

**STATEMENT OF ASKEW SCHOOL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND
POLICY
PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND MERIT PAY DETERMINATION FOR
FACULTY MEMBERS**

Adopted by the Faculty on January 28, 1986

Revised March 12, April 23, September 6, 2007, January 15, 2013, and January 27, 2020

I. Introduction

There are three basic reasons why the Askew School engages in performance appraisal in addition to formal requirements from higher authorities):

- A. To provide information and counsel to members of the faculty, in order that each can reach his/her full potential in service to the school.
- B. To enable faculty members to track their progress toward tenure and/or promotion in a systematic way.
- C. To provide a basis for merit increases.

In pursuing these goals, it is fundamental that the process be regarded as one that is fair to all participants. In order to assure fairness, three elements are required:

- A. A decision structure that provides all possible assurance that there is fair and equitable treatment.
- B. Stated, clear expectations that leave little doubt as to the basic terms within which performance will be evaluated.
- C. An open communications system, in which all relevant data are shared among the faculty members, committee members and Director.

Finally, it is recognized that any performance appraisal system requires a substantial degree of judgment; and the process must be so developed that the many points of view within the School are fully assimilated and utilized. Objectivity is furthered by the development of a process that is inclusive of all members and is clear about expectations.

II. Process Structure

The basic elements of the process are:

- A. Systematic and caring approach in the development and negotiation of assignments of responsibility.

- B. Basic responsibility for the assembly and presentation of relevant data resting with the faculty member.
- C. Extensive review of performance which recognizes that scholarly work and successful public service often requires more than a single year to accomplish, and which encourages contributions of lasting importance. The current status of each project, including the acceptance of subsequent publication of written efforts as well as new evidence of the importance of past efforts such as book reviews, should be noted each year. The review process for annual evaluations will place primary emphasis upon activities actually performed during the year of evaluation, but will also consider new evidence about the lasting importance of work.
- D. The primary time period for the annual evaluation of activities shall be the activities of the member for the prior calendar year.
- E. Provision of reasons to each member on appraisals made, opportunity for further discussion with the Personnel Committee and the Director on specific aspects of the appraisal.
- F. Consistent application of the evaluation criteria specified in the by-laws.

The structure for evaluation involves:

- A. A three member Personnel Committee elected by the faculty for two year terms on an overlapping basis.
- B. A provision that members of the School Policy Committee cannot serve concurrently on the Personnel Committee.
- C. The functions of the Personnel Committee in this process are: (a) establish procedures, including a specific timetable with due dates, and determine the content of evaluation categories in accordance with the provisions of this statement for the school's consideration; and (b) evaluate faculty members and make recommendations to the Director.

The phases in the process are:

- A. The Director works with each faculty member on an individual basis to establish assignments of responsibility on a semester-by-semester basis. When tasks change during the semester, there can be a renegotiation of assignments to reflect the new reality. Assignments of responsibility should be settled by the beginning of each semester.
- B. The Personnel Committee distributes to the faculty the format under which performance data will be provided.

- C. Each faculty member will provide to the Personnel Committee performance data, including the previous year's evaluation letter. Teaching evaluations for the year under review, and a current CV..
- D. The Personnel Committee will meet, make its appraisals known to each faculty member, and if requested, discuss the evaluation.
- E. The Personnel Committee will conclude its appraisals, prepare individual letters, and transmit them to the Director.
- F. The Director shall transmit performance documents including the individual letters of evaluation prepared by the Personnel Committee, the evaluation form required by the employer, and letters prepared at the option of the Director, to the Dean as well as any response which might be submitted at the option of the faculty member. The member shall have the right to discuss any of these performance documents with the Director.

III. Standards

Faculty members may have three basic responsibilities, as outlined in the Assignment of Responsibilities:

- A. Instruction
- B. Research/Creativity
- C. Service

Additionally, it should be noted that the School is engaged in professional education and therefore places more emphasis on professional service than would be true in many other units of the university. The School is also conceived as a collaborative, participative organization, thus requiring that each faculty member devote more time and energy to its service.

A. Instruction

1. Assignment of Responsibilities

a. Assignment of responsibilities shall be in accordance with Article 9 "Assignment of Responsibilities" of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Each faculty member will receive annually a written assignment of responsibilities from the Director. The Director in consultation with the faculty member will develop this assignment. The completed assignment form will reflect the mix of teaching, research and service and/or administrative assignments upon which the faculty member will be evaluated. A standard teaching assignment for tenure track faculty consists of two courses or approximately 50 percent of one's duties.

Consultation with the Director for an appropriate adjustment in teaching assignment (as well as research or service) should be done at the beginning of the semester. Teaching assignments may also be increased under the procedures identified in the bylaws.

- b. Percentage of assigned time will be used to establish relative weights in arriving at a total performance measure for the faculty member.

2. Performance Criteria

a.. Evidence of Performance in Classroom Instruction

- (1) Number of classes and of different course preparations taught
- (2) Student evaluation scores, which will be administered in all classes, with the further option of making special arrangements with the Personnel Committee. Students' written comments shall be submitted and shall be fully disclosed.

b. Preparation of teaching materials including:

- (1) Course specific resources such as syllabi, examinations, reading lists, computer programs, and class exercises.
- (2) General resources such as elementary texts, casebooks, anthologies (these three may be offered by the faculty member as scholarly research activities), major bibliographies, literature reviews and book reviews.

c. Direction of Dissertations.

- (1) Numbers of Ph.D. committee memberships
- (2) Numbers of Ph.D. committees chaired
- (3) Numbers of Ph.D. Dissertations supervised to completion

d. Advising Students.

- (1) Numbers of students for which formal counseling reports made

- e. Directing Individual or Group Study.
- f. The indicators can also be summarized in the following ways:
 - (1) Classroom
 - (a) Syllabi, reading lists
 - (b) Student evaluations
 - (c) Evidence of instructional innovations
 - (2) Outside Classroom
 - (a) Special recognition by student or faculty groups
 - (b) Publication of texts, book reviews, articles
 - (c) Individual studies completed under faculty member's supervision

B. Research/Creativity

1. Assignment of Responsibilities

a. A common standard of this component for tenure track faculty is 35 – 45 percent of one's time. An active program of research consists of article/books published, manuscripts submitted for publication, and work in progress.

2. Performance Criteria

Since research and creativity are important parts of the professional responsibility, special effort will be made to insure that the evaluation committee has all the necessary data on which to make informed judgments. Faculty members are encouraged:

- a. To provide brief abstracts summarizing the nature of their work.
- b. To develop a statement indicating the nature of the contribution.
- c. To insure that there is an outside review of the quality and importance of the work. (In refereed journals, of course, this need has already been met.).

The *research products* to be evaluated include:

- a. Articles in Journals
 - (1) Appraisals of articles will not only be made for their own quality but also on the basis of the periodical in which they appear. Refereed journals will receive the greatest credit.
- b. Books
 - (1) Publication of a book is an important evidence of performance. (Acceptance of publication will also be recognized as performance.).
 - (2) Reviews and other formal indications of quality and significance will be considered.
 - (3) Unpublished manuscripts for books may be evaluated, thereby providing credit for work in progress. However, the same work may not be submitted for review twice.
- c. Monographs, book chapters, etc.
 - (1) Monographs, book chapters, etc. are outlets and the general terms of evaluation previously described would apply. Since many of these contributions are arranged on an invitational basis, it will be important to keep correspondence to ascertain the reasons why an invitation was received. The more it can be established that the invitation was a function of status in the field, the greater the credit for performance.
- d. Grants
 - (1) Awarded grants shall be considered as commensurate with publication of refereed articles. The Personnel Committee will consider such things as the quality of the proposal, funding source, amount, whether a principal or co-principal

investigator, and overall likely impact of the project.

e. Other evidence of Research/Creative Activity

- (1) Papers at conferences, symposia, etc.
- (2) Editorships, reviews of articles, etc.
- (3) Grants submissions, applied research reports, and technical papers.

C. Service

1. Assignment of Responsibilities

a. The most frequent assignment of time in this area for tenure track faculty is 5 percent, although program directors and specialized faculty are likely to have higher percentages.

b. There are two types of service activity in which a faculty member may engage:

- (1) Professional service: professional practice and service to clients; advisory and consultative services to government or government-related organizations; and work performed for professional organizations, as in the position of president of a national or regional professional organization.
- (2) Academic service: academic program direction; College or School, committees; University functions or activities, such as the Faculty Senate, committees, or task groups; and participation in School administrative processes.

2. Performance Criteria

a. Service activity will differ significantly from individual to individual; and therefore it is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide as complete and useful information on performance as possible.

- b. Faculty members should seek to engage in professional service activities. The more documentation available, the greater the likelihood of a valid and fair evaluation.
- c. Three measures of performance will serve as guidelines to the Personnel Committee:
 - (1) *Impact of the contribution*, which may be established by evaluation studies, letters or other documentation from service recipients, media reports, and similar forms of evidence.
 - (2) *Intellectual and professional soundness of the work*, which can best be established when there is a written product, which may be evaluated by peers and by outsiders, and which may be reviewed by the evaluation committee. Where there is no written output, observation reports may be used as a means of measuring intellectual, professional soundness.
 - (3) *Efficiency and effectiveness of performance*, which can be established through reports by recipients of services, by others participating in the program, by written documentation of personal contributions, and so forth.

IV. Evaluation Standards

The following “operational definitions” of the categories (as they appear in the by-laws) are offered. Faculty members’ performance in each of their assigned categories of duties, as well as their overall performance, will be graded according to the following ordinal categories: Substantially Exceeds FSU’S High Expectations, Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations, Meets FSU’s High Expectations, and Does Not Meet FSU’s High Expectations (either “Official Concern” or “Unsatisfactory”).

Members of the Personnel Committee are expected to exercise their professional judgment regarding their grading of the performance of members in each of the three components of service assignments. The following guidelines are intended to be informative while retaining needed flexibility when judging the quality of performance in such matters as

teaching innovations, public service, or publications in outlets other than in the major disciplinary journals. In evaluating members' performance, the Personnel Committee is to act with the understanding that members are accorded substantial academic freedom in developing the content of their courses and in defining the content and outlets for their research agendas.

A. Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations. A record of highly competent teaching, research or service; activities were accomplished with distinction.

1. Substantially Exceeds Expectations Overall: To receive an Overall evaluation of Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations the member need not receive an evaluation of Substantially Exceeds in all three categories, but performance in at least one category must be judged as Substantially Exceeds and overall performance deemed strong enough to warrant an overall evaluation in this category. Normally, receipt of an evaluation of Substantially Exceeds for 55 percent or more of an assignment of duties, and nothing below Meets FSU's High Expectations will warrant an overall grade in this category.

2. Substantially Exceeds Teaching Expectations: Student evaluation scores, particularly as they reflect that the instructor shows respect and concern toward students, should be very strong, while also taking into consideration the difficulty of the subject matter being taught. In addition, a strong record of teaching innovation is present, as well as evidence of very well developed, effectively taught courses. Active engagement in doctoral committees and co-publication with students is considered as evidence of exceptional teaching.

3. Substantially Exceeds Research Expectations: Publication of a major book, particularly by a university press or in respected commercial series, or publication of articles in one of the top journals in the field of public administration or in similarly considered journals in other fields related to policy or management, and other very strong evidence such as other publications, major grants awarded as a Principal or Co-Principal investigator, or special recognitions for research.

4. Substantially Exceeds Service Expectations: Contributions, of a written or oral nature, to the practitioner community that provide much needed insights, or are likely to positively affect decisions or professional behaviors, are examples of outstanding service contributions. Election to and service in a substantial national or regional professional office, including an ASPA section chair or equivalent, or to an important state policy advisory body, are likely to deserve an outstanding rating. Normally service to the school alone

will not justify this category unless it involves undertaking a substantial amount of work of particular importance that is especially well done.

B. Exceeds FSU's High Expectations. A record of commendable work was achieved with considerable success.

1. Exceeds Expectations Overall: Normally, receipt of an evaluation of "good" in at least two of the categories of assignments of duties, with nothing below satisfactory will warrant an overall grade in this category.

2. Exceeds Teaching Expectations: Student evaluation scores, particularly as they reflect that the instructor shows respect and concern toward students, should average in the good to excellent categories, while taking into consideration the difficulty of the subject matter being taught. In addition, a record of teaching innovation is present, as well as evidence presented of well-developed, effectively taught courses. Active engagement in doctoral education is a normal component of good teaching.

3. Exceeds Research Expectations: Publication of a single article in a top journal, or articles in outlets comparable to most ASPA section journals or in similarly considered journals in other fields related to policy or management, and other strong evidence such as other publications, edited books and symposia, or a significant role in grants newly awarded. The Personnel Committee is encouraged to look closely at other forms of publications and research accomplishments, particularly those directed to practitioners, to ascertain whether the contribution is of a quality comparable to that of the aforementioned types of articles.

4. Exceeds Service Expectations: The member is fully active in making contributions, of a written or oral nature, to the practitioner community as well as to the academic community. Election to lesser offices, service beyond membership in professional organizations, and active engagement with practitioners are likely to deserve an Exceeds rating. Noteworthy service to the school alone could justify this ranking for a particular year but members are strongly encouraged to engage in the broader practitioner and academic communities.

C. Meets FSU's High Expectations. Evidence presented demonstrates adequate teaching, research, or service performance; most activities for the year were completed.

1. Meets High Expectations Overall: For an overall grade of Meets FSU's High Expectations to be assigned, no grade for any component of assignments of duties may be below this level with the exception noted below

pertaining to merit pay.

2. Meets High Teaching Expectations: Student evaluation scores should not show that thirty percent or more of students judge the member as “fair” or “poor” in their overall assessment of the instructor. In addition, evidence is presented of sufficiently well developed and taught courses.

3. Meets High Research Expectations: Evidence presented that the member’s research activities are likely to result in refereed publications or products of similar quality in the near future. The member’s publications, papers, manuscripts, and other research projects as well as the member’s record of past publication will be considered in this context. The overall body of on-going research activity is sufficient to attain or to retain graduate directive status. The Personnel Committee is encouraged to look closely at the full range of the member’s research activities to ascertain whether the member’s on-going contribution is adequate for continuing doctoral directive status.

4. Meets High Service Expectations: The member is reasonably active in making contributions, of a written or oral nature, to the practitioner community or to the academic community. Active attendance at professional meetings, some engagement with practitioners, and meeting peer set standards regarding level of service to the school will normally justify this rating.

D. Does Not Meet FSU’s High Expectations – Official Concern. Work is not done to an acceptable level of proficiency. Specifically, work does not fully meet established standards of the university or school faculty in material respects. “Material” is here defined as being sufficient to affect the Personnel Committee’s judgment of the quality of performance in any category of assignment of duties.

1. Official Concern Overall: An overall assignment in this category normally occurs if work in one of the three components of assignments of duties is of Official Concern. If the member’s performance otherwise is sufficiently strong, an overall grade of Meets FSU’s High Expectations may be assigned, but the member will not be eligible for merit pay shares.

2. Official Concern about Teaching: Student evaluation scores show that thirty percent or more of students judge the member as “fair” or “poor” in their overall assessment of the instructor or in their judgment as to whether the member showed respect and concern toward students. Evidence presented casts doubt that courses are being sufficiently well developed and taught.

3. Official Concern about Research: Evidence presented casts doubt that the member’s research activities are likely to result in refereed publications or products of similar quality in the near future. The member’s

record of past publication will be considered in this context. The Personnel Committee is encouraged to look closely at the full range of the member's research activities to ascertain whether the member's on-going contribution is appropriate to continued membership on the university's graduate faculty. The overall body of research activity is not sufficient to attain or to retain doctoral directive status.

4. Official Concern about Service: While it is recognized that members may refuse specific service assignments in the school, for reasonable cause, it is expected that each member will participate actively in school service activities, especially in fulfilling their assigned committee responsibilities. Failure to do so will normally justify this rating.

E. Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations -- Unsatisfactory. Performance is inadequate.

1. Unsatisfactory Overall. Performance in two or more categories of assignments of duties is less than satisfactory.

2. Unsatisfactory in Teaching: A pattern of less than satisfactory teaching about which Official Concern has been indicated, has been continued, for three or more years, that remediation efforts have not overcome.

3. Unsatisfactory in Research. The member has not engaged in an active research agenda as should be evidenced by a lack of works in progress.

4. Unsatisfactory in Service. The member is not actively engaged in providing service to the profession or the member fails to meet assigned school service responsibilities.

V. Evaluation Documents

A. The Personnel Committee will:

1. Review the performance of all faculty members assigned to the School. Where a member of the School is assigned elsewhere, the committee will undertake an advisory review for the faculty member affected.

2. Grade each member's performance in each of their assigned categories of duties, as well as determine a grade for their overall performance, and identify the reasons for its rating. The Personnel Committee will seek consensus among its three members, but majority vote will prevail when consensus is not achieved.

3. Communicate its judgments to the affected faculty member and provide opportunity for discussion.
 4. Prepare an evaluation letter for each faculty member and transmit it to the Director and to the member.
- B. The Director of the School will:
1. Review the letter of the Personnel Committee.
 2. Transmit performance documents to the Dean including individual letters of evaluation prepared by the Personnel Committee, as well as any response by the faculty member, and prepare and transmit the evaluation form required by the employer and, at the Director's option, the Director's evaluation letter for any faculty member. The member shall have the right to discuss any of these documents with the Director.
 3. Circulate the performance documents to the individual faculty members for review.
 4. Offer to meet with faculty members to discuss performance documents and to make appropriate changes.
 5. The Director may request the Personnel Committee to reconsider its evaluation.
 6. Transmit to the Dean any response that might be submitted at the option of the faculty member.
 7. Use faculty evaluations by the Personnel Committee to determine the award of merit increases in the manner prescribed below.

VI. Merit Pay Assignment Process

The merit pay assignment process in the Askew School recognizes that, by national standards of performance in our field, meritorious performance is the norm among our members. Our evaluation process is designed to enforce that level of expectation. The merit pay assignment process provides greater rewards to those whose performances stand out notably. The assignment process also recognizes that repeatedly distributing merit pay to a small number of members, when meritorious performances are more widely distributed, would contribute to both morale and salary inversion problems. The assignment process, therefore, allows for differential rewards while also rewarding merit when it is more widely distributed among members. In addition, the process recognizes that the annual amounts to be distributed for merit pay increases can vary widely from year to year, due to budget exigencies, and therefore seeks to provide equity in merit pay distribution over time.

The merit pay allocations to the School shall be distributed to members based on the number of shares to which they are entitled under the Performance Appraisal Process described herein. The allocation of shares is as follows:

- A. All members who receive an overall evaluation of “Meets FSU’s High Expectations” and who have published a refereed publication within the year, are entitled to one (1) share.
- B. All members who receive an overall evaluation of “Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations” are entitled to two (2) shares.
- C. All members who receive an overall evaluation of “Substantially Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations” are entitled to three (3) shares.
- D. Any member whose overall evaluation is below “Meets FSU’s High Expectations” is not entitled to merit pay shares. This ineligibility includes allocations of merit shares for salary inversion adjustments as described below.

Upon receipt of the notice as to how much the School has been allocated for merit pay distributions, the School Director will ascertain the total number of shares to which members are entitled, divide the total allocated amount by the number of entitled shares, and then distribute the full amount according to the members’ entitlements.

APPENDIX I. Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

A. Criteria and Standards for Performance: Overview

The route from initial appointment to contract renewal to tenure and/or promotion cannot be mapped with precision. But effectiveness in teaching and advising, very good scholarship, and service to FSU, the professional community, and the community of practice are standards that all faculty are expected to meet.

Faculty members who receive contract renewals, tenure and/or promotion will not all achieve those milestones in identical fashion. That is to say, some will do so by being extraordinarily effective teachers and very good scholars, some will be effective but not outstanding teachers and superior scholars, and a few will turn in exemplary performances both as teachers and as scholars. Thus, the School has not specified a set of highly specific criteria that must be satisfied.

In the absence of rigid criteria or a formula against which untenured faculty members can measure their performance and progress, the annual evaluations provided by the faculty and personnel committees play a central role in the School's performance evaluation process. These evaluations serve both to inform untenured faculty about their progress in teaching and advising and in scholarship and to give suggestions for dealing with any deficiencies. Preparation of an annual written evaluation and discussion of the evaluation in a meeting with the untenured faculty member and the School Director should allow the untenured faculty member to have an honest appraisal of how they are doing and where, if any, improvements need to be made to be successful in the tenure process.

B. Criteria and Performance Standards: Teaching and Advising

Past experience in the School indicates that faculty members who join the ranks with little or no previous teaching experience are rarely "excellent" teachers immediately. Therefore, course evaluations and other indicators of substandard teaching performance during a faculty member's first year of teaching are to be regarded primarily as bases to identify areas requiring special attention by the faculty member – if the evidence also shows that the faculty member is committed to becoming an effective teacher. It is also the case, however, that if extremely poor teaching performances are apparent, it will be dealt with immediately by the School Director and Personnel Committee.

Examples of other sources of information that will be taken into account, when available, in assessing teaching performance are evaluations prepared by senior faculty who make classroom visitations, videotaped classroom instruction, a teaching dossier (including syllabi, examples of graded examinations and term papers, group project and other course assignment description, etc.), and narratives prepared by the untenured faculty member that describe course objectives, teaching strategy and style.

In reviewing an untenured faculty member during his or her second and subsequent years, the personnel committee will look closely for evidence both that the faculty member has made a clear effort to address teaching shortcoming identified in previous years and that improvement is documented with course evaluation and other evidence of effective teaching performance.

At the time of contract renewal, the evidence regarding teaching performance should demonstrate clearly the faculty member is strongly committed to becoming a highly effective teacher and adviser and is likely to achieve that goal. At the time of candidacy for tenure and promotion to associate professor, the evidence should demonstrate unequivocally that the faculty member is an effective teacher and adviser of graduate students in the interdisciplinary, graduate professional program. In addition, candidates for tenure are expected to have demonstrated

1. their ability to teach effectively in areas that are likely to remain in the School's core and specializations curricula, and
2. their willingness to teach courses needed by the School that fall within their areas of training and expertise.

As members of a Ph.D. granting School, public administration faculty members are expected to serve on dissertation committees. But junior untenured faculty members are advised to participate only minimally on dissertation committees. (A more demanding role for a junior faculty member might be necessary on occasions such as when a Ph.D. student is conducting research closely linked to junior faculty member's own research interest. But even these instances the junior faculty member is advised not to assume more than a secondary role on a dissertation committee if he or she was judged in the most recent annual review to have serious teaching-advising or scholarly deficiencies.)

Subsequent to contract renewal, however, a more demanding role as a member of one or more dissertation committees each year is expected of an untenured faculty member – if there are Ph.D. students whose research

can benefit from the special competencies of the faculty member. (Such a role should be expected immediately in the case of untenured persons who are granted credit for two or more years toward tenure at the time of their initial appointment.) But in no case is an untenured faculty member expected to chair a dissertation committee.

Advising students regarding program-of-study plans, career planning, and job searches are especially important obligations of faculty who teach graduate students in a professional degree program. As in the case of dissertation committee service, however, the role played by junior faculty in such advising responsibilities is expected to be a modest one in their early years of service. But with increasing years of service, clear progress in meeting School standards for teaching and scholarship, and the development of the knowledge required to be an effective adviser, each untenured faculty member is expected to assume an increasing responsibility for teaching advising.

Candidates for Professor are expected to have successfully directed doctoral students.

C. Criteria and Performance Standards: Scholarship

Tenure earning faculty are expected to develop and implement research programs in their areas of specialization and interest. While the research program is left largely to the discretion of the faculty member, the focus of the research should be consistent with the School's mission and strategic plan and have some relevance to one or more of the person's teaching areas. For faculty who begin their academic careers in the School of Public Administration immediately upon completion of the dissertation, it is common to spend some time drawing on and extending that research to produce a journal article(s) and/or a book(s). However, it is expected that, by the third year of appointment, a faculty member's research program will have moved substantially beyond mere refinement of and elaboration on dissertation research and into additional areas of inquiry.

Ordinarily, high-quality research manifests itself in articles in leading peer-reviewed journals and in peer-reviewed books, and chapters in books and monographs.

A major mission of the School is to enhance its reputation as one of the country's leading programs of public administration and policy. Therefore, annual performance reviews and decisions regarding contract renewal, tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor will be concerned with assessing the likelihood that an untenured faculty member's scholarship will lead to his or her recognition as a leading scholar in the field. Therefore, faculty are advised both

1. to choose high-quality outlets for their published scholarship and major national or international meetings for their presentations, and
2. to concentrate their research specializations sufficiently to insure that their work is known and well-regarded by their field's leading authorities.

3. When evaluating a faculty member's progress towards promotion and tenure, the Department considers the mix of single and multi-authored works. Specifically, the Department looks to the degree to which the faculty member has established an independent line of research at Florida State University. The Department recognizes that faculty will produce research in collaboration with other scholars but requires that the faculty member be able to demonstrate their independent scholarly contribution to the field of planning to be promoted and tenured. The Department also recognizes that the demands of different types of scholarship and different methodological approaches take more or less time to complete depending on the approach that faculty utilize and the questions they ask and this can impact the body of scholarship produced by a faculty member.

The School does not set a precise numerical minimum for scholarly publications either for a single year or for the entire period of service preceding decisions about contract renewal, tenure or promotion. The School does expect, however, that a faculty member will have achieved a record of sustained scholarship that is reflected in high-quality research publications by the time of candidacy for tenure and promotion to associate professor. It follows that a faculty member's research and publication record will become an increasingly important element of annual evaluations in each successive year of his or her service on the faculty.

The School also expects the scholarly records of candidates for tenure and for promotion to associate professor to:

1. Be recognized and reviewed favorably by members of the national/international scholarly community (a) primarily in the candidate's area(s) of specialization, and (b) secondarily in the broader areas of public administration and policy.
2. Meet the norms for tenure and promotion that prevail at other leading schools of public administration and policy.
3. Be consistent with the School mission.

Candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to be regarded by national/international specialists as among the leading scholars in their areas of expertise.

Faculty being promoted to Professor are expected to have made contributions to public administration and policy within a defined area, or areas, of research and creative activity and to be recognized by other scholars as a contributor to the advancement of knowledge in their field. Faculty are expected to have made contributions to knowledge since their promotion to Associate Professor and granting of tenure, and thus consistent post-tenure research and creative activity is expected of faculty being considered for promotion to Professor.

D. Criteria and Performance Standards: Service

Because the public administration faculty place such heavy emphasis on the development of effective teaching skills and a solid record of scholarship by all members of the School, the School does not impose or suggest significant service obligations on untenured faculty who are relatively new to teaching and who are at the early stages of building their scholarly records.

Therefore, service accomplishments by untenured faculty will be given little if any positive recognition in annual reviews if there are deficiencies in a faculty member's teaching performance and scholarly record.

In the case of more senior untenured faculty (e.g., those whose contracts have been renewed and whose teaching and scholarship have been judged satisfactory relative to their time in service, and those who joined the faculty after having established satisfactory records of teaching and scholarship elsewhere), assumption of their "fair share" of service to the School, college, and University and professional organizations is expected and each faculty member's contribution to the service mission will be included in annual performance evaluations, contract renewal reviews, and tenure reviews.

This section informs specialized faculty in the Askew School about the School's expectations for their performance in their areas of assignment. Please note that the Department's promotion procedures and criteria are guided and governed by the standards articulated in the FSU Faculty Handbook, the Collective Bargaining Agreement, and guidance provided in an annual memo produced by the Office of the Vice President of Faculty Development and Advancement.

Promotion Expectations. In the Askew School, specialized (non-tenure-track) faculty may provide high-level professional services to local, state, and federal governments, communities, nongovernmental organizations and others engaged in or affected by the

policy and administration process. They may contribute to the teaching functions of the Department, depending on their classification and assignment of responsibilities, and they may serve in administrative posts such as MPA director. Specialized faculty members in the Askew School have titles that include, but are not limited to, Senior Practitioner in Residence and Teaching Faculty track ranks.

Promotion in the specialized faculty ranks is attained through meritorious performance of assigned duties in the faculty member's present position. Promotion decisions shall take into account annual evaluations, annual assignments, and fulfillment of the department written promotion criteria, as stated below, in relation to the assignment. Although the period of time in a given rank is normally five years, demonstrated merit, not years of service, shall be the guiding factor in promotion decisions. Early promotion is possible where there is sufficient justification. More details on promotion and evaluation are contained in the Askew School's Statement on Performance Appraisal.

The following criteria will be taken into account when recommending a specialized faculty member for promotion. These criteria are in no particular order, and will be applied as appropriate based on the duties, responsibilities, and expectations of the faculty member's position. These criteria are stated below for Research Faculty and Teaching Faculty:

Research Faculty Promotion shall take into account:

1. Applied research or creative activity of high quality, appropriate to the field, in the form of professional research reports, articles in either refereed or non-refereed journals, books, book chapters, articles or features in professional magazines or newsletters, and other publications appropriate to the duties of the faculty member in this track;
2. Success in obtaining contract and grant funding awarded from external sources such as federal, state, regional, or local government agencies or departments, private foundations, non-profit organizations, community organizations, or other similar entities, as appropriate to the individual's job description;
3. Demonstrated ability to produce high-quality student-centered research or creative activity as attested to in letters from at least three outside members of project advisory committees or other esteemed planning professionals, as appropriate to the individual's job description;
4. Indicators of the faculty member's standing among peers, such as: receipt of professional awards, honors, or recognitions; invited presentations at meetings, workshops, or conferences of professional societies; organization of workshop sessions, seminars, or sessions at professional conferences or meetings; selection or nomination to positions of responsibility in professional organizations; or other professional recognitions or accomplishment, as appropriate; and
5. Demonstrated effectiveness in the performance of other duties that are part of the faculty member's assignment, such as service to the department, university, community, and/or professional organizations and societies, advising of students, and instruction of students.

Teaching Faculty Promotion shall take into account:

1. Evidence of well-planned and delivered courses.
2. Summaries of data from Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPOT) or Student Perception of Courses and Instructors (SPCI) questionnaires.
3. Letters from at least three faculty members who have conducted peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching.
4. Proven ability to teach multiple courses within a discipline/major.
5. Other teaching-related activities, such as student advising, instructional innovation, involvement in curriculum development, and authorship of educational materials.

Eligibility Criteria

Research Track Faculty Promotional ladder is Research Faculty I, Research Faculty II, and then Research Faculty III.

Teaching Track Faculty Promotional ladder is Teaching Faculty I, Teaching Faculty II, and then Teaching Faculty III.

In all cases, the Askew School will adhere to Florida State University policy. A copy of the criteria must be on file in the Office of the Vice President of Faculty Development and Advancement.

- Ranks
1. Promotion in the specialized faculty ranks is attained through meritorious performance of assigned duties in the faculty member's present position.
 2. Promotion to the second rank in each track shall be based on recognition of demonstrated effectiveness in the areas of assigned duties.
 3. Promotion to the third rank in each track shall be based on recognition of superior performance in the areas of assigned duties.

Promotion Process 1. The Askew School will accept recommendations for promotion every year in March/April. The recommendation originates with the Personnel Committee. Which recommends to the School Director and is then submitted to the appropriate officials for review, as discussed below.

2. The supervisor may not withhold a specialized faculty member's materials from review should the specialized faculty member wish to be considered.
3. The Askew School considers all faculty members who are eligible for promotion each year. Although the period of time in a given rank is normally five years, demonstrated merit, not years of service, is 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.

4. 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.

5. All specialized faculty members are informed of their prospective candidacy by their supervisor. If they wish to proceed, the specialized faculty member has the opportunity to assist in preparing their binder prior to review. The specialized faculty member shall have the right to review the contents of the promotion binder and may attach a brief response to any material therein. Once the promotion committee (described below) has reviewed a binder, no material may be added to it or deleted from it except under the conditions specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement under Articles 14 and 15.

6. The promotion committee for specialized faculty shall consist of other specialized faculty. Because of the small number of specialized faculty members in the Askew School, the promotion committee for specialized faculty shall be appointed by the Dean of the College of Social Sciences and Public Policy from among the specialized faculty in the college. The promotion committee reviews the binders of prospective candidates, recommends action on the nomination of each candidate by secret vote, and prepares a report of the committee's recommendations. The specialized faculty promotion committee report is then submitted to the chair of the faculty member's department. The regular tenured faculty in the Askew School will also vote on the binder.

7. In addition to the specialized faculty promotion committee described above, the Askew School Director independently reviews the binders of all prospective specialized faculty promotion candidates in the Askew School and recommends action on the nomination of each candidate by submitting to the Dean of the College of Social Sciences and Public Policy a report of the promotion committee recommendations and the Chair's recommendations on all submitted binders.

8. The Dean of the College of Social Sciences and Public Policy considers these recommendations, independently reviews the binders, and then submits his or her advice regarding whether the candidate meets the appropriate promotion criteria to the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement.

9. Prospective specialized faculty candidates will be informed of the results of the recommendations at each level of review. A candidate may withdraw his or her file from consideration within five working days of being informed of the results of the consideration at a given level. If a candidate chooses to withdraw, he or she must notify in writing, through the chair and dean, the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement.

10. The Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement confirms that the candidate meets the eligibility requirements and then forwards its recommendation to the Provost or Vice President for Research.

11. The Provost or Vice President for Research considers the previous recommendations, independently reviews the binders, and then forwards his or her recommendation to the President for a final decision.

Promotion Binder

Promotion binders for all Specialized Faculty shall include:

1. Professional vita
2. Assigned duties
3. Annual evaluations
4. Chair/supervisor's annual letter of appraisal toward promotion
5. Candidate's statement on research or creative activity and/or teaching, as appropriate to the faculty member's job description
6. May also include evidence of the other considerations specified in department/unit promotion criteria

Promotion binders for all faculty with teaching assignments shall include:

1. 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.
2. A summary of the results of the polls of student perceptions of teaching shall also be included for each course