfactory and Satisfactory); X (Merit overall); 1.5X (High Merit overall); or 2X (Exceptional Merit overall). The value of X will depend on the money available. Proportions of the division of money

will depend on the Dean's approval, if in compliance with the CBA.

Each faculty member will also receive the results of the annual performance evaluation in two documents required by the CBA: a copy of the "Annual Evaluation Summary Form" (Appendix F in the CBA) and a narrative report prepared by the chair (the "evaluator" in the terms of the CBA). Assistant Professors hired July 1, 2019 or later shall receive a tenure review in their third year. Assistant Professors hired 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'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 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 chair will hold a required meeting with each faculty member in April to discuss the annual performance evaluation and the merit evaluation and to sign the Assignment of Responsibilities Form (AOR)for the next year.

Appeals

Faculty members wishing to appeal their merit evaluation should submit a document specifying 1) the category (teaching, research, service, or all three) in which they wish to appeal and 2) why their case meets a different level of evaluation (Exceptional Merit, High Merit, Merit, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory), based on the benchmarks. The evaluation committee will meet to review this case in relation to the established standards of evaluation and will follow again the procedure outlined in phase 3 above. If the committee changes its evaluation of the contested area or areas, the chair will repeat the phase 5 procedure to determine a new overall ranking. The committee will generate a memo that reports its decisions to the faculty member.

Appeals of the annual performance evaluation follow the procedure outlined in the.Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Tabulation system

The chair will tabulate the results using the following systems.

1) Merit Evaluation.

First, the evaluative terms for Service, Teaching, and Research will be converted to numerical values as follows: in Service, E = 4, H = 3, M = 2, S = 1, U=0; in Teaching E = 3, M = 2, S = 1, U=0; in Research E = 4, H = 3, M = 2, S = 1, U=0.

Second, for the three-year evaluation period, the chair will compute an average overall percentage of assignment for each faculty member in Service, Teaching, and Research based on the assignment of responsibilities for those years.

Third, using these numerical values and average percentages of assignment for each area (Service, Teaching, Research), the chair will compute a Total Score for each faculty member according to this formula:

(S score x S average) + (T score x T average) + (R score x R average) = Total score

The individual's overall merit category will then be determined by locating the Total Score in the following distribution:

Exceptional Merit : 2.8-3.5.
High Merit: 2.4-2.8.
Merit: 2.0-2.4.
Satisfactory: 1.0-1.9.
Unsatisfactory: below 1.0

With a standard AOR of 55/40/5, the results will be as follows:

Research on a scale of 1-4. Multiplied by .40.
Teaching on a scale of 1-3. Multiplied by .55.
Service on a scale of 1-4. Multiplied by .05.

The relative effect of evaluative scores in each area may be seen in the following table. The score (E, H, M, S) located at the intersection of the horizontal Teaching line and vertical Research line represents the total score the faculty will receive if she scores E, H, M, or S in Service In other words, the total score E at the intersection of E in Research and E in Teaching means that the faculty member will receive this total score regardless of which score she receives in Service. However, the total scores of E,E,E,H at the intersection of E in Research and M in Teaching indicates that the scores of E, M, and H in Service have no effect on the total score of E, but a score of S in Service will drop the total score to H.

		Teaching (horizontal)		
		E3	M2	S1
Research (vertical)	E4	E	E,E,E,H	M
	H3	E	H,H,H,M	M, M, S, S
	M2	H	M,M,M,S	S
	S1	M	S	S

The same grid with decimal values illustrated:

			1.65	1.1	.55
			Teaching (horizontal)		
			E3	M2	N1
1.6	Research (vertical)	E4	E	E,E,E,H	M
1.2		H3	E	H,H,H,M	M, M,S,S
.8		M2	H	M,M,M,S	S
.40		S1	M	S	S

For example, Professor X had an average AOR for the three years of 5 S, 49.2 T, and 45.8 R. She received supermajority scores of H in Service, E in Teaching, and H in Research.

(.05 x 3) + (.492 x 3) + (.458 x 3) = 3.00 = E overall

Any overall score falling between two intervals (e.g., 2.496 or 3.242) will be rounded to the nearest interval (e.g., 2.496 = 2.50; 3.242 = 3.24). Any score equidistant between two intervals (e.g. 1.745, 2.495, 3.245) will be rounded up to the higher interval (e.g., 1.745 = 1.75).

2) Annual Performance Evaluation

The overall annual performance evaluation is based on the evaluation in the three areas of Service (and Service and Administration); Teaching; Research and Creative Activity; and Service and Administration. See "Benchmarks" below.

BENCHMARKS

MERIT EVALUATION BENCHMARKS (3 year period)

Service:

Extraordinary Merit should be awarded to tenured faculty who hold high office in important international, national, and regional professional organizations or who chair important university and college committees and organizations at any time during the three year period of evaluation in addition to a consistent record of highly meritorious departmental service (active on multiple committees, plus chairing one or more). Untenured faculty may demonstrate extraordinary service contributions through especially active service on university committees, active participation in the governance of international, national, and regional professional organizations, exceptional leadership in organizing international, national, or regional conferences or symposia. A record of exceptional leadership of community service activities (including service to public schools, community colleges, public lecture series and panel discussions, contributions to TV, radio, and newsprint, and other forms of community education) in addition to a consistent record of highly meritorious departmental service can equal extraordinary merit. Administrative functions related to editorships may also be considered (specify role and level of individual contributions; such activities might include grants and fundraising, or supervision of staff and production).

High Merit should be awarded to faculty who are active in national and/or regional professional organizations; active on college and/or university committees and organizations; or who show significant departmental leadership in addition to meritorious service (for tenured faculty, chairing one or more departmental committees; for untenured faculty, active in developing curricular or programmatic initiatives, moderating special events, organizing a series of lectures, co-directorship of conferences and symposia). A record of significant leadership of community service activities (including service to public schools, community colleges, public lecture series and panel discussions, contributions to TV, radio, and newsprint, and other forms of community education) in addition to a consistent record of meritorious departmental service can equal high merit. Administrative functions related to editorships may also be considered (specify role and level of individual contributions; such activities might include grants and fundraising, or supervision of staff and production).

Merit should be awarded to faculty with significant departmental service activity beyond the normative assignment, such as: active service on multiple committees, including elected committees; organization of a departmental symposium or lecture; regular and active involvement in hiring and recruitment; participation in community service activities (including service to public schools, community colleges, public lecture series and panel discussions, contributions to TV, radio, and newsprint, and other forms of community education). Administrative functions related to editorships may also be considered (specify role and level of individual contributions; such activities might include grants and fundraising, or supervision of staff and production).

Satisfactory should be awarded to faculty who minimally fulfill the minimum departmental service assignment (2 or 3 assigned committees, depending on rank)

Unsatisfactory should be assigned to faculty who receive an evaluation of "Official Concern" or "Does not meet FSU's high expectations" in the annual performance evaluation of service.

Service and Administration: (NB: Service and administration benchmarks are to be combined in assessment of persons with administrative assignments.)

Extraordinary merit should be awarded to faculty for extremely effective performance of the duties of the position. For examples in service, see service benchmarks. In administration, examples would include innovative leadership of units or insuring and advancing the overall strengths of the larger bodies of which the unit is a significant part (such as the department for a sub-department unit, or the Humanities Area for a college-level program).

High merit should be awarded to faculty for exemplary leadership. For examples in service, see service benchmarks. In administration, examples would include leadership of units that not only maintained the high standards of the particular unit but that also actively contributed to the overall effectiveness of the larger bodies of which the unit is a part (see above).

Merit should be awarded to faculty for active leadership. For examples in service, see service benchmarks. In administration, examples would include not only the maintenance of high standards in the unit, but active work to plan and propose forms for the unit's continuedimprovement.

Satisfactory should be assigned to faculty for adequate performance of administrative duties. For examples in service, see service benchmarks. In administration, examples would include satisfactory oversight of routine operations.

Unsatisfactory should be assigned to faculty who receive an evaluation of "Official Concern" or "Does not meet FSU's high expectations" in the annual performance evaluation of service and administration.

Teaching:

Exceptional Merit: A University Teaching Award or comparable recognition from any established body or organization, or a consistent pattern of exceptionally high scores on SPCI question #8, in addition to substantial service on graduate committees as appropriate to rank and the availability of students in the faculty member's particular area of expertise, well-organized sample syllabi, and also grade summaries, student responses (on sample SPOT forms), and other teaching items consistent with high quality teaching, will comprise the benchmark for Exceptional Merit in teaching.

Merit: High scores on SPCI question #8, service on graduate committees as appropriate to rank and the availability of students in the faculty member's particular area of expertise, well-organized sample syllabi, and also grade summaries, student responses (on sample SPOT forms), and other teaching items consistent with high quality teaching, will comprise the benchmark for Merit in teaching.

Satisfactory should be assigned to faculty with a consistent pattern of lower scores on SPCI question #8, sample syllabi that are less well organized or less ambitious than the best professional standards, or whose grade summaries, student responses (on sample SPOT forms), or other teaching items demonstrate teaching that falls short of the very best professional standards.

Unsatisfactory should be assigned to faculty who receive an evaluation of "Official Concern" or "Does not meet FSU's high expectations" in the annual performance evaluation of teaching.

Research:

Exceptional Merit should be awarded for a high quality publication, from a respected press, within the three-year period of evaluation, of: a monograph of original research, a novel, a substantial short story collection, or a book of poetry. Seven or more excellent well-placed articles (published or in press[1]), more than one co-authored book of importance to the discipline (with clear evidence of the individual faculty member's contributions to authorship), or lengthy and textually complex editions as described in the promotion and tenure document may also demonstrate exceptional merit as would major grants or fellowships connected to a record of publication. Equivalent work in electronic media should also qualify.

Each of these activities should be weighed in view of the faculty member's rank, the length and creative ambition of the work, and its contributions to the specific field(s) sub-field(s) in which s/he primarily works. Contributions to the field may be demonstrated by major external prizes and awards for scholarly or creative work.

High Merit should be awarded for publication of four to six referred articles or book chapters (published or in press), four to six stories, or fifteen or more poems in top journals, within a three-year span. High Merit should also be awarded for a completed manuscript of a monograph of original research, a novel, substantial short story collection, more than one co-authored book, or book of poetry that has been accepted or placed under contract at a respected press. Notable grants and fellowships connected to a record of publication may also qualify.

Also considered will be: publication associated with organization of a major conference or symposium; multiple presentations or invited lectures and readings at regional, national, or international conferences or symposia (with evidence of development and submission of conference papers preferred); service as the editor of a respected journal or journals, with clear evidence of the individual's role (specifically in reference to editing functions, such as length of introductions, amount of editing or manuscript selection responsible for, number of issues per year).

Each of these activities should be weighed in view of the faculty member's rank, the length and creative ambition of the work, and its contributions to the specific field(s)or sub-field(s) in which s/he primarily works.

[1] Refers to any piece that has received final editorial approval.

Merit should be awarded for publication of: three substantial scholarly articles in respected journals; three book chapters in refereed outlets; three short stories or twelve poems published in respected venues, within a three-year span. Also meritorious is publication of an edited collection of essays, stories, or poems with a substantial introduction authored or co-authored by the individual faculty member.

The following activities may supplement but not entirely replace those mentioned in the preceding paragraph: evidence of significant progress on a book manuscript; acceptance and publication of multiple substantial book reviews; service on the editorial board of a respected journal or journals, with clear evidence of the individual's role; peer review of manuscripts; development and presentation of research or creative activity in connection with a key elected role in a major professional organization; regular presentations at regional, national, or international conferences and symposia; grants and fellowships internal to the University.

Each of these activities should be weighed in view of the faculty member's rank, the length and creative ambition of the work, and its contributions to the specific field(s) sub-field(s) in which s/he primarily works.

Satisfactory should be assigned to faculty members who demonstrate ongoing research or creative activity through refereed presentations at multiple conferences or publication of one or more articles, book

chapters, poems, or short stories at respectable presses in the three-year period. Participation in conferences and symposia; publishing non-peer-reviewed items such as press articles or book reviews; and clear evidence of work in progress that has not yet resulted in publication can also serve as evidence of ongoing research or creative activity.

Unsatisfactory should be assigned to faculty who receive an evaluation of "Official Concern" or "Does not meet FSU's high expectations" in the annual performance evaluation of research.

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION BENCHMARKS (3-year period)

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

2. "Exceeds FSU's high expectations." This describes an individual who exceeds expectations during the evaluation period by virtue of demonstrating noted achievements in teaching, research, and 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 completes assigned responsibilities in a manner that is both timely and consistent with the high expectations of the university.

If an individual's overall performance rating falls below "Meets FSU's High Expectations," specific suggestions for improvement should be provided to the employee. There are two performance rating categories for individuals who are not meeting expectations:

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

5. Does not meet FSU's high expectations. This describes an individual who fails to demonstrate with consistency the knowledge, skills, or abilities required in his/her field of specialty and/or in completing assigned responsibilities.

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF SPECIALIZED FACULTY

The department follows the procedures in Appendix J of the CBA, including a peer component agreed upon by a majority vote of the specialized faculty and by the Executive committee. When the Committee considers the annual performance of individual Specialized Faculty, the elected representative of the Specialized Faculty will participate and vote. (The Specialized Faculty representative will not participate or vote on evaluation of tenured or tenure-earning faculty.). In particular, the department will take into account the following criteria for Teaching Faculty:

Service:

Specialized Faculty may have a service component defined by their AOR, which should be evaluated annually. Specialized faculty should prepare information according to departmental

guidelines regarding their service from the past three years at FSU if applicable.

Extraordinary Merit should be awarded to Specialized Faculty who have leadership roles on university committees; active participation in the governance of international, national, and regional professional organizations; exceptional leadership in organizing international, national, or regional conferences or symposia. A record of exceptional leadership of community service activities (including service to public schools, community colleges, public lecture series and panel discussions, contributions to TV, radio, and newsprint, and other forms of community education). Administrative functions related to editorships may also be considered (specify role and level of individual contributions; such activities might include grants and fundraising, or supervision of staff and production).

High Merit should be awarded to Specialized Faculty who are active in national and/or regional professional organizations; active on college and/or university committees and organizations; or who show significant departmental leadership (e.g., active in developing curricular or programmatic initiatives, moderating special events, organizing a series of lectures, co-directorship of conferences and symposia, writing and obtaining grants or other funding). A record of significant participation in community service activities (including service to public schools, community colleges, public lecture series and panel discussions, contributions to TV, radio, and newsprint, and other forms of community education). Administrative functions related to editorships may also be considered (specify role and level of individual contributions; such activities might include grants and fundraising, or supervision of staff and production).

Merit should be awarded to Specialized Faculty with significant departmental service activity beyond the normative assignment (e.g., active service on multiple committees, including elected committees; organization of a departmental symposium or lecture; regular and active involvement in hiring and recruitment); participation in community service activities (including service to public schools, community colleges, public lecture series and panel discussions, contributions to TV, radio, and newsprint, and other forms of community education). Administrative functions related to editorships may also be considered (specify role and level of individual contributions; such activities might include grants and fundraising, or supervision of staff and production).

Satisfactory should be awarded to Specialized Faculty who minimally fulfill the minimum service requirements as defined in their contracts and AORs.

Unsatisfactory should be assigned to Specialized Faculty who do not fulfill the minimum service requirements as defined in their contracts and/or AORs.

<u>Teaching</u>:

Specialized Faculty may have a teaching component defined by their AOR, which should be evaluated annually. Specialized faculty should prepare information according to departmental guidelines regarding their teaching from the past three years at FSU if applicable. Specialized Faculty can submit additional documents as evidence of their meritorious preparation and expertise specifically related to their teaching assignment as long as those documents are not included elsewhere in their evaluation.

Extraordinary Merit should be awarded to Specialized Faculty who win a teaching award from an established body or organization (e.g., university, college, national organization), or a consistent pattern of exceptionally high scores on SPCI question #8. Specialized Faculty should be recognized

with extraordinary merit if they have substantial service on graduate committees as appropriate to their rank and specialty area as well as undergraduate research, internship, and mentoring. Other evidence of extraordinary merit can include especially well-planned and delivered courses (evidenced through sample syllabi, assignments, grade summaries, student responses, and other teaching items), letters from faculty members who have conducted peer evaluations of teaching, ability to teach multiple courses within and across the discipline/major, and authorship of educational materials.

High Merit should be awarded to Specialized Faculty who demonstrate a consistent pattern of high scores on SPCI question #8. Specialized Faculty should be recognized with high merit if they serve on graduate committees as appropriate to their rank and specialty area as well as undergraduate research, internship, and mentoring. Other evidence of high merit can include well-planned and delivered courses (evidenced through sample syllabi, assignments, grade summaries, student responses, and other teaching items), letters from faculty members who have conducted peer evaluations of teaching, ability to teach multiple courses across the discipline/major, and authorship of educational materials.

Merit should be awarded to Specialized Faculty who receive some good scores on SPCI question #8, though there may be some inconsistency in these scores over time. Other evidence of merit can include good teaching as evidenced through sample syllabi, assignments, grade summaries, student responses, and other teaching items.

Satisfactory should be assigned to Specialized Faculty with inconsistent scores on SPCI question #8, sample syllabi that are complete but unambitious, or whose grade summaries, student responses, or other teaching items demonstrate inconsistent teaching.

Unsatisfactory should be assigned to Specialized Faculty with a pattern of lower scores on SPCI question #8, sample syllabi that are less well organized or less ambitious than the best professional standards, or whose grade summaries, student responses, or other teaching items demonstrate teaching that consistently falls short of professional standards.

Research:

Specialized Faculty may have a Research component defined by their AOR, which should be evaluated annually. Specialized Faculty should prepare information according to departmental guidelines regarding their Research from the past three years at FSU if applicable.

Exceptional Merit should be awarded Specialized Faculty for a high-quality publication from a respected press: a monograph of original research, a novel, a substantial short story collection, or a book of poetry. Articles (published or in press), co-authored books of importance to the discipline, or lengthy and textually complex editions can also be considered as well as grants or fellowships connected to a record of publication. Equivalent work in electronic media should also qualify. Each of these activities should be weighed in view of the Specialized Faculty member's rank, the length and creative ambition of the work, and its contributions to the specific field(s) sub-field(s) in which s/he primarily works. Contributions to the field may be demonstrated by external prizes and awards for scholarly or creative work.

High Merit should be awarded for publication of articles or book chapters (published or in press), stories, and poems in top journals within a three-year span. High Merit should also be awarded for a completed manuscript of a monograph of original research, a novel, substantial short story

collection, co-authored book, or book of poetry that has been accepted or placed under contract at a respected press. Notable grants and fellowships connected to a record of publication may also qualify. Also considered will be: publications associated with organization of a major conference or symposium; multiple presentations or invited lectures and readings at regional, national, or international conferences or symposia; service as the editor of a respected journal with clear evidence of the individual's editorial role. Each of these activities should be weighed in view of the Specialized Faculty member's rank, the length and creative ambition of the work, and its contributions to the specific field(s)or sub-field(s) in which s/he primarily works.

Merit should be awarded for publication of scholarly articles in respected journals; chapters in refereed outlets; short stories or poems published in respected venues, within a three-year span. Also meritorious is publication of an edited collection of essays, stories, or poems with a substantial introduction authored or co-authored. The following activities may supplement but not entirely replace those mentioned in the preceding paragraph: evidence of significant progress on a book manuscript; acceptance and publication of multiple substantial book reviews; service on the editorial board of a respected journal or journals with clear evidence of the individual's role; peer review of manuscripts; development and presentation of research or creative activity in connection with a key elected role in a major professional organization; regular presentations at regional, national, or international conferences and symposia; grants and fellowships internal to the University. Each of these activities should be weighed in view of the Specialized Faculty member's rank, the length and creative ambition of the work, and its contributions to the specific field(s) sub-field(s) in which s/he primarily works.

Satisfactory should be assigned to faculty members who demonstrate ongoing research or creative activity through refereed presentations at conferences or publication of articles, book chapters, poems, or short stories at respectable presses in the three-year period. Participation in conferences and symposia; publishing non-peer-reviewed items such as press articles or book reviews; and clear evidence of work in progress that has not yet resulted in publication can also serve as evidence of ongoing research or creative activity.

Unsatisfactory should be assigned to faculty who do not meet the criteria defined in "Satisfactory" merit above.

Appendix II

Revised 12/9/02; 09/17/07

PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES

Department of English
Florida State University

The Department of English seeks to promote excellent teaching, distinguished scholarship and creativity, and exemplary professional service to the Department, the College, the University, and the community at large. The best English departments in the nation exhibit these characteristics, and our goal is to achieve and maintain equal ranking with these departments.

I. Introduction

The Promotion and Tenure Review

In the spring semester of each year, subcommittees of the Department's Evaluation Committee, acting as subcommittees of the Promotion and Tenure Committee,review the status of every faculty member except for tenured full professors regarding tenure and/or promotion; these evalutions are based on the assignments of responsibilities for the periods under review. The tenured members of the Evaluation Committee, acting as a subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, also conduct the third year reviews of tenure-track faculty required by the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The non-tenured members of the Evaluation Committee will not participate in the vote to review tenured faculty for promotion, though they may be present for the discussion. The Chair formally invites faculty under review to provideappropriate materials. For non-tenured faculty members, materials to be reviewed — but not to be considered part of the formal evaluation portfolio — will ordinarily include the faculty member's plans for publication, teaching, and service, as they pertain to tenure.

Each non-tenured faculty member shall receive the results of the annual review for promotion and tenure in a formal consultation with the Chair. This consultation will include a written advisory report from the Chair describing the evaluation Committee's review of the faculty member's progress and plans for publication, teaching, and service, as they pertain to tenure. Each faculty member below the rank of full professor will receive a letter from the chair each year apprising him or her of progress toward promotion and./or tenure.

General Tenure Procedures

In accordance with the policies outlined in the University Faculty Handbook and the Collective Bargaining Agreemnt, the subcommittee of tenured members of the Evaluation Committee acting as a subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall propose candidates for tenure to the tenured faculty of the Department. There shall then be a meeting of tenured faculty for discussion of the qualifications of each candidate prior to voting on that candidate.

A list of additional references related to evaluation of faculty appears at the end of these procedures.

II. Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

In keeping with the normal practice of major universities, the Department generally considers a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor under a single set of criteria.

Candidates become eligible for promotion and tenure in their sixth year of service to the Department. Under exceptional circumstances, a candidate may be recommended for early promotion, with consideration for tenure then coming in the candidate's sixth year. In this situation, the requirements for tenure and for promotion to associate professor remain the same.

In order to be recommended for promotion to the rank of associate professor, each candidate must demonstrate excellence in teaching and in research and other creative activity as well as commitment in the area of professional service.

Teaching Ability and Effectiveness

The Department seeks to ensure high-quality teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

In evaluating the quality of each candidate's teaching the Department shall consider student evaluations, including SPOT forms; peer evaluation based on classroom visitation, usually during the year preceding consideration for promotion; and a teaching portfolio. Peer evaluations take the form of two or more letters from qualified (preferably tenured) colleagues who have personally observed the candidate in the classroom. Such observations shall occur in the three semesters immediately prior to the term in which the candidate is considered for promotion and/or tenure. The Chair will choose the evaluators in consultation with the candidate, who will have prepared a list of four qualified (preferably tenured) colleagues.

Additional evidence of the quality of the candidate's teaching can include directing individual studies, theses, and dissertations as well as serving on honors, thesis and dissertation committees; academic advising; receiving awards or formal recognition for outstanding teaching; obtaining grants or financial aid for innovation and experimentation in teaching; developing new programs and courses of study; developing new syllabi or instructional methods and materials for existing courses; and other materials the candidate wishes to make available to the subcommittee of tenured professors on the Evaluation Committee acting as a subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure committee.

Research and Creative Activity

The Department requires distinction in research and creative activity. In evaluating each candidate, the Department shall consider the quality of the work, including its significance to the candidate's field(s); sufficient quantity is necessary both to permit a reliable judgment and to assure continued commitment. Published work is most important; however the Department recognizes that a candidate's research and creative activity also includes both work in circulation and work in progress.

The most significant evidence of research and creative activity includes a completed book-length

project of original scholarship or creative activity, which a respected press has published or accepted and slated for publication. A record of publication of articles, book chapters, and/or short creative works, however strong, will not ordinarily be sufficient in itself to gain tenure and promotion.

Another category of evidence includes papers read at professional meetings and readings or performances of creative work; grants and fellowships received in support of scholarship and other creative activity; review articles and reviews published in magazines and journals; and editorships, assistant editorships, and advisory positions on the boards of nationally distributed journals.

Other evidence can include encyclopedia articles; newspaper articles and reviews; abstracts; active participation in professional organizations and conferences as related to scholarship and creative work; consulting on professional matters related to scholarly expertise; scholarly and creative work in electronic media; and reviews, citations, reprints, and translations of one's own work. The candidate is responsible for providing appropriate descriptive and evaluative documentation pertaining to the publication outlets.

Outside letters evaluating research and creative activity will be solicited according to university guidelines.

Service

The Department expects each faculty member to contribute to the intellectual life and governance of the University. The subcommittee of tenured professors on the Evaluation Committee acting as a subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure Committee considers only those service activities that are related to the candidate's professional expertise or to the mission of the University. The Department assumes the responsibility to provide opportunities for departmental service.

Service shall include participation in departmental, college, and university committees and councils; involvement in the organization and expedition of meetings, symposia, conferences, and workshops; membership on national, regional, and state professional committees; participation in local, state, and national boards, agencies and commissions; participation in electronic/telecommunications programs; judging writing competitions; and appearances before civic and community groups.

III. Tenure and/or Promotion to Professor

While meeting the criteria in section II demonstrates that one is qualified to be an associate professor, one must accomplish more, both qualitatively and quantitatively, in order to be recommended for promotion and/or tenure to the rank of full professor. Candidates must demonstrate the following:

Outstanding teaching and significant involvement in the graduate program, including but not limited to directing theses and serving on degree committees.

Achievement of national or international reputation within one's field based on distinguished work, normally including two published books (at least one since promotion to associate professor). In special cases, the department may recommend promotion on the basis of one very important and well-received book and a substantial body of articles or creative works.

Sustained participation in professional life, including a record of significant involvement in regional and national organizations and in departmental, college, and university committees.

Outside letters evaluating scholarship and other creative activity will be solicited according to university guidelines.

IV. Specialized faculty

Specialized faculty will be assessed for promotion in accord with their annual evaluations, as reflected in their annual letters pertaining to progress toward promotion (see Appendix I on annual evaluation procedures). These in turn depend upon their weighted performances in their assigned areas of responsibility. Annual evaluation and promotion procedures for specialized faculty follow the procedures in Appendix J of the CBA, including a peer component agreed upon by a majority vote of the specialized faculty and by the Executive committee. In particular, the department will take into account the following criteria for Teaching Faculty:

- Evidence of well-planned and delivered courses
- Summaries of data from SPCI student questionnaires
- Letters from faculty members who have conducted peer evaluations of teaching
- Ability to teach multiple courses within a discipline/major
- Other teaching-related activities, such as instructional innovation, involvement in curriculum development, authorship of educational materials, and participation in professional organizations related to the area of instruction

V. Evaluation

The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall read the folder of each person under consideration, requesting such materials as the committee deems appropriate and accepting such materials as the candidate deems appropriate consistent with the provisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article II, concerning the "Personnel Evaluation File."

The Committee shall read and discuss the folder of each faculty member prior to voting to recommend or not to recommend that person for tenure and/or promotion.

The Committee shall take a formal secret ballot (with each member voting "yes" or "no" or "abstain") on whether to recommend or not to recommend a faculty member. In order to be recommended a person must receive a majority of "yes" votes.

The FSU Constitution, Article VI (6C2-1.004(6), FAC) and the BOR/UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement, Articles 14 and 15, contain provisions that apply to promotion or tenure or both. The Florida Administrative Code, 6C5.2212 (BOR policy) and 6C2-4.034 (FSU policy) and Article 10 of the BOR/UFF Agreement contain provisions on evaluation of faculty. A compilation of these policies appears in Faculty Handbook 1991, Chapters 9 and 10.

Commentary on Tenure and/or Promotion
Department of English

These questions and answers are intended to help candidates preparing for tenure and/or promotion. Additionally, the Department Chair's annual orientation session for faculty who expect to be considered for tenure and/or promotion the following year will be helpful. In your first few years on the faculty, you will also find it helpful to seek the advice of senior colleagues on matters relating to promotion and tenure.

Note that while you first become eligible for tenure and/or promotion in your sixth year of service to the Department, you may request deferral of consideration until the seventh year. If tenure is not received in the sixth year, you will receive a letter of dismissal effective at the end of the seventh year; nevertheless, you may be put forward for promotion and/or tenure at the beginning of your seventh year, before the letter of dismissal takes effect.

Commentary on section II: Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

(1) Does the Department really expect excellence in both teaching and research/creative activity?

Yes. The Department is committed to both our teaching and research missions, and one simply cannot gain tenure without demonstrating excellence in both of these areas.

(2) Does service "count"?

Yes. The Department will not recommend promotion to associate professor and tenure for any candidate who is not a useful department citizen as well as an excellent teacher and a productive writer/scholar. Remember, however, that service counts less than teaching and research/creative activity; we urge untenured faculty to use their time wisely and keep their priorities balanced. Performance evaluations are based on the assignment of responsibilities, which in almost all circumstances contains some percentage of service.

(3) How do we determine excellence in teaching?

High quality teaching can be demonstrated by a variety of means, for example, student evaluations, peer evaluation, formal awards or recognition, grants or funding for teaching experimentation or innovation, and a teaching portfolio. As a way of preparing for the required peer evaluations, candidates may wish to ask senior colleagues to observe their teaching during their first two years in the Department.

Under the University's guidelines, student advising counts as a part of the teaching assignment. Student academic advising often takes the form of advising undergraduate basic studies students, English majors, and graduate students, as well as the informal advising that results from interaction with students in classes.

(4) What is the teaching portfolio?

For promotion and tenure, the University Committee requires a formal binder that must be assembled in conformity with the Committee's guidelines (see Faculty Handbook). This binder contains a section on teaching, which the Department considers to be the candidate's teaching portfolio. It will include a statement of teaching philosophy, commentary on development of innovative course materials, and other documentation or descriptions of your teaching activities that you wish to have the promotion and tenure committees consider. Although the University requires that the portfolio contain materials from only the three years immediately prior to consideration for promotion and tenure, it is a good idea to begin, in your first year on the faculty, setting aside copies of course hand-outs, examinations, and other materials that you may want to include in your binder.

Note that the portfolio must include the student evaluation forms that are required by university policy.

(5) How do we determine excellence in research and other creative activity?

While many factors are involved, the Department recognizes that publication of a book by a respected press significantly enhances your — and the Department's — visibility and reputation in the profession. Nevertheless, we also acknowledge that, in the course of a faculty member's career, some research and creative projects are better suited to publication in electronic or shorter print forms. In either case, publications that have undergone the scrutiny of peer review carry the greatest weight.

The Department strongly encourages candidates to publish a book. New faculty are advised to plan for the publication of a book well in advance since publishers' review processes often take much more than a year. Publishing well-placed articles/shorter creative works that are widely recognized as having made a significant contribution to the field is also a mark of excellence.

The department recognizes that faculty who are recommended for tenure and promotion will contribute to one (or sometimes more) of our three programs: Creative Writing; Literature and Cultural Studies; and Rhetoric and Composition. A candidate may come up in more than one area by submitting an appropriate combination of publications or an interdisciplinary book that meets the qualitative standards of each, accompanied by other evidence of scholarly activity such as readings, conference papers and grants. While different kinds of publication are valued in the three programs within the English

Department, there is no hierarchy among programs. Work in one area (Creative Writing; Literature and Cultural Studies; or Rhetoric and Composition) is not inherently more valuable than work in any other area. There are, however, distinctions within programs; not all publication is equally valuable in enhancing a faculty member's and the Department's visibility and reputation in the profession. The following explanations are meant to guide candidates for promotion and tenure in understanding how these distinctions are likely to bear on promotion and tenure decisions.

Literature and Cultural Studies Program

Published work in the Literature and Cultural Studies Program is evaluated on the following bases:

Books. Books of original scholarship published at respectable presses carry the most prestige, followed closely by editions of literary, folklore, and cultural texts. Also of significant value are edited collections of essays, textbooks, surveys of scholarship, and study guides.

Articles. Full-length articles in refereed, nationally circulated journals and in edited collections carry the most prestige. Very brief articles, review essays andreviews in such journals also qualify as important publications. Other kinds of articles, such as newspaper and magazine reviews and essays, also provide evidence of accomplishment.

In the Literature and Cultural Studies program, a book that has been published or scheduled for publication by a University press or its equivalent is the best evidence of the scholarly profile necessary for tenure. A record of article and book chapter publication, however strong, will not ordinarily be sufficient in itself to gain tenure and promotion.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, a lengthy and textually complex edition of a literary work (or letters, diaries, etc.) derived from manuscript and/or printed sources counts as a book, as does a comprehensive edition of historically significant texts requiring extensive search work and archival research. A facsimile of a printed or manuscript text, like a new edition (i.e., new typesetting) of an earlier edition that has not been subjected to editing based upon rigorous textual research and analysis-based emendation, does not count, though its introduction may be assigned the same weight as a scholarly article. In the case of promotion to Professor, it is expected that a candidate whose primary area of expertise is textual studies will have either a scholarly edition and a scholarly book in his or her own words, or two scholarly editions and a significant body of analytical articles published in scholarly journals or books.

To count as a book for promotion and tenure, works of bibliographic research will be held to the highest standards regarding their completeness and analytic depth.

Creative Writing Program

Publications in creative writing will be evaluated on the following bases:

Books: a volume of the author's own work — whether a novel, collection of short stories, a volume of poetry, drama, or creative non-fiction — carries the most prestige. These may be published either by small press, university press, or trade presses of high quality, distinguished reputation and national distribution.

Journals or anthologies: short stories, poems, plays, novel excerpts, creative non-fiction essays published in distinguished literary journals or collections by reputable editors, and distinguished productions of original drama, constitute work valued the highest after books.

Other kinds of publication and publication-related activity we value include: the conceptualization and/or editing of text books, anthologies, literary journals; collaborative authoring; performance art and publications via electronic media.

In terms of publication, promotion to Associate Professor would require a book or its equivalent, with preference being given to a book. Promotion to Professor would require two books or a book and its equivalent, with preference being given to the former. In the case of drama, distinguished professional production might be considered equivalent to a book.

Rhetoric and **Composition Program**

In the Rhetoric and Composition program, a book that has been published or scheduled for publication by a University press or its equivalent is the best evidence of the scholarly profile necessary for tenure. In the field of composition and rhetoric, innovative textbooks, pedagogical methodology and research, historical and empirical research, and collaborative and interdisciplinary work are considered primary forms of scholarly achievement and legitimate and regular ways of making knowledge in the profession. Therefore, a candidate for tenure may be able to or even required to demonstrate the standards of critical and original scholarship and prestige of her field with publications of these kinds.

Books: Books of original scholarship published at respectable presses, followed closely by innovative textbooks (which are considered scholarly in this field) carry the most prestige. Also of significant value are co-authored scholarly books and edited collections of critical essays. Of some value are anthologies of student or professional writing and composition readers.

Articles: Full-length articles in refereed, nationally circulated journals or in edited collections published at respectable presses and chapters in collaborative books published at respectable presses carry the most prestige. Also of significant value are full-length review essays and thorough surveys of scholarship. Of some value are brief articles, teaching guides, and newspaper and magazine articles and

(6) When is a book a book?

For purposes of promotion and tenure, it is obviously best that the book be not only in print but in the hands of the Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee. If your book has not quite reached that stage, however, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will expect you to provide evidence that it is in its final form (i.e., has been accepted as a completed manuscript and is scheduled for publication). A pre-completion contract, valuable as it is, is not in itself enough to qualify you for consideration for promotion and tenure.

(7) Does work you published before joining this department count toward promotion and tenure?

Yes, but with certain caveats. The Department is concerned with evidence of involvement in new projects and long-term productivity. A book and several articles completed before arrival here will undoubtedly enhance your credentials. But, a few years later, the Department would not consider these publications alone as satisfactory evidence of continuing commitment to publication.

An assistant professor's first book is often a revised dissertation, and such a book, published by a good press, represents a significant achievement. You must, however, demonstrate substantial and on-going research or other creative activity in order to qualify for promotion and tenure. This work might well include an extension or continuation of the dissertation.

(8) How are publication outlets judged?

The Department strongly advises all faculty to place books and articles in the most visible, selective, and prestigious presses and journals possible. The Department has no desire to impose a rigid hierarchy in the judgment of presses or journals, but an awareness of the quality of outlets, based on the practice of external reviewing, is important. For example, a book from a solid and respectable press is what the Department expects and hopes for, but we recognize that the prestige of the outlet can vary according to the nature of the publication. Outlets considered prestigious vary greatly from field to field. In each area, however, there are good, bad, and mediocre outlets. It is important to seek opinions about presses and journals from others knowledgeable in the field in order to place work as advantageously as possible. Book publication with non-university commercial presses that require an author's subvention may fail to be considered adequate evidence of scholarship. In such cases, other evidence, such as reviews of a book already in publication and other publications by the candidate will be necessary.

In order to help the Promotion and Tenure Committee gauge the quality of your publication outlets, you need to supply the appropriate material. For example, for critical books, include not only the published work or the typescript with letter of acceptance (and copies of readers' reports if available) but also the publisher's entry in the MLA Directory of Scholarly Presses, and, if available, a recent publisher's catalogue. For articles/shorter creative works,

supply not only offprints (or copies of typescript for accepted but not yet published works including copy of letter of acceptance and readers' reports if available), but also a photocopy of the journal's editorial page/masthead (showing names of editors and editorial board) and a photocopy of the entry for that journal in the most recent MLA Directory of Periodicals.

(9) Do conference papers and readings count as evidence of ongoing research activity?

Yes. Conference papers and readings contribute to the Department's reputation and visibility. However, such presentations are not publications, and when preparing for a presentation, you should keep in mind the potential for submitting a version of the presentation for publication.

(10) What about collaborative work?

Collaborative publication is common in some areas of English studies. While the Department recognizes the value of collaborative projects, we emphasize the importance of establishing an independent reputation. The Department has no guidelines about what proportion of your work should be independently authored, but you are undoubtedly in a better position if you have some clearly definable texts of your own in print (articles or book chapters) when you are considered for tenure. If you do collaborative work, seek advice early and often (for example, at the time of your annual evaluation) about how the Department is perceiving your independent reputation.

Commentary on section III: Tenure and/or Promotion to Professor

Anyone appointed as or promoted to professor should be a distinguished and steadily productive critic, scholar, or creative artist, nationally or internationally visible in his or her field. A professorship is to a large degree a matter of professional status, not something one earns by time in service or merely quantitative production. By these means, our departmental goal is to achieve and maintain equal ranking with the best English departments in the nation.

Most of what we say above about promotion to associate professor with tenure is equally relevant here. Higher committees rely heavily on outside referees to verify a Department's evaluations: our candidates will have to meet the expectations of senior faculty in equivalent and better universities.

Two points, however, need further commentary.

(1) Do "two books" equal promotion?

Simply having published two book-length works, without regard to the quality of work, to other evidence of an active and substantive research program, to outstanding teaching, and to sustained service, is no guarantee of promotion. In addition to outstanding teaching and sustained service, the department expects on-going publication. The Department grants a professorship for the achievement of national (preferably international) reputation.

Promotion to professor presumes among other things the publication of an impressive body of distinguished work, typically including at least two books. While the Department endorses both book and article publication, the Department does not expect to promote candidates who have produced only articles.

(2) When can a faculty member be considered?

Books should be in print before consideration for a promotion to professor. This is not always feasible when considering a faculty member for promotion to associate professor, but general practice for promotion to professor requires that material should be in print.

Appendix III

English Department Hiring Procedures

1) During the spring the Program Committees following open meetings will each give a rank-ordered list including rationale of hiring area preferences to the Executive Committee which in turn will present a single rank-ordered list to the department faculty for discussion at a Needs meeting. The Department Chair will poll the faculty for their top five choices during or subsequent to the meeting.
2) During the summer the Department Chair will seek approval from the Dean for a certain number of hires based on deliberations of the Executive Committee considering the poll of the faculty.
3) Early in the fall the Department Chair in consultation with the appropriate Program Director will propose a chair for a search committee for each approved position to the Executive Committee for ratification. The Executive Committee will invite interested faculty and graduate students to nominate themselves and briefly state their qualifications for participation on one or more Search Committees. The Executive Committee and Search Committee Chair will select the remainder of the Search Committee, which will ordinarily consist of a total of three to six faculty members and one graduate student. No more than one graduate student will be included, and will be an ex-officio (non-voting) member.
4) Where desirable, the search committee chair may recommend to the Executive Committee a faculty member from another department to serve on a search committee, in cases where the department lacks sufficient faculty with the relevant expertise in field, or lacks appropriately diverse faculty in field, or lacks senior faculty in field. No search committee will contain more than one member from outside the English department.
5) In consultation with each Search Committee Chair and the appropriate Program Director, the Department Chair will finalize the language of the ad submitted to HR, to be used for all printed and online advertising.
6) Applications will be made through the university's online HR system, which

automatically compiles demographic statistics and collects other information and documents necessary for state legal requirements.

7) Each Search Committee will read all the applications that come in for that position and decide which ones to ask for additional information. Each Committee will establish its own procedures and timetable. Each will provide opportunities for faculty volunteers not on the committee to read applications and make recommendations.

8) No later than the end of November each Search Committee will provide the Executive Committee with a rank-ordered list of the top 20 candidates. At a meeting attended by all members of all Search Committees, the Executive Committee will determine how many from each list to offer interviews. The Executive Committee may not change the rank-order of each list, but may ask the Search Committee to reconsider.

9) The Department Chair will arrange for Search Committee Chairs to notify candidates and schedule interviews.

10) After initial interviews, members of all Search Committees will meet with the Executive Committee. For each position, the members of that Search Committee and the

Executive Committee will vote on no more than four and no fewer than two candidates to bring to campus (with no single person voting more than once in the case of duplicate memberships).
11) The Department Chair will call the candidates to schedule interviews and supervise the mechanics of the visits, but will do so in consultation with the Search Chairs and delegate as much of that duty as feasible.
12) After each visit the Department Chair will ask faculty and graduate students to submit written comments. These comments will be made available to all department members who wish to review them.
13) As soon as possible after the visits for a given position are complete, all members of that Search Committee and the Executive Committee will vote to rank order the candidates (with no single person voting more than once in the case of duplicate memberships).
14) The Department Chair will call a special meeting of the department to hear the committees' recommendation and to poll the faculty on the rank-ordered list of candidates.
15) The Executive Committee and the Search Committee will finalize the rank order.
16) The Department Chair will meet with the Dean to present the rank order and seek permission to make an offer.
17) The Department Chair will make offers to the candidates.
18) As soon as possible, the Department Chair will report to the department when an offer has been accepted. The Department Chair will notify all other candidates that the position has been filled and return appropriate materials.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS IN THE BY-LAWS ABOUT RECRUITING AND HIRING FACULTY

D.4.h. "The Chair, in conjunction with the Executive committee, shall supervise and coordinate the recruiting of new faculty members."

E.6.a. "The Executive Committee shall function as a decision-making body on such matters as . . . the recruitment of faculty"