FSU | FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY PANAMA CITY

Bylaws for Florida State University Panama City

These are the bylaws for Florida State University Panama City (FSU PC). These bylaws were last approved on February 11, 2025, by a majority of the applicable voting members of FSU PC and on March 12, 2025 by the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement.

Preamble

The FSU PC campus affirms and strives to fulfill the mission of Florida State University and the various Colleges and Departments the campus serves. These bylaws formulate a method of organization and operating procedures that enable the effective operation of the campus in furtherance of these missions.

The primary focus of this campus is to provide educational activities and supportive services to the population of the surrounding geographic area as well as the global community. The highest goal of this institution is to provide an exceptional educational experience for every student.

These bylaws were created to assist in the effective and efficient shared governance of the FSU PC campus. These bylaws are subject to and adhere to the higher authority of regulations and policies adopted by Florida State University, the FSU Constitution, the FSU Board of Trustees and the United Faculty of Florida (BOT-UFF) Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), the FSU Faculty handbook, and annual Promotion and Tenure letter. All resident programs are to operate in conjunction and in compliance with these campus bylaws.

All faculty associated with the FSU PC campus are professionally and ethically obligated to adhere to the spirit, policies, and procedures set forth in these bylaws.

I. Bylaws

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

B. Bylaws Revision. Bylaws may be amended at any regularly scheduled faculty meeting. Changes to the bylaws require a two-thirds (2/3) majority vote of voting faculty present, provided that:

- a. A written notice of intent is given at the previous regularly scheduled faculty meeting, or
- b. A written notice is submitted to all voting faculty no less than 14 days (two weeks) prior to the regularly scheduled meeting at which the proposed changes require a vote.

A written petition for an amendment may be submitted by any voting faculty member to a faculty facilitator to place on a faculty meeting agenda.

If a voting faculty member wishes to vote but cannot be present for a vote, they shall contact the parliamentarian.

C. Substantive Change Statement. Faculty and staff members are expected to be familiar with and follow the Florida State University Substantive Change Policy as found on the university web site https://sacs.fsu.edu/substantive-change-policy/

II. Membership and Voting Rights

A. Faculty Membership. Faculty membership is in unit faculty that are permanently assigned to the Florida State University Panama City Campus, including teaching faculty, research faculty, and university librarians. The faculty is composed of persons representing a diversity of interests that contribute to the knowledge of the student population, and who are qualified as educators by their scholarly or creative work and their effectiveness in teaching students.

B. College Membership. In addition to the faculty defined in II.A above, the following are members of the Florida State University Panama City campus: visiting faculty, adjunct faculty, courtesy and special program appointments, and staff.

C. Faculty Voting Rights. The faculty defined in II.A above are entitled to vote in faculty meetings. Voting faculty attending the meeting electronically (i.e., by phone or internet) will vote by a show of hands or by the voice; however, to facilitate secret ballots, a mail or fax ballot or a secure internet balloting system may be used.

The business of the FSU PC voting faculty shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following:

- a. Participate in shared governance of the FSU PC campus according to these campus bylaws;
- b. Approve amendments to campus bylaws;
- c. Receive and discuss reports from representatives on the campus committees and to take appropriate actions;
- d. Receive and discuss reports from the Dean, Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, and other appointed campus leadership;
- e. Participate in discussions and make recommendations regarding campus reorganization, realignment of programs, and other changes in the purpose and functioning of the campus; and
- f. Assure all approved amendments to the bylaws or modifications of campus policies are in compliance with all current FSU Policies/Regulations and the BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

D. Non-faculty Voting Rights. Faculty who are not permanently assigned to FSU PC or faculty who hold a courtesy appointment (visiting, adjunct, or otherwise) are not part of the voting faculty. However, visiting faculty should participate in the discussion of policy changes that affect them to provide input.

III. College Organization and Governance

A. Jurisdiction.

- The basic legislative body of FSU PC shall consist of the faculty of the campus, defined in II.A above. Subject to state law, the regulations of the Florida Board of Governors, and the Constitution of FSU, this legislative body shall have full authority to develop policy and decide matters of curriculum, program offerings, admissions, grading, and any other academic matters of concern to the college.
- 2. The voting faculty at FSU PC may resolve any issue of general interest to the University or FSU PC and make recommendations to the appropriate officer or body.

B. Faculty Meetings.

1. Kind and Frequency of Meetings: Faculty meetings may be called by the Dean or designee, a faculty facilitator, or upon a written request of five (5) voting faculty members. Faculty meetings require an agenda and a forty-eight-hour notice. Faculty meetings will be held monthly on the

second Tuesday of each month unless otherwise cancelled and rescheduled by the voting faculty in a previous faculty meeting via majority vote, or by the faculty facilitator (in the case of no agenda items from the faculty or deans) with at least three (3) days of notice. In the event of an emergency (e.g., pending hurricane) or unforeseen situation, the Dean and faculty facilitator can decide to cancel or reschedule a meeting. In the event that the parliamentarian and/or faculty facilitators will be absent from a faculty meeting, they will appoint substitutes to assume their roles at the meeting. Faculty will be marked in attendance if attending the meeting in person or electronically (i.e., by phone or internet, as set up in the meeting room).

- 2. Faculty Facilitators: At the first faculty meeting of the fall semester, or at another time established by the faculty, the faculty will elect, by a simple majority vote (i.e., half plus one of the voting members in attendance), two (2) voting members as facilitators. These facilitators will serve interchangeably as presiding chair at faculty meetings and as a faculty representative to the Dean's Office (e.g., attend Dean's Staff meetings or serve in some other capacity as decided by the Dean, solicit items from the faculty to bring to the Dean's Staff meetings, give any reports from the Dean's Staff meeting) for a one-year term. A faculty facilitator shall ensure that a current copy of the bylaws and the faculty evaluation criteria, policies, and procedures is posted on the campus website and provided to the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement.
- 3. Parliamentarian: At the first faculty meeting of the fall semester of each academic year, or at another time established by the faculty, the faculty will elect, by a simple majority vote (i.e., half plus one of the voting members in attendance), a parliamentarian. The parliamentarian shall advise the presiding facilitator/chair on procedural issues (using the most recent edition of *Robert's Rules of Order*), preside over and conduct elections, obtain a current list of voting members, and generally facilitate the orderly transaction of business at meetings.
- 4. Agenda: Facilitators will assemble agendas for faculty meetings and preside over faculty meetings. The facilitator will be responsible for requesting agenda items from the faculty and deans. As a general guideline, the faculty facilitator shall send the agenda to faculty at least one day prior to the meeting date, and request copies of previous meeting agendas to be provided for disposition at the meeting. The facilitator shall manage the meeting to allow adequate time on each agenda item.
- 5. Quorum: Two-thirds (2/3) of the voting faculty membership shall constitute a quorum at any faculty meeting. A quorum is required to conduct business (e.g., voting, forming committees, etc.) at a faculty meeting.
- 6. Recording Secretary: The Dean or a representative from campus administration will designate someone from the staff to serve as the Recording Secretary at all faculty meetings.
- 7. Order of Business: The order of business shall resemble the following:
 - Call to Order and Approval of Minutes
 - Deans Reports
 - Action Items (committee reports, old business, new business, etc.)

- Information Items (various presentations and updates)
- Open Discussion
- Adjournment
- 8. Meeting Conduct: Faculty meetings shall be conducted in the spirit of *Robert's Rules of Order*. When deemed necessary and appropriate by the presiding facilitator/chair of the meeting or by the parliamentarian, or at the request of at least two members of the attending faculty, strict adherence to the newest edition of *Roberts Rules of Order* may be enforced.
- 9. Voting: A simple majority vote of the voting members present (i.e., half plus one of the voting members in attendance) will be sufficient to pass any motion, elect members to committees, to approve changes to faculty evaluation policies, or to elect a faculty senate representative (for any seat(s) that are available and allocated to our campus). However, a two-thirds (2/3) majority vote of the voting members present is required for approval of a change in the bylaws or for any items that significantly impact the campus or faculty members (e.g., bylaw changes, promotion policies, and votes of no confidence of members of the University). Items that significantly impact the campus must have been placed on the meeting's agenda with at least 14 days

(two weeks) of notice before a vote can be entertained. If a voting faculty member wishes to vote but cannot be present for a vote, they shall contact the parliamentarian.

C. Director/Other Administrator Selection. Not Applicable

D. College Leadership. The Dean, Associate Deans, and Assistant Deans shall serve in a leadership position facilitating decisions made through Faculty governance, supporting Faculty development, coordinating the activities of the campus, presenting faculty ideas to college and university-level administration, and adhering to the FSU PC campus bylaws. When possible, input from the faculty should be solicited when selecting a dean. Additional duties of the deans include (but are not limited to):

- a. Working with program coordinators for coordination of the FSU PC resident programs and holding coordinator meetings as needed
- b. Assuring fairness in assignments as specified in faculty assignment of responsibilities (AORs) and assuring compliance with FSU policies regarding AORs;
- c. Allocating resources (e.g., assistantships, adjunct appointments, capital outlay, expense funds) in a transparent manner across majors, programs, and faculty;
- d. Acting as liaison officers and representatives (or shall ask the faculty to serve as representative) to officers and bodies outside the campus;
- e. Assigning the maintenance of the FSU PC campus bylaws and all FSU Policies, including the BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement;
- f. Enforcing all FSU policies and FSU-PC bylaws therein;
- g. Providing oversight of faculty performance and completing faculty evaluations in accordance with all FSU employment policies;
- h. Assisting with recruiting and hiring new faculty, and participating in the promotion process of faculty in accordance with the current FSU Faculty Handbook, FSU PC Faculty Evaluation Policy, BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement, and all FSU Policies and Procedures;
- i. Provide reports to faculty during faculty meetings; and

j. Develop FSU PC campus committees and/or solicit committee volunteers during faculty meetings and oversee and provide assistance as needed to various campus committees.

The faculty may recommend to the Provost that a Dean be removed from office. A petition calling for removal must be signed by at least one-half of the voting members and submitted to the Provost. The Provost or the Provost's Representative shall preside at a meeting of the faculty to consider the petition. Two weeks' notice shall be given to this meeting. To be adopted, a motion for removal must be supported by two-thirds of the voting members in a secret ballot. This ballot shall be conducted by an ad hoc Elections Committee selected by the Provost, who shall report the results to the Provost.

E. College Committees.

Committee Membership:

For the betterment of the FSU PC campus, faculty may serve on various campus committees to help fulfill the missions of FSU and FSU PC and to provide assistance as needed to campus administration. Faculty can serve on committees 1) by volunteering to serve on the committee, 2) by appointment from voting faculty or campus administration, or 3) by nomination and election by voting faculty in a faculty meeting (self-nomination is permitted unless otherwise specified). The selection of replacements and additions to any campus committee may be done within a committee meeting by simple majority vote of faculty committee members or during a faculty meeting with a majority vote of the voting faculty present.

Committee Meeting Guidelines:

Each committee shall have a chairperson that is either voted for or appointed. The chair of the committee shall be responsible for 1) scheduling committee meetings, 2) arranging for attendance and minutes to be taken at each meeting, and 3) providing reports about the committee business to the Dean's office and faculty at faculty meetings as needed.

Ad Hoc Committees:

Committees may be developed and/or appointed by the campus administration and/or the facilitators on an ad hoc basis. The charge and the lifetime of the committee should be defined before the committee is constituted. The appointing authority or the faculty may request that members of an ad hoc committee be elected by either an open or secret ballot. When possible, ad hoc committees should have representation of faculty from varied disciplines.

Standing Committees:

Faculty Promotion and Merit Committee:

Per the FSU PC Faculty Evaluation Policy (see Appendix I for the most recently ratified *Faculty Evaluation Policy* document) a committee of five (5) voting faculty members (teaching faculty II or teaching faculty III who are not up for promotion during the time of service) from different disciplines (with at least one member from the College of Applied Studies) will serve as peer reviewers of the annual evaluation binders (referred to as Evidence of Performance Reports in the BOT-UFF agreement).The committee will review all faculty assigned to FSU PC for the purpose of assisting campus administration with merit and promotion decisions. The committee members for the Promotion and Merit Committee will be chosen by a simple majority vote of voting faculty present and they will serve in accordance with the FSU PC Faculty Evaluation Policy, the current BOT-UFF Bargaining Agreement, and all other related FSU Policies and state regulations.

Promotion and Merit Committee members' terms of service will begin and end immediately following the first annual faculty meeting of the fall semester. All members shall serve for a 2-year term. Chairmanship of the Promotion and Merit Committee shall be decided by the committee during their first meeting. No member of the Promotion and Merit Committee will evaluate their own binder for merit or promotion. Replacements to this committee may be made at the discretion of the members of the Promotion and Merit Committee members. If a committee member goes up for promotion during their term of service (e.g., early promotion), the committee must replace the member for that evaluation period).

Campus Bylaws Committee:

The Campus Bylaws Committee shall be comprised of five (5) faculty members from different disciplines, with at least one member from the College of Applied Studies and elected by the FSU PC faculty by a simple majority vote. The elected members of the committee shall serve for a 2-year term. Chairmanship of the Campus Bylaws Committee shall be decided by the committee during their first meeting. The committee shall monitor and review the campus bylaws at least annually, recommending changes of the bylaws to the FSU PC faculty as necessary, and serve as a liaison to the administration regarding interpretation of the bylaws.

Student Research Committee:

The Student Research Committee shall be comprised of at least five (5) members and is responsible for preparing for the annual Student Research Symposium held in the spring semester every year as well as proposing and organizing more general student research initiatives on the FSU PC campus. The core committee's responsibility is to meet regularly to discuss research initiatives. Examples of research initiatives include but are not limited to: Student Research Symposium planning, research outreach and recruiting to local high schools, support of the Student Research Experience Colloquium, review of student research travel grants, and general student research advocacy. Committee members will serve for a 2-year term.

Honorific Working Titles Committee:

This committee is composed of three (3) senior FSU PC campus faculty members appointed by the President or designee. The committee will meet when the Dean or designee has determined a faculty member satisfies the criteria for an honorific working title (Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, or Teaching Professor) as outlined in the Faculty Handbook. The committee recommends in a secret ballot that the faculty member be granted the honorific working title. The President or designee has the final approval.

F. Faculty Senators. Specialized faculty will independently nominate and elect specialized faculty senators in accordance with the university Faculty Senate bylaws. The nomination and election process will be administered by the Faculty Senate Elections Committee.

G. Faculty Recruitment. A Dean shall supervise and coordinate the recruiting of new faculty members, including formation of search committees comprising of appropriate faculty members. The search committee provides a recommendation to the Dean. All hiring decisions are vetted with the Dean. Faculty searches will be informed by the guidelines and procedures of the Florida State University Search and Screening Guidelines as found on the Office of Human Resources website, as well as other University resources.

H. Unit Reorganization. The Dean shall be responsible for the organization and administration of the campus. When possible, changes in the organizational structure should be done in consultation with related faculty.

IV. Curriculum and Degree Approval

A. Curriculum Review. Faculty at FSU PC will defer to their respective home department/program policies and procedures for curriculum review.

B. Degree Approval. Approval of the completion of degree requirements shall be determined by Deans' designees within colleges and departments that house the program.

V. Annual Evaluation of Faculty on Performance and Merit

A. Peer Involvement in Annual Performance and Merit Evaluation. Each faculty member's performance will be evaluated relative to his or her assigned duties. Each faculty member's performance will be rated annually using the following university rating scale:

Exceeds Expectations Meets Expectations Official Concern Does Not Meet Expectations

See Appendix I for the most recently ratified faculty evaluation policy document.

B. Criteria for Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty. See Appendix I for the most recently ratified faculty evaluation policy document.

C. Criteria for Evaluation of Specialized Faculty. See Appendix I for the most recently ratified Faculty Evaluation Policy document.

VI. Promotion and Tenure

A. Progress Toward Promotion Letter. Each year, every faculty member who is not yet at the highest rank for their position will receive feedback in their annual evaluation letter concerning their progress towards promotion. This feedback is typically included in the annual evaluation document provided by the supervisor.

B. Third Year Review for Tenure-track Faculty. Not applicable

C. Peer Involvement in Evaluation of Promotion and Tenure of Faculty. See Appendix II for the most recently ratified promotion policy document.

D. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure of Tenure-track Faculty. See Appendix II for the most recently ratified promotion policy document.

E. Criteria for Promotion of Specialized Faculty. See Appendix II for the most recently ratified promotion policy document.

Appendices FSU | FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY PANAMA CITY

Appendix I:

Faculty Evaluation Criteria, Policies, and Procedures Voted by faculty January 14, 2025; Approved by the FDA: February 04, 2025 Effective as of the 2024 evaluation year

The Mission of Florida State University Panama City

Florida State University is a multi-site organization comprised of the Tallahassee campus, Panama City, FL Campus (FSU PC), Panama City, Republic of Panama Campus, and other centers and campuses dispersed throughout the world. FSU PC offers life-changing educational and social opportunities that prepare students, faculty, and community members to achieve their goals, develop a richer culture of diversity, and foster a spirit of lifelong learning. By partnering with area military installations, industry leaders, and FSU departments and colleges, FSU PC tailors the educational experience to make higher education accessible to the residents of Northwest Florida and all students, regardless of their background. Although there is an expectation of creative activity necessary to sustain teaching excellence, at FSU PC the research and publication expectations typical of a flagship R1 university yield to more substantial instructional and service work. This document describes the criteria and procedures to be used at FSU PC for annual faculty performance evaluations and merit evaluations. It applies to all specialized faculty employed at FSU PC. These criteria and procedures are consistent with the mission and goals of the FSU PC Campus and comply with the provisions set forth in article 10 of the BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Section 1: General Overview, Requirements, & Expectations

The faculty evaluation policy is divided into two distinct but related processes, the **Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation**, and the **Faculty Merit Evaluation**. After the conclusion of each calendar year, faculty shall compile and submit an *Annual Evidence of Performance* (EOP) report*. This report serves as the basis for supervisor evaluations of annual performance, as well as for determination of eligibility for any available merit pay. Faculty annual evaluations are completed each spring by faculty members' designated supervisor and shall result in a written supervisor narrative and rating of faculty performance in all areas of the faculty member's assignment of responsibilities (AOR) from the previous calendar year. Each faculty member provides a *merit self-rating* in the EOP report. The *Faculty Merit and Promotion Committee* reviews all contents of faculty members' EOP reports for the purpose of designating priority ratings to assist the Dean's office in awarding merit pay, should funds become available. Details of these two processes are outlined in section 1.2 and 1.3 below. While there is often a great deal of agreement between *Faculty Merit and Promotion Committee* merit ratings and faculty evaluations, as reflected by the supervisor narrative, the annual evaluation is necessarily a more holistic process, which takes additional information into account such as peer evaluations and curriculum development.

1.1 Creation of Annual Evidence of Performance (EOP) Report

Detailed guidelines for creating faculty EOP components can be found in Appendix F. However, there are core components of the document that shall be included in all EOP report submissions to ensure

comprehensive and expeditious review of the document by faculty members' supervisor and the *Faculty Merit and Promotion Committee*. These core components are outlined in Appendix F but have been listed below for ease of reference.

- I. Faculty Merit Self-Evaluation
- II. Faculty AORs for Calendar Year
- III. Current Curriculum Vitae (FEAS Generated)
- IV. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness
 - a. Teaching Activities Summary Page
 - b. Statement of Teaching Philosophy
 - c. Peer Evaluation Component
 - d. SPCI Summary Page
 - e. Syllabus Compliance Affidavit
 - f. Representative Course Syllabus
- V. Research
 - a. Research Activities Summary Page
- VI. Service
 - a. Service Activities Summary Page
- VII. Appendix (optional)

Once compiled, the EOP report shall be submitted to the faculty member's supervisor or their designee for review. Faculty EOP reports will be distributed to the *Faculty Merit and Promotion Committee* by the FSU PC Dean's office to obtain timely merit recommendations. The committee's ratings will not be shared with faculty supervisors prior to the supervisor's evaluation of the reports. Additionally, the annual evaluation rating and narrative provided by the faculty supervisor is not submitted to the *Faculty Merit and Promotion Committee* for consideration in their evaluation of Faculty EOP reports for merit pay consideration.

1.2 Faculty Annual Evaluation

Section 5 of the *FSU Faculty Handbook* and related sections in the *UFF-FSU Collective Bargaining Agreement* provide specific information and standards that shall be used to evaluate teaching/instruction, research, and service. For each area of responsibility outlined in a faculty member's AOR (teaching, research, and service), minimal expectations for meeting standards should be specified. If the specified expectations are fulfilled, a ranking of "Meets Expectations" would be awarded. Additional high-quality performance above and beyond basic responsibilities in any AOR area would constitute the potential for a higher ranking. These criteria are intended to be inclusive of all faculty activities and to quantify the performance of such activities objectively and fairly to the greatest extent possible.

- i. The criteria and procedures laid out in this document, and as specified in the FSU Faculty Handbook and UFF-FSU Collective Bargaining Agreement, are the sole bases upon which administrators shall evaluate faculty effectiveness in specified areas of their AOR.
- ii. The campus-specific criteria and evaluation procedures listed in this document are consistent with the mission and goals of FSU PC and the corresponding provisions of the BOT-UFF collective bargaining agreement.
- iii. These criteria and evaluative procedures are logically related to annual evaluation, merit evaluation, salary increase consideration, and promotion.
- iv. Criteria for achieving each performance rating has been sufficiently detailed in this document and accompanying appendices such that any faculty member can reasonably understand the standards expected to earn each performance evaluation rating.

- v. For purposes of annual evaluation, these criteria, including both qualitative and quantitative aspects of performance shall be evaluated by the Dean of FSU Panama City and/or their designee(s).
- vi. These criteria reflect levels of performance which are classified ordinally into four (4) distinct categories.
 - 1. Exceeds Expectations
 - 2. Meets Expectations
 - 3. Official Concern
 - 4. Does Not Meet Expectations
- vii. A Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) is required when a specialized faculty member receives a rating of "Does Not Meet Expectations".
- viii. Each faculty member must create an annual *Evidence of Performance Report* with contents consistent with the provisions found in Appendix F.
- ix. Annual evaluations provided by faculty supervisors must contain a narrative explanation of the faculty member's evaluation as well as a complete *Annual Evaluation Summary Form* (BOT-UFF CBA Appendix F).
 - a. If there is a discrepancy between the submitting faculty member's self-evaluation and the rating given by the faculty member's supervisor, the narrative must address the reason for the discrepancy.
 - b. If the merit self-evaluation is complete and accurate, the narrative may simply state so.

1.3 Merit Evaluation

The *Merit Reporting Worksheet for Faculty Self-Evaluation* (Appendix C) includes a sample list of activities divided by AOR area that should be used to determine performance ranking (e.g., meets or exceeds expectations). These standards were created by listing a rank-order of typical faculty activities, organizing them into three categories, and providing corresponding weights based on the perceived value of the activity. Merit evaluation is based on activities in all areas of faculty members' AOR. The *Faculty Self-Evaluation Form* (Appendix C) and a Sample Form for faculty to use when completing their self-evaluation is included in Appendix D. In the self-evaluation form, faculty score their performance in each area of their AOR by assigning a zero (0), one (1), or two (2) to activities that fail to meet, meet, or exceed expectations respectively. These scores are then weighted by the percentage of full-time-equivalent (FTE) allocated to each AOR area which yields a final quantitative measure for all activities to assist in the determination of a merit rating. An outlined summary of the *Merit Self Evaluation* calculation process is provided in Appendix G. **Any Faculty member who fails to meet minimum requirements for performance of duties in a single area of their AOR but meets the minimum requirements in all other areas should receive a rating of "official concern". Consistent with the BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement article 23.5(a)(2), they will be deemed ineligible for merit pay during that evaluative cycle.**

- i. These criteria may also be used to assure that all faculty members are reviewed for merit pay consideration when funds are available. However, completion of the foregoing criteria does not automatically confer merit pay awards for all FSU PC faculty.
- **ii.** For current definitions of meritorious performance, faculty should reference the current BOT-FSU Collective Bargaining Agreement section 10.4(a).
- **iii.** Each *evidence of performance report* will contain a *merit self-evaluation* based on the criteria in Appendix C in which faculty members will indicate the merit rating (0.0 2.0) that they believe are appropriate for each area of their AOR. These ratings will be considered for:
 - **a.** Merit evaluation recommendations completed by the *Faculty Merit and Promotion Committee*.

b. Merit evaluations completed by the FSU PC Dean and/or their designee(s).

Section 2: Merit Calculation

The detailed standard procedure for calculating merit and the criteria that contribute to merit calculations can be found in Appendix B of the faculty evaluation appendices. However, if a faculty member believes that an alternative procedure is warranted or the addition of alternative criteria is warranted, the submitting faculty member shall provide an explanation of how their procedure or alternative criteria differ from the standard. Specific considerations for each typical AOR area are listed below.

2.1 Teaching Effectiveness

The purpose of teaching is to impart the necessary knowledge and skills to students for them to thrive in their field(s) of study. Evidence of teaching effectiveness is reflected, in part, in student course evaluations. Although such evaluations are necessary indicators of student's *perceptions* of teaching effectiveness, they shall not be interpreted as comprehensive assessments of faculty teaching performance, consistent with provisions in the BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement (Article 10.3).

The faculty at FSU Panama City acknowledge that student perceptions are only a small part of teaching effectiveness. Additionally, certain qualities of the course itself may influence student perceptions of teaching (online instruction, course content, class size, lab courses, etc.) If a faculty member believes that their Student Perception of Course and Instruction (SPCI) ratings do not accurately reflect their teaching effectiveness, the faculty member may submit additional relevant materials to support an alternative rating (along with a written statement providing a coherent, fact-supported argument for justification). Examples of additional optional materials are provided in Appendix I. Faculty should provide a list of each completed activity in the *Faculty Merit Self Evaluation Form* as well as within the "teaching activities summary page" in their EOP report under Section IV.

2.2 Research/Creative Activity

The purpose of research and creative activity is to discover and develop deeper understandings with direct or indirect applicability to academic disciplines offered at FSU PC. Scholarship is exemplified through the dissemination of knowledge in publications, media, and oral presentations. See Appendix B for a list of creative activities and their associated values. The list is not considered exhaustive. Faculty should provide a list of each completed activity in the *Faculty Merit Self Evaluation Form* as well as within the "research/creative activities summary page" in their EOP report under Section V. Please note that only the activities related to the area/field of teaching should be considered.

2.3 Service

The purpose of service is to facilitate the accomplishment of departmental, university, community, and professional goals. Service activities include those that are not considered teaching, research, or other creative activities. Appendix B contains a list of activities that may be considered in the evaluation process. The list is not considered exhaustive. Faculty should provide a list of each completed activity in the *Faculty Merit Self Evaluation Form* as well as within the "service activities summary page" in their EOP report under Section VI. Faculty members may include activities that fit within service activity guidelines, **and those that are not included in the table.**

2.4 Other

A category has been created for activities that do not fall under teaching, research and other creative activity, and service. The value (time spent) for this category should be set at 0% in the AOR and would therefore not be entered into the calculation of merit, though it may be considered as part of the more holistic evaluation process. All AOR activities that faculty complete should fall under 1) Teaching/Instruction, 2) Research/Creative Activity, and 3) Service. Activities that fall in the o*ther* category should be included in the appendix section VII.

2.5 Final Calculation of Merit:

Final Merit calculation should be done within the score summary section of the *Faculty Self Evaluation Form* (Appendix C) which mirrors the BOT-UFF CBA Annual Evaluation Form (Appendix A).

On the score summary, the faculty member refers to the percentage of time allocated to each AOR category (i.e., Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service). Note that AOR documents typically reflect academic years, where merit evaluations reflect calendar years. Faculty should take care to present averages of effort only from the appropriate semesters within the evaluative calendar year.

- Under each category, the faculty member notes the level of expectation met (0-2). Any AOR category for which a faculty member has 0% effort assigned on their AOR shall receive a rating of "Not Observed" in the Annual Evaluation Summary Form completed by administration.
- Consistent with FSU's scoring guidelines, for merit calculation, "Meets Expectations" is given a value of "1" and Exceeds Expectations" a value of "2."
- To calculate overall merit, the score for each AOR area is multiplied by its corresponding percentage of FTE.

Section 3: Changes and Updates to the FSU PC Faculty Evaluation Procedure

Collective bargaining is an annual process through which the CBA is updated and/or modified. In any circumstance where the evaluation procedures are modified or changed in the BOT-UFF CBA, this document should be updated promptly to reflect those new criteria. However, if this document is not updated, the Collective Bargaining Agreement should be used as the guiding document in all evaluative processes.

Faculty Evaluation Process Appendices

*Page numbers reference original document and are not accurate to the bylaws document

Appendix A. Annual Evaluation Summary Form (Adapted from UFF-FSU CBA Appendix F) ANNUAL EVALUATION SUMMARY FORM

ΝΑΜΕ			RANK AND	RANK AND POSITION				
COLLEGE/UNIT			DEPARTME	DEPARTMENT/UNIT				
Evaluator's Name a	and Position							
PERFORMANCE OF	DUTIES							
ndicate evaluation	n by placing an "	X" in the approp	oriate column fo	r each categor	y below. In the "	Overall Perform	anc	
ection, rate the fa	•	•		•		-		
OR percentage is		-	•	-		• •		
nnual evaluation	shall include eva	aluation of sum	mer activities fo	r 9-month facւ	lty if there is a s	ummer assignn	nent	
Category	Average AOR Percentage	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Official Concern	Does Not Meet Expectations	Not Observed		
Teaching								
Research/Creative Activity								
Activity							-	
Activity Service								
Activity Service Other Spoken English							•	

Signature of Evaluator

Signature of Faculty Member

Date

Number of pages attached to report: _____

Signature of Academic Dean/Director Date

• If "Does Not Meet Expectations" is noted in spoken English Competency, options for remediation should be communicated in writing as an addendum to this form. A copy of the form with the addendum should be forwarded through the Dean to the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement.

Date

• If "Overall Performance" is rated as "Does Not Meet Expectations," this report must be forwarded with the appropriate recommendations for improvement (including a Performance Improvement Plan, if applicable) to the Provost and the President through the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement.

Appendix B. Merit Calculations

Teaching Effectiveness

Instructions: Please use the following worksheet to determine your own ratings (0, 1, or 2) for your performance in each of your AOR categories when self-evaluating your performance for merit. For the purpose of evaluation, each faculty member must assign a number of (0, 1, or 2) for each area of their AOR:

- 0 = Fails to meet expectations
- 1 = Meets expectations
- 2 = Exceeds expectations

During the AOR meeting, faculty will discuss the allocations of their time to these different activities as well as what is expected for them to meet expectations. When evaluating your own activities for merit, the tables below provide examples of activities that would be considered meeting expectations and those considered meritorious* (exceeding expectations). Please use this worksheet to determine your own ratings of your activities when you complete your self-evaluation. You will only provide a 0, 1, or 2 for each area of your AOR in your self-evaluation, as well as justification(s) for your ratings.

Teaching/Instruction	Rating
SPCI evaluations of < 80% Excellent, Above Satisfactory, and Satisfactory on Overall Assessment of Instructor over academic year (i.e., *weighted average of all courses taught).	0
SPCI evaluations of \geq 80% Excellent (5), Above Satisfactory (4) and Satisfactory (3) on Overall Assessment of Instructor for the year (i.e., *weighted average of all courses taught).	1
SPCI evaluations of >80% Excellent (5) and Above Satisfactory (4) on Overall Assessment of Instructor for the year (i.e., *weighted average of all courses taught).	2

* Weighted average based on the number of students responding in each class (See Appendix G)

The faculty at FSU Panama City acknowledge that student perceptions are only a small part of teaching effectiveness. Additionally, certain qualities of the course itself may influence student perceptions of teaching (online instruction, course difficulty, lab courses, etc.) If a faculty member believes that the above ratings do not accurately assess their teaching effectiveness, the faculty member may submit additional relevant materials to support an alternative rating (along with a written statement providing a coherent, fact-supported argument for justification). Examples of additional optional materials are provided in Appendix I.

Research/Creative Activity

Research/Creative Activity	Rating
Did not complete duties as assigned	0
Attending and participating in a conference (not presenting)	
Supervising student project(s) within courses taught	
Publishing non-peer reviewed papers, books, etc. related to field of study	1
Publishing in magazines, newsletters, media outlets related to field of	
study	
Presenting at a conference (poster, paper presentation, etc.)	
Serving/Chairing on committee for Honor's thesis, Master's thesis, or	2
Dissertation	(At least 2 activities in this category is
Supervising or conducting research outside of courses taught	required for 2 rating)
Serving as a discussant for a conference presentation	
Serving as a Reviewer for a National/International Conference	(If only 1 activity in
Book or chapter review for textbook publisher	this category is met
≥3 rd Authorship on a Peer Reviewed Journal Article	then the rating is 1)
PI/Co-PI of an Extramurally Funded Research Grant (<\$50,000/yr)	
1 st or 2 nd Authorship on a Peer Reviewed Journal Article	
Serving as Editor or Guest Reviewer for Scholarly Journals (peer review)	2
Organizer for a National/International Conference (on planning committee)	(At least 1 activity in
Author/Editor of Scholarly book by a Major Publisher	this category is required for 2 rating)
PI/Co-PI of an Extramurally Funded Research Grant (> \$50,000/yr)	required for 2 facility)

- The activities listed in the above table represent examples of research/creative activities and are based on guidelines for Research and Creative Activities described in "Successful Faculty Performance in Teaching, Research and Original Creative Work, and Service" (Sampson, Driscoll, Foulk & Carroll, April 26, 2010, pages 5 – 13) and a local review of typical faculty expectations at FSU PC.
- Provide a list of each activity listed in the *Merit Self Evaluation Form*. Faculty members may also choose to include activities that fit within Research and Creative Activity guidelines that are not included in the table. The appropriateness of such activities will be determined in the recommendations of the Merit and Promotion Committee as well as the FSU PC Dean.

Service

Service	Rating
Did not complete duties as assigned.	0
Serving as Advisor for Student Organizations	
Developing Promotional Materials for Program, Department, or University	
Participating in FSU PC Open House or recruiting event	
Completing agreed upon (in AOR meeting) recruiting activities to neighboring schools	1
Recruiting at Professional Conferences or Via Printed Articles in Professional Publications	
Completing recruiting visits outside of agreed upon activities in AOR meeting	
(e.g., extra visit to a new campus, completion of more visits than planned)	
Serving as Member of FSU, PC Campus, Department or College/University	
Committees	2
Serving in Professional Groups (local, regional, national) Such as Officer, Board	(At least 2
Member, Committee Member, etc. related to your field	activities in this
Providing Presentation to Community, Civic, Governmental, or Other External	category is
Organizations	required for 2
Serving as Representative of Department, College, or University at Professional	rating)
Meetings	
Special Recognition by Professional Organizations	(If only 1
Assuming Administrative Duties Such as Serving as a Program Coordinator or a	activity in this
Center Director for less than 6 months	category is met
Serving as Leader of FSU, PC Campus, Department, College, or University	then the rating
Committees in which services lasts less than 6 months	is 1)
Assuming Administrative Duties Such as Serving as a Program Coordinator or a	2
Center Director for longer than 6 months	(At least 1
Providing Testimony on Professional Matters to Legislative Bodies	activity in this
Serving as Leader of FSU, PC Campus, Department, College, or University	category is
Committees in which services lasts longer than 6 months	required for 2
Serving as Faculty Coordinator	rating)

This list of examples is in no way exhaustive. If faculty members feel that activities warrant higher ratings, they are welcome to supply justifications for merit ratings in their self-evaluations. Additionally, faculty can justify other activities for merit categories in their self-evaluation or make changes to their AOR with administration as new duties arise (e.g., new grant proposal submitted). Provide a list of each activity completed in the Faculty Self Evaluation Form. Faculty members may include activities that fit within Service Activity guidelines, and those that are not included in the table.

Appendix C. Blank Faculty Self-E	valuation Form for Merit Evaluati	ion		
Facu	lty Self-Evaluation Form for Me	rit Evaluation		
Faculty Name:	ulty Name:Year of Evaluation:			
		areas using the Merit Reporting Worksheet. your AOR areas complete the self-		
<i>Merit Rating for Teaching/Instru</i> Please ensure your "SPCI Overall		0 1 2 (circle) FEAS is in your report/binder.		
<i>Merit Rating for Research/Creat</i> List activities completed to suppo	-	0 1 2 (circle)		
<i>Merit Rating for Service</i> List activities completed to suppo	ort this rating (in bulleted form).	0 1 2 (circle)		
Score Summary Please weigh yo		below (see sample evaluation form). ur final Merit Rating Score Here		
Based on this evaluation, I believe	e I have (circle one below):			
Not Met /Official Concern	Met Standards	Exceeded Standards		

Note: Non-italicized language is set by the university and should not be altered. Italicized language reflects the required bylaws element with the specifics determined by the unit faculty.

Score 1.00-1.49

Score 0.00-0.99

Score 1.50 - 2.00

Appendix D. Sample Faculty Self Evaluation for Merit Evaluation

Sample Faculty Self-Evaluation Form for Merit Evaluation

Faculty Name: _____Jane Doe__

_____ Year of Evaluation: __2024_

0

Instructions: First, determine your personal ratings for your AOR areas using the Merit Reporting Worksheet. Once you have determined your own ratings (0, 1, or 2) for each of your AOR areas complete the self-evaluation form below.

Merit Rating for Teaching/Instruction

1(2) (circle)

Please ensure your "SPCI Overall Evaluation Summary" page from FEAS is in your report/binder.

• My average for all courses taught during 2019 was 83.2% (see Appendix G for detailed calculations) excellent and above satisfactory

Merit Rating for Research/Creative Activity

List activities completed to support this rating (in bulleted form).

- I supervised 4 student research projects in my AAA 1122 course
- I presented 2 papers at a National Conference

Merit Rating for Service

List activities completed to support this rating (in bulleted form).

- I am the advisor for a student organization
- I recruited at a national conference
- I completed my recruiting duties from my AOR
- I chaired a search committee which lasted 3 months
- I continually serve as academic program director (12 months long)

Score Summary Please weigh your ratings according to your AOR allocations (e.g., 80% (.80) teaching, 5% (0.05) Research, and 15% (0.15) Service) below.

(e.g., [2×. 0.80] + [2×. 0.05] + [2×. 0.15] = 2.00) List your final Merit Rating Score Here _2.0___

Based on this evaluation, I believe I have (circle below):

Not Met /Official Concern	Met Standards	Exceeded Standards
Score 099	Score 1-1.49	Score 1.50-2.00



(circle)

1 2 (circle)

Appendix E. Outline of procedures for completing and submitting annual evidence of performance report.

- Conduct your Assignment of Responsibility (AOR) meeting with your supervisor.
- During your AOR meeting, determine the allocation of your time across the AOR areas.
 1) Teaching/Instruction,
 - 2) Research/Creative Activity
 - 3) Service
 - Recruiting falls under Service
 - Any "other" activity should be allocated to Research or Service areas on the AOR (e.g., grant writing)
- During your AOR meeting, also determine the individual expectations for meeting your performance requirements for each area.
- During the calendar year, keep records of your activities—update these in the Faculty Expertise and Advancement System (FEAS).
- When the calendar year is over, evaluations for the previous calendar year must be completed.
- Create your Annual Evidence of Performance report (see Appendix F for EOP report contents)
- Complete the "Faculty Self-Evaluation Form" in which you provide your individual ratings (any supplemental support to justify your self-ratings should be included in your report)
 - Use the *sample self-evaluation form* and *merit reporting worksheet* as references that were provided by the Merit Evaluation Committee when completing the self-evaluation.
- Include your self-evaluation as the **first page** of your annual evaluation report, then submit the report to the campus administration for annual evaluation. The same report will also be used for merit evaluations by the Faculty Merit and Promotion Evaluation Committee.

Note. All faculty must submit their self-evaluations.

Appendix F. Faculty Evidence of Performance Document Format

Each Faculty Evidence of Performance report should be aggregated from source materials (PDF forms, Word Documents, etc.) into a single .pdf file that is bookmarked for ease of review. The following structure should be followed **EXACTLY** to ensure a consistent review process.

I. Faculty Merit Self-Evaluation

- II. Faculty AORs for the Calendar Year (Spring, Summer, Fall)
- III. Faculty Curriculum Vitae (FEAS Generated)

IV. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

a. Statement of Teaching Philosophy

b. Teaching Activities Summary Page

- i. Includes narrative of overall SPCI results.
- ii. List and description of course development activities.
- iii. Awards or nominations for campus/university teaching awards.
- iv. Summary of advising activities
- v. All activities may be listed but include supporting materials in Appendix.

c. Peer Evaluation Component

- i. Peer Class Evaluation Affidavit
- ii. Peer Class Evaluation Letter

d. SPCI Summary Page

- i. Summary of how summary statistics were calculated if different than student-weighted average.
- ii. Can include overall assessment of instructor and any additional relevant questions.
- iii. Individual course SPCI summaries **may** be added to the appendix if you wish to submit them as additional evidence of performance.

e. Syllabus Compliance Affidavit

f. Representative Course Syllabus/Syllabi

V. Research

a. Research Activities Summary Page

- i. Citations of published works (full text of publications should not be included)
- ii. List of grants received.
- iii. List of conference or professional presentations
- iv. List of undergraduate or graduate supervised research
- v. List of other misc. scholarly activity.

VI. Service

a. Service Activities Summary Page

- i. List of campus/university committee roles.
- ii. Outreach and recruiting
- iii. Community engagement

VII. Appendix (Optional)

- a. Additional supporting documents
- b. Any activities that do not fall under teaching, research/creative activity, and service can be included here.

Appendix G. Sample SPCI Calculations

Faculty can use the FEAS system to generate a report on the SPCI Overall Evaluation Summary ("overall assessment of instructor") for the courses they have taught for the evaluation year. Below is a sample report for illustrative purposes. Using the data on this report one can calculate their "overall assessment of instructor" rating on SPCI evaluations across categories of Satisfactory (S)/Above Satisfactory (AS)/Excellent (E) or across categories of Above Satisfactory (AS)/Excellent (E). While a student-weighted average is standard, faculty who wish to submit alternative calculations may submit them alongside a justification for utilizing their alternative method.

Semester	Course	Туре	Total	Nbr	Excellent		Satis-		Poor
	Number		Enroll	Eval			factory		
Fall 2019	XYX ####	classroom	15	12	58%	17%	17%	8%	0%
Fall 2019	XYX ####	classroom	17	14	71%	29%	0%	0%	0%
Fall 2019	XYX ####	classroom	18	17	47%	35%	18%	0%	0%
Summer 2019	XYX ####	classroom	17	15	60%	20%	20%	0%	0%
Summer 2019	XYX ####	classroom	16	15	80%	13%	7%	0%	0%
Spring 2019	XYX ####	classroom	23	20	50%	25%	15%	15%	0%
Spring 2019	XYX ####	classroom	19	18	56%	22%	22%	0%	0%
Spring 2019	XYX ####	classroom	15	14	72%	14%	14%	0%	0%

Course Evaluation Summary for XYXSPCI Summary from Spring 2024 through Fall 2024

*Weighted average of Excellent (E)/Above Satisfactory (AS) classes/courses taught can be calculated using the following formula:

 $\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[(\% E/AS) \times (\# of responses) \right] \right]$

Total # of responses

, where *n* = classes/courses taught.

For example - for the data given in the table above %E/AS rating for the year would be:

 $[(58+17)x12+(71+29)x14+(47+35)x17+(60+20)x15+(80+13)x15+(50+25)x20+(56+22)x18+(72+14)x14] \\ /[12+14+17+15+15+20+18+14] = 10397/125 = 83.2\%$

The %E/AS/S rating can be similarly calculated.

Appendix H. Peer Evaluation Component

Teaching faculty are required to complete a minimum of one peer evaluation per calendar year. In addition to a written letter, Faculty will provide evidence (affidavit) of the completion of the peer evaluation with the faculty's annual evaluation binder. This evidence is called the "Peer Evaluation Completion Affidavit" and as a minimum will include:

- Date criteria were agreed upon (pre-evaluation conference)
- Date of classroom observation
- Date of post-evaluation conference
- Date of written report
- Signature of peer observer

The peer observer may be any faculty member at FSU. The instructor (being evaluated) and the observer will discuss the observation criteria beforehand and the results of the observation afterwards. The observer will provide a written report and the completion affidavit separately. The peer evaluation will include:

- Pre-evaluation conference including the instructor and observer
- In-class evaluation including the instructor, observer, and students
- Post-evaluation conference including the instructor and observer
- Written Report to Instructor (for use at instructor's discretion)
- Peer-EvaluationCompletion Affidavit (for instructor's annual evaluation binder)

PEER EVALUATION COMPONENT - DETAILS

Acknowledgement: This is adopted from FSU's Department of Higher Education's Peer Evaluation Policy adopted March 24, 1998.

A formative process of peer evaluation of teaching offers the opportunity for faculty to learn more about the content and teaching approaches of other faculty and contributes to a process of continuous improvement. In arranging for a peer assessment of teaching, a faculty member (instructor) will invite a member of the FSUPC teaching faculty (observer) to observe in the classroom. Most observations will be a minimum of one hour. The peer evaluation shall include:

- Pre-evaluation conference including the instructor and observer.
- In-class evaluation including the instructor, observer, and students.
- Post-evaluation conference including the instructor and observer.
- Written Report to Instructor
- Peer-Evaluation Completion Affidavit

Pre-evaluation Conference

In preparation for the observation, the instructor and observer should arrange a pre-observation conference at which they can discuss the appropriate date, time, and place for the observation. At this conference, instructor and observer should agree on what criteria will be used to assess performance in the lecture. A representative list of criteria and indicators is provided below. The instructor should provide the observer with a copy of the course syllabus and any other materials that stipulate the goals, objectives, outcomes, and methods of student evaluation used in the course. The date for a post-conference discussion of the observation and evaluation may also be arranged.

In-class Evaluation

At the beginning of the classroom observation, the observer should be introduced to the students and her or his purpose for being present explained to the students. At the conclusion of the observation, when the instructor calls for a class break or is prepared to adjourn, the observer should be provided a period of about ten minutes in which to explain the purpose of the observation to the students. During this meeting with the observer, the instructor should not be present in the classroom. At this time, the observer should ask students whether the class observed was representative of the instructor's previous instruction and may solicit comment on (1) the student's perceptions of what the instructor does well in teaching and (2) what areas of improvement in the instructor's teaching they would recommend.

Post-evaluation Conference

Following the observation, a post-conference discussion should be held between instructor and observer. This observation should include an opportunity for the instructor to provide a self-assessment of his or her teaching performance, emphasizing what he or she believes was done well and what improvements can be made. After the instructor has had an opportunity to present the self-assessment, the observer should offer guidance based on the criteria that were agreed upon in the pre-conference, emphasizing what the observer believes was done well and what improvements are recommended. At the conclusion of this discussion, the observer should provide feedback on student perceptions (ensuring that student anonymity is preserved) and offer suggestions to the instructor on how the syllabus and related materials can be improved.

Written Report to Instructor

At the conclusion of the post-conference, the observer should prepare a letter to the instructor indicating when the observation took place, highlighting strengths of the instructor's performance, and noting any recommendations for improvement. This letter should be based on the post-conference discussion. The letter should be completed within 10 days of the post- evaluation conference and given to the instructor as a follow-up to the observation. The instructor will include this letter in his or her annual evaluation report.

Peer-Evaluation Completion Affidavit

The observer is responsible for providing a peer-evaluation completion affidavit for the instructor to include in his or her annual evaluation report. The affidavit must include:

- Date criteria were agreed upon (pre-evaluation conference)
- Date of classroom observation
- Date of post-evaluation conference
- Date of written report

Criteria and Indicators for Classroom Evaluation

The following criteria and indicators are recommended for the conduct of an observation but are by no means inclusive. The observer and instructor should agree on the specific criteria that will be applied in any observation. In most cases, selected criteria should be limited in order to avoid making the observation too complicated for effective assessment.

Criteria: The instructor uses a variety of teaching and learning strategies that reflect the diversity of student learning styles, background, and experience

Indicators:

- Provides a range of activities and assignments to meet the various students' learning styles.
- Uses appropriate teaching techniques to effectively instruct students.
- Uses a range of materials, technology, and resources to assist all students to learn.
- Creates a climate of openness, mutual respect, and support for inquiry and discussion.

Criteria: The instructor uses assessment strategies to assist the continuous development of the learner.

Indicators:

- Uses a range of measures to assess student learning and design learning experiences.
- Plans and implements assessment consistent with desired performance outcomes and course objectives.
- Provides timely feedback to students on performance.

Criteria: The instructor plans and implements effective instruction in the classroom.

Indicators:

- Engages students in learning activities.
- Maintains academic focus of students by using verbal, nonverbal, and visual cues.
- Provides clear directions for instructional activities.
- Uses an interdisciplinary approach to learning and integrates multiple subject areas.
- Relates concepts through more than one method, such as analogies, metaphors, graphics, and models.
- Emphasizes links between theory and practice and connections to professional development.

Criteria: The instructor creates a positive learning environment.

Indicators:

- Stimulates student reflection on previously acquired knowledge.
- Links new knowledge and ideas to already familiar ideas.
- Uses classroom time efficiently.
- Presents concepts and principles at varying levels of complexity so that they are meaningful to students at varying levels of development.
- Organizes instruction to include cooperative, students directed groups.
- Monitors activities and provides feedback on student performance.
- Maintains instructional momentum with smooth and efficient transitions.
- Maximizes time-on-task in important learning activities.
- Demonstrates a positive attitude.
- Engages inattentive students.
- Models appropriate classroom behaviors.

Criteria: The instructor uses effective communication techniques.

Indicators:

• Establishes positive interactions with students that are focused upon learning.

- Communicates effectively with students of varying backgrounds and experiences.
- Challenges students in a positive and supportive manner.
- Promotes individual and group inquiry and discussion.
- Gives constructive feedback.
- Provides clear directions and explanations.
- Reinforces positive behavior.
- Praises when appropriate.
- Listens attentively and thoughtfully.
- Provides appropriate prompts and allots adequate time for student responses.

Criteria: The instructor encourages critical thinking.

Indicators:

- Chooses classroom activities and strategies that expand students' critical thinking skills.
- Poses problems and asks questions that require students to analyze, synthesize and apply information.
- Assists students in applying standards of proof and critically appraising evidence for propositions.
- Introduces current research and assists students to evaluate and critically appraise that research.
- Constructs problem-solving exercises that enable students to apply knowledge and skills.
- Assists students in the conduct of reasoned and systematic inquiry.
- Encourages inquiry, creative thinking, group problem solving, and innovative solutions.

Criteria: The instructor uses appropriate technology in teaching and learning.

Indicators:

- Selects and utilizes appropriate learning media, computer-applications, and other technology to enhance classroom instruction.
- Uses computer applications to prepare and deliver instructional presentations.
- Encourages student use of email and Internet resources available through Florida State University.
- Uses appropriate technologies to create and maintain databases for monitoring student performance and progress.

Criteria: The instructor demonstrates knowledge of subject matter.

Indicators:

- Communicates information accurately and appropriately.
- Enables students to interrelate knowledge and information from a variety of perspectives.
- Maintains currency with regard to changes in subject field, as demonstrated through appropriate and timely syllabus revisions and updates.
- Uses a variety of reference materials.
- Effectively communicates course objectives, requirements, and evaluative standards.
- Links theory to the field of practice.
- Models required competencies.

FSU PC Bylaws 27

Faculty member:_____ Observer:_____

Date of pre-evaluation conference: _____ Date/time of observation: _____

Criteria

Indicators Observed

Criteria

Indicators Observed

Criteria

Indicators Observed

Additional Comments

Peer Evaluation Completion Affidavit

Faculty member requesting peer evaluation:	
Date of pre-evaluation conference:	
Date of classroom evaluation:	
Class evaluated:	
Date of post-evaluation conference:	
Date of written report:	
Name of observer:	
Signature of observer:	

Please read this statement and sign and date below:

I completed having a peer evaluate one of my courses as a part of the annual evaluation process.

Name:	Date:

Appendix I. Examples of Alternative Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

SPCI Based

- Summary of additional questions from student perceptions
- Comparison within faculty member across time
- Comparison with other sections of the same course
- Other relevant comparisons across the university.

Other Evidence

- Outside reviewer (department, Office of Distance Learning (ODL), etc.)
- Peer evaluations of curriculum
- Class notes
- Curriculum development
- Comprehensive assessment performance
- Student characteristics (lower division, upper division, required, elective, etc.)
- Use of TA/online mentors
- Complexity of the material
- Grade distribution
- Synchronous vs. asynchronous
- Responsiveness to students
- Class size

*Note. Additional evidence must be accompanied by a short narrative explaining why the supporting evidence was included and how it relates to one's teaching effectiveness.

Online-specific Instruction

- FSU has adopted the Quality Matters rubric to assess the quality of online courses. (https://odl.fsu.edu/online-instruction/quality) This rubric is backed by research into online learning and is used in a faculty-centered peer review process. This process ends in a certification of quality when the eight benchmark standards are met by the course under review.
- Supplemental evidence will not require that a course undergo a full review. There are several levels in the review process that provide a hierarchy that can be used as increasing levels of evidence.
 - The first level is that the instructor is certified in Applying the QM Rubric (APPQMR) and completes a Self-Review of the course. The completed Self-Review worksheet would be included in the faculty binder.
 - The second level is that an internal review performed locally by a QM Peer Reviewer on the PC Campus. The Reviewer Report would be submitted as evidence in the binder.
 - The third level is an ODL review of the course. Satisfactory achievements at this level include earning a Quality rating or High-Quality rating, and the report and certificate would be provided. *
 - The fourth level is an external review by Quality Matters. A course that meets QM standards and receives the Certification Mark would provide the certificate with their binder. *

*Since the course is locked as a master to be used without substantial changes, reviews at this level are good for five years and may be submitted each year.



Appendix II: **FSU** | FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY PANAMA CITY

PROMOTION POLICY

Position Classifications in the Collective Bargaining Unit First to Second Rank & Second to Third Rank Florida State University Panama City

Voted by faculty January 2025; policy effective for implementation ****** Approved by the Office of Faculty Development & Advancement *****

In accordance with FSU policy and The United Faculty of Florida Collective Bargaining Unit, criteria for specialized faculty promotion focus on meritorious performance of assigned duties in the faculty member's present position, in addition to degree and time in service. Promotion for faculty at Florida State University Panama City is a function of time in rank and quality of work. The candidate for promotion to a higher rank must demonstrate performance beyond what is minimally acceptable.

Promotion decisions for specialized faculty will take into account the following:

- Annual evaluations.
- Annual assignments of responsibility (AOR).
- Fulfillment of the academic unit's written promotion criteria as it relates to a faculty member's AOR.
- Evidence of sustained effectiveness relative to opportunity and according to a faculty member's AOR.

Promotion Criteria to the Second Rank

In order to be considered for promotion to the second rank in each track the candidate must meet or exceed all the following criteria:

1. The candidate should have served at least five (5) years in the first rank or equivalent grade at another institution. Only a candidate with extraordinarily strong justification will be considered for promotion to the second rank prior to the fifth year.

In general, activities that may warrant justification for early promotion consideration include:

- a. Consistent exceptional performance of "Exceeding Expectations" standards in all areas of a faculty member's assignment.
- b. A strong, positive, and measurable impact on the community, the campus, and the university.
- 2. The candidate must have shown a consistent record of outstanding performance through the examination of the candidate's annual evaluations. The successful candidate shall:
 - a. Have not received any annual evaluation of "Official Concern" within the past two (2) years.
 - b. Have an annual overall evaluation rating of at least "Meets Expectations" for at least 50% of the evaluated years during the promotion time period.
- 3. The candidate must demonstrate a continuous effort to improve and keep oneself professionally updated.
- 4. The candidate must show a strong record of service to the FSU PC campus, Academic Program/Department, College, and/or University by meeting or exceeding AOR service criteria.

5. Completion of the standards above does not confer **automatic** approval of promotion.

Promotion Criteria to the Third Rank

In order to be considered for promotion to the third rank in each track, the candidate must meet or exceed all the following criteria:

- 1. The candidate should have served at least five (5) years in the second rank or equivalent grade at another institution. Only a candidate with extraordinarily strong justification will be considered for promotion to the third rank prior to the fifth year. In general, activities that may warrant justification for early promotion consideration include:
 - a. Consistently exceptional performance **"Exceeding Expectations"** standards in all areas of a faculty member's assignment.
 - b. A strong, positive, measurable impact on the community, the campus, and the university.
- 2. The candidate must have shown a consistent record of outstanding performance through the examination of the candidate's annual evaluations. The successful candidate shall:
 - a. Have not received any annual evaluation of "Official Concern" within the past two (2) years.
 - b. Have an annual overall evaluation rating of at least **"Meets Expectations"** for at least 50% of the evaluated years during the promotion time period.
- 3. The candidate must demonstrate a continuous effort to improve and keep oneself professionally updated.
- 4. The candidate must show a strong record of service to the FSU PC campus, Academic Program/Department, College, and/or University by meeting or exceeding AOR service criteria.
- 5. Completion of the above standards does not confer **automatic** approval of promotion.

For up-to-date information regarding Specialized Faculty Promotion Process including Promotion Binder/Portfolio requirements, the candidates should refer to Annual Memorandums by Office of Faculty Development and Advancement Office and its website (https://fda.fsu.edu/facultydevelopment/promotions-for-specialized-faculty).

J.1 Scope. This Appendix is a supplement to the provisions of Article 14 Promotion, regarding the criteria and procedures for promotion within the Specialized Faculty, which are defined in Article 9.10.

J.2 University Criteria for Promotion

(a) When first employed, each faculty member shall be apprised of what is expected of him or her, generally, in terms of teaching, research and other creative activities and service, and specifically if there are specific requirements and/or other duties involved. If and when these expectations change during the period of service of a faculty member, that faculty member shall be apprised of the change.

(b) Promotion. Promotion in the Specialized Faculty ranks is attained through meritorious performance of assigned duties in the faculty member's present position.

(1) Promotion to the second rank in each track shall be based on recognition of demonstrated effectiveness in the areas of assigned duties.

(2) Promotion to the third rank in each track shall be based on superior performance in the areas of assigned duties.

(3) Promotion decisions shall take into account the following:

a. annual evaluations

b. annual assignments

c. fulfillment of the department/unit written promotion criteria in relation to the assignment

d. evidence of sustained effectiveness relative to opportunity and according to assignment

e. for the Teaching Faculty track:

i. evidence of well-planned and delivered courses

ii. summaries of data from Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPOT) questionnaires

iii. letters from faculty members who have conducted peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching

iv. ability to teach multiple courses within a discipline/major

v. 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

f. for the Instructional Support track:

i. evidence of contributions in support of instruction, as attested to by internal letters from faculty members at FSU

ii. other instructional support activities, as described in J.2(b)(3)e5

g. for Research Faculty or Curator track:

i. scholarly or creative accomplishments of high quality, appropriate to the field, in the form of books and peer-reviewed scholarly publications

ii. success in obtaining external funding, as principal investigator or co-principal investigator on grants

iii. recognized standing in the discipline and profession, as attested to by letters from outstanding scholars outside the university

iv. other research-related activities, such as those described in 10.3(c)

h. for Research Support Faculty

i. evidence of contributions in support of research, as attested to by internal letters from collaborators at FSU

ii. other research-related activities, such as those described in 10.3(c) and in J.2(b)(3)g

for University Librarian and Information Specialties track

i. demonstrated excellence in the candidate's specialized area of librarianship

ii. participation in continuing education in the form of appropriate academic course work, workshops, institutes or conferences

- iii. participation or membership in professional associations
- iv. attainment of an advanced degree
- v. publications

vi. evidence of commitment to the service concerns of the University or the community

(4) Although the period of time in a given rank is normally five years, demonstrated merit, not years of service, shall be the guiding factor. Promotion shall not be automatic, nor may it be regarded as guaranteed upon completion of a given term of service. Early promotion is possible where there is sufficient justification.

(5) Specialized faculty members who have been assigned an administrative code shall be subject to the normal promotion criteria and procedures for the applicable rank. They may not substitute performance of their administrative duties for qualifications in teaching or research. The duty assignments of such employees shall accord them an opportunity to meet the criteria for promotion; however, the number of years it takes a faculty member to meet the criteria in teaching or research and scholarly accomplishments may be lengthened by reduced duty assignments in those areas; the number of years over which such accomplishments are spread shall not be held against the faculty member when the promotion case is evaluated.

J.3 Promotion Procedures

i.

(a) All departments/units must have written promotion criteria and procedures for all applicable Specialized Faculty available in the department/unit, posted on a single publicly accessible University Web site, and on file in the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement. All procedures culminate in submission of recommendations via the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement to the President for formal approval. All actions are effective at the same time as tenure track faculty promotions, which is the beginning of the next academic year.

(b) Recommendations for promotion of members of the Specialized Faculty proceed, as for all other members of the faculty, according to the process specified in Article 14. The following additional provisions apply.

(c) Each department/unit is to consider for promotion all specialized faculty members who are not yet at the top rank of their track. The department chair (or equivalent administrator if the department/unit is not a department) shall consult with those faculty members who are being considered for promotion review to determine whether they desire to proceed to the preparation of a promotion binder. If the faculty member so desires, the chair and the faculty member will prepare a promotion binder as described in (l) below.

(d) A promotion committee of the department/unit, elected by the faculty in accordance with the department's/unit's bylaws, shall be charged with the responsibility of reviewing the binders of all prospective candidates for promotion in that department annually, and recommending action on the nomination of each candidate.

(e) The department chair shall be charged with the responsibility of independently reviewing the binders of all prospective candidates in that department and recommending action on the nomination of each candidate.

(f) Once the departmental committee has reviewed a binder, no material may be added to or deleted from it except under the conditions specified in Articles 14 and 15 of this Agreement. This means that after the binder leaves the first-level committee, it is complete and no materials can be added to it under normal circumstances, except that the dean may place a letter of evaluation on the record of achievement as reflected in the binder. The chair shall submit the binders of all candidates, except those withdrawn by a candidate, to the dean with a report of departmental committee recommendations taken via a secret ballot and the chair's recommendations on all submitted binders of all candidates.

(g) The applicable director, dean, or vice president considers these recommendations as well as independently reviews each candidate's record and then submits his or her advice regarding whether the candidate meets the appropriate promotion criteria to the President or designee via the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement. The bylaws of a college/unit may also institute a faculty committee to review all Specialized Faculty promotions within the college/unit.

(h) The Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement confirms that the candidate meets the eligibility requirements, and then forwards the recommendation to the President or designee for final approval.

(i) The recommendation of the applicable review committees and those of the department/unit chair and dean are only to convey to the President their recommendation as to whether the candidate meets the written criteria for promotion, based on their independent evaluations of the promotion files.

(j) All recommendations (to approve or deny) by the dean, or equivalent administrator, and all applicable review committees, are forwarded to the President or designee for final action via the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement unless the candidate withdraws his or her file from consideration within five working days of being informed of the results of the consideration at a given level.

(k) Each faculty member shall be informed of his or her prospective candidacy, have an opportunity to assist in preparing the binder and add any relevant information prior to review by the departmental committee, and be informed in writing of the results of the recommendations at each level of review.

(1) Promotion Binder.

(1) The promotion binder shall include: professional vita, assigned duties, annual evaluations, chair/supervisor's annual letters of appraisal of progress toward promotion, and letters of recommendation, and may include evidence of the other considerations specified in Section J.2(b)(3).

(2) For all faculty members with teaching assignments, the binder shall include a list of courses taught since appointment to the rank from which being considered for promotion, with the percentage of effort assigned, enrollment, and grade distribution for each course. A summary of the results of the polls of student perceptions of teaching shall also be included for each course.

(3) For faculty members in the Teaching track, the binder must also include two or three letters from faculty members, besides the department/unit chair, who have conducted a peer evaluation of the candidate's teaching.

(4) For faculty members in the Instructional Support track, the binder shall include two or three letters from faculty members, besides the department/unit chair, who have reviewed the faculty member's service in support of instruction, and teaching if applicable.

(5) For faculty members in the Research track, the binder shall include:

a. Three letters of recommendation from outstanding scholars outside the University that attest to the quality of the candidate's research and/or other creative activities and her/his recognition in the field.

b. Descriptions of the contracts and grants for which the candidate has served as Principal Investigator (PI) or co-PI since the last promotion or initial appointment, as appropriate, including: the title of the project; the funding agency; the list of PI and co-PIs; any other institutions involved; the FSU share and amount of the funding.

(6) For faculty members in the Research Support track, the binders shall include two or three letters from faculty members, besides the department/unit chair, who have reviewed the faculty member's service in support of research. If the duty assignments over the period since last promotion included a research component, the binder shall also include evidence of the quality of the research.

(7) A complete description of materials to be included in the promotion binder shall be provided in an annual memorandum from the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement.

(8) Appropriate materials may be selected or abstracted from the faculty member's one evaluation file for inclusion in the promotion binder, as long as the affected faculty member is informed of the selection. Any evaluation of a faculty member placed in the promotion binder shall become a part of the faculty member's one evaluation file.

J.4 Working Titles.

(a) Members of the Specialized Faculty may be assigned a specific working title according to Table J.4 Working Titles, by the dean of the college or comparable unit in which they are employed.

Table J.4 Working Titles				
Position Code	Position Title	Working Title		
9060	Teaching Faculty I	Assistant Lecturer, Assistant Teaching Faculty, Instructor, Legal Writing Instructor		
9061	Teaching Faculty II	Associate Lecturer, Associate Teaching Faculty, Instructor II, Legal Writing Instructor II		
9062	Teaching Faculty III	Senior Lecturer, Senior Teaching Faculty,		

		Instructor III, Legal Writing Instructor III
9070	Instructional Specialist I	Instructional Designer I, Training Specialist I, Legal Writing Assistant
9071	Instructional Specialist II	Instructional Designer II, Training Specialist II, Legal Writing Associate
9072	Instructional Specialist III	Instructional Designer III, Training Specialist III, Legal Writing Specialist
9080	Research Faculty I	Assistant Scholar, Assistant Scientist, Assistant Engineer
9081	Research Faculty II	Associate Scholar, Associate Scientist, Associate Engineer
9082	Research Faculty III	Senior Scholar, Senior Scientist, Senior Engineer, Staff Physicist
9168	Assistant in Research	Laboratory Technician
9167	Associate in Research	
9165	Senior Research Associate	

(b) Deans may approve additional working titles, provided they do not contain the word "professor," with consent of the faculty member.

J.5 Honorific Working Titles. In addition, members of the Teaching and Research tracks may be granted an honorific working title containing the word "professor," as specified in Table J.5 Honorific Working Titles, under the following conditions.

Table J.5 Honorific Working Titles				
Position Code	Position Title	Working Title		

9060	Teaching Faculty I	Assistant Teaching Professor Assistant Clinical Professor
9061	Teaching Faculty II	Associate Teaching Professor Associate Clinical Professor

9062	Teaching Faculty III	Teaching Professor Clinical Professor
9080	Research Faculty I	Assistant Research Professor
9081	Research Faculty II	Associate Research Professor
9082	Research Faculty III	Research Professor

(a) Such a title may only be granted with the recommendation of a majority vote of the tenured faculty of an academic department/unit offering a degree program, in recognition of scholarly accomplishments within the granting department/unit's academic field.

(b) The criteria and procedures for awarding such an honorific working title shall be the same as for promotion or initial appointment to the corresponding tenure-track rank, except:

(1) The department/unit and college/unit that evaluates the nomination and recommends the granting of the title may be different from those in which the faculty member is employed, if the faculty member is employed in a non-academic unit.

(2) The expectations in research, teaching, and service shall be scaled proportionally to the assignment of duties.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of J.5(a) and J.5(b), faculty appointed at the Panama City Campus who are assigned to the Teaching Faculty series may use the appropriate Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, or Teaching Professor honorific working title under the following conditions:

(1) The faculty member holds a terminal degree in a field relevant to the faculty member's teaching area(s), and

(2) A special Panama City Committee on Honorific Working Titles for Teaching Faculty appointed by the President or designee and consisting of three senior Panama City Campus faculty members recommends in a secret ballot that the faculty member be granted the honorific working title, and

(3) The President or designee approves the recommendation.

(d) The faculty member may use the honorific working title in place of the name of the faculty member's position classification for the following purposes: correspondence, publications, business cards, web pages, and applications for contracts and grants. The University may use this

title in bulletins, University directory listings, and other publications. The entire phrase, including the modifiers "teaching" or "research," must be used.

(e) Notwithstanding any of the above, wherever the terms "professor," "associate professor," and "assistant professor" appear without a modifier in this contract and in all University documents, they shall apply only to the tenured and tenure-earning position classifications (9001 Professor, 9002 Associate Professor, 9003 Assistant Professor, and 9009 Eminent Scholar). Examples of published University documents for the purpose of this provision include, but are not limited to: the University Constitution; Faculty Senate Bylaws and other Faculty Senate documents; the Faculty Handbook; college and department bylaws; University rules and policy memoranda; and University reports to external agencies.