

**Bylaws for the Department of Economics
College of Social Sciences and Public Policy**

Preamble

I. Bylaws

II. Membership and Voting Rights

III. Department Organization and Governance

IV. Curriculum

V. Annual Evaluation of Faculty on Performance and Merit

VI. Promotion and Tenure

Appendix 1: Detailed Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

Appendix 2: Annual Evaluations Criteria and Procedures

Appendix 3: Supplement to Annual Evaluation Committee Procedures Proposal

Record of Substantive Revisions and Amendments to these Bylaws

Approved by a Majority of the Faculty, September 19, 2013; sunset 4-25-2017

Approved by a Majority of the Faculty, April 25, 2017; sunset 4-30-2021

Approved by a Majority of the Faculty, March 31, 2021; sunset 4-30-2026

Sunset/Renewal Provision

The Department bylaws and any Amendments to them will remain in effect until April 30, 2026, whereupon they must either be rewritten or renewed by receiving an affirmative vote from a two-thirds majority of the voting faculty.

These are the bylaws for the Department of Economics in the College of Social Sciences and Public Policy at Florida State University. These bylaws were last approved on March 31, 2021 by a majority of the applicable voting members of the department and on April 20, 2021 by the College and the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement.

Preamble

The purpose of the bylaws is to outline organizational and operating procedures for the Department of Economics that will be in keeping with academic and administrative needs. The authority of the Department will reside in its voting membership.

I. Bylaws

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

B. Bylaws Revision. Any five voting members of the Department may propose an amendment to the bylaws. A proposed amendment must be available to the voting membership at least two weeks prior to the Departmental meeting. To be adopted, a proposed amendment must receive an affirmative vote by a two-thirds majority of the faculty.

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

II. Membership and Voting Rights

A. Faculty Membership. The faculty of the Department of Economics shall consist of those persons holding full-time appointments in tenured or tenure-earning positions and full-time 9- and 12-month appointments in specialized faculty positions.

B. Department Membership. In addition to the faculty defined in II.A above, the following are members of the Department of Economics:

(1) Temporary or part-time faculty appointees, including those serving as

- instructors
- visiting faculty appointees
- courtesy appointees
- adjunct appointees
- postdoctoral fellows
- professors emeriti
- research associates

- associates in research
 - assistants in research
- (2) Administrative and Professional (A&P) personnel
 - (3) All part-time and full-time graduate students

C. Faculty Voting Rights. Voting faculty are comprised of faculty as defined in Section II.A above, and will be entitled to vote in faculty meetings or by mail or online ballot, subject to restrictions stipulated in later parts of these bylaws.

D. Non-faculty Voting Rights. Other members as defined in Section II.B above are not entitled to vote.

III. Department Organization and Governance

A. Faculty Meetings. The faculty of the Department will meet at least once each semester during the academic year. The first meeting during the Fall term will normally be scheduled in the first two weeks of classes. Additional sessions may be called by the Chair or the designated representative:

- (1) on his/her/their initiative,
- (2) in response to a majority vote of one of the standing committees requesting a meeting, or
- (3) at the written request of (at least) four departmental members eligible to vote as stipulated in Section II.A.

Rules for Faculty Meetings:

- (1) The Chair will normally preside at faculty meetings. In the absence of the Chair, another voting member designated by the Chair will preside.
- (2) One-half of the eligible voting members of the department will constitute a quorum at any faculty meeting.
- (3) The Chair or presiding voting member will appoint a meeting Secretary. The duties of the Secretary will be:
 - [i] to record the minutes of the meetings,
 - [ii] to distribute copies of minutes to all departmental faculty members within one week following the meeting, and
 - [iii] to keep in the departmental office a complete file of departmental minutes.

B. Department Chair Selection.

- (1) The Chair will be a full-time faculty member of the Department. The person so named will, upon appointment by the Dean, assume the duties and responsibilities of the department Chair in accordance with the rules and regulations of the university and under conditions negotiated with the Dean of the College of Social Sciences and Public Policy (COSSPP).
- (2) The Chair will serve at the pleasure of the Dean of COSSPP and the President of the University.
- (3) Appointment of the Chair shall be made by the Dean of the College in consultation

with the voting faculty.

- (4) The normal term of the Chair will be three years.
- (5) The procedure to select a new Chair will begin in the Fall of the final year of a Chair's term or upon a vacancy in this office for another cause.
- (6) The process to select a new Chair will be coordinated through the Policy Committee.

The Committee will receive nominations from the voting faculty then meet with nominees to determine the interest and willingness to accept the position. Candidates will make presentations and answer questions from voting faculty. By secret ballot, the voting faculty will vote for the candidate of their choice. The results will be forwarded to the Dean to use in the appointment.

C. Department Leadership and Committees.

1. Chair

- (1) The Chair will serve as the chief executive officer of the Department and is responsive to the faculty of the Department and represents the Department to the University.
- (2) The Chair's annual evaluation will be conducted by the Dean, with input solicited from all the voting faculty as defined in Section II.A.
- (3) The Chair will appoint for one-year renewable terms a Director of Undergraduate Studies, a Director of Graduate Studies, a Director of the Master of Science in Applied Economics Program, and an Assistant Director of the Master of Science in Applied Economics Program.
- (4) The Chair may appoint an Associate Chair for a one-year renewable term, as described below.
- (5) The Chair will appoint any other officers and/or committee members required for the administration and conduct of departmental affairs. Appointments should be made within two weeks of the annual elections meeting in the Fall term, unless unusual circumstances arise.
- (6) The Chair, serving as principal financial officer of the department will:
 - [i] supervise all departmental accounts,
 - [ii] in conjunction with the Policy Committee, prepare an annual operating budget and previous year-end financial report. These documents will be presented to the faculty as early in the academic year as circumstances permit.
- (7) The Chair, in conjunction with the appropriate departmental committees, will supervise and coordinate the recruiting of new faculty members.
- (8) The Chair will be an ex-officio, non-voting member of all departmental committees, except that s/he may cast the deciding vote in the event of a tie, unless the Chair decides to delegate these duties to the Associate Chair.
- (9) The Chair will be responsible for initiating meetings of the Policy Committee, Annual Evaluation Committee, and the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committees in order to ensure timely preparation of materials and recommendations for promotion and tenure decisions in the department and at the college level.

2. Associate Chair

- (1) The Chair may appoint an Associate Chair to a one-year renewable term to assist in the administration of the Department.
- (2) If an Associate Chair is appointed, the choice must be ratified by a majority of the voting faculty and approved by the Dean.
- (3) The Chair may designate the Associate Chair to fill in as non-voting member of committee meetings, as needed.

3. Director of Graduate Studies

- (1) The Chair will propose for appointment, to a one-year renewable term, a Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) who will coordinate matters relating to department-wide issues pertinent to graduate training including
 - curriculum (e.g., departmental and area 'core' courses)
 - recruitment, admission, and retention of graduate students
 - program requirements
 - PhD prelim exams
- (2) Appointment and renewal of the DGS must be ratified by a majority vote of the Policy Committee.
- (3) The DGS will maintain records of graduate students, coordinate timely evaluations, monitor enrollment patterns, and determine eligibility of students for University sponsored awards.
- (4) The Director of Graduate Studies will be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the Department's Graduate Committee.

4. Director of Undergraduate Studies

- (1) The Chair will propose for appointment, to a one-year renewable term, a Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUGS).
- (2) Appointments and renewals of the DUGS must be ratified by a majority vote of the Policy Committee.
- (3) The Director of Undergraduate Studies is responsible for implementing the policies of the Department as outlined on the Department website and other policies and directives of the Undergraduate Committee.
- (4) The DUGS will be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the Department's Undergraduate Committee.

5. Director of the Master of Science in Applied Economics Program

- (1) The Chair will appoint, to a one-year renewable term, a Director of the Master of Science in Applied Economics Program (DMSAEP).
- (2) Appointments and renewals of the DMSAEP must be ratified by a majority vote of the Policy Committee.
- (3) The DMSAEP is responsible for implementing the policies of the Department as outlined on the Department website and other documents as they pertain to the

Program.

(4) The DMSAEP will be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the Department's Graduate Committee.

6. Assistant Director of the Master of Science in Applied Economics Program

(1) The Chair will appoint, to a one-year renewable term, an Assistant Director of the Master of Science in Applied Economics Program (ADMSAEP).

(2) Appointments and renewals of the ADMSAEP must be ratified by a majority vote of the Policy Committee.

(3) The ADMSAEP is responsible for assisting the Director of the Master of Science in Applied Economics Program in the administration of the Program.

Standing Committees:

1. Policy Committee

The Policy Committee will consist of five tenure-track faculty as stipulated in Section II.A item 1 and one specialized faculty as stipulated in Section II.A item 2 for one-year appointments. If there is at least one tenure-earning faculty in the department, exactly one of the five tenure-track faculty must be tenure-earning, unless circumstances prevent that faculty from serving (e.g., there is only one Assistant Professor and that person is serving on the Annual Evaluation Committee). Faculty may serve on at most one of the Policy or Annual Evaluation Committees in the same academic year. In addition, faculty may not serve on the Policy Committee for more than two consecutive years.

The Policy Committee will act as the principal coordinating and policy making body of the Department and will advise the Chair on general departmental matters.

The Policy Committee will meet at the request of the Chair or on petition of any five of its members, but will always meet at least once each semester during the academic year. Notification of time, place, and agenda of all Policy Committee meetings will be given to all Department members at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting. All Department members may be present and participate in Policy Committee meetings. In addition to general policy duties, the Committee will:

(1) Determine yearly travel budgets.

(2) Solicit interest in serving on the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees at the first general faculty meeting each Fall semester.

(3) Coordinate the selection process of a new Chair.

(4) Approve by majority vote the Chair's appointments and renewals of the following:

[i] Director of Graduate Studies

[ii] Director of Undergraduate Studies

[iii] Director of the Master of Science in Applied Economics Program

[iv] Assistant Director of the Master of Science in Applied Economics Program

[v] Graduate Committee members

[vi] Undergraduate Committee members

2. Annual Evaluation Committee

The Annual Evaluation Committee will consist of seven tenure-track faculty as stipulated in Section II.A item 1 and two specialized faculty as stipulated in Section II.A item 2 for one-year appointments. If there is at least one tenure-earning faculty in the department, exactly one of the seven tenure-track faculty must be tenure-earning, unless circumstances prevent that faculty from serving (e.g., there is only one Assistant Professor and that person is on family leave). Faculty may serve on at most one of the Policy or Annual Evaluation Committees in the same academic year. In addition, faculty may not serve on the Annual Evaluation Committee for more than two consecutive years.

The committee will meet during annual evaluations time in the Spring semester, and as needed through the rest of the year. The specialized faculty members will participate in evaluations and committee deliberations for specialized faculty only, and will not be present when tenured and tenure-track faculty are discussed. The responsibilities of this committee include:

(1) Annual Evaluations:

[i] Establish and carry out procedures for the annual evaluation of faculty. Such procedures or changes in previously approved procedures must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of all voting faculty members.

[ii] Review annually each faculty member in terms of their overall performance of professional responsibilities consistent with that member's annual assignment of responsibilities. Each committee member will submit to the Chair a numerical score for each of the three evaluation areas (research, teaching, service) for each faculty member. The numerical scoring range must be consistent with University standards.

[iii] Each committee member has an option to submit to the Chair any comments on faculty performance along with their numerical scores.

[iv] For Assistant Professors, the Third Year Review document will replace the annual evaluation document. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will separately perform the Third Year Review.

[v] The Chair will use the median score of all committee members' scores to obtain the final score for a faculty member in each category. Committee members do not rate themselves. The Chair will construct a score based on the "Isaac Variation to the Sass procedure" in place of member's own scoring, and then obtain a median score. Committee members may not evaluate faculty with a conflict of interest, as defined in the FSU Faculty Handbook. Those faculty median score will be obtained based on the remaining scores (i.e., based on a smaller number of scores).

[vi] When a member of the committee is being evaluated for any purpose, the member will be absent from the committee's deliberations and voting. This also applies when a committee member has a conflict of interest with a faculty member (e.g., a spouse/partner) who is being evaluated.

(2) Grievances: The Annual Evaluation committee will mediate any evaluation grievances brought to the committee's attention by any Department member. Grievances may also be brought to the attention of relevant authorities at FSU. These are not mutually exclusive.

3. Graduate Committee

(1) The Director of Graduate Studies chairs the Graduate Committee as an ex-officio, non-voting member. In addition to the Director of the Master of Science in Applied Economics Program, who is an ex-officio, non-voting member, the committee will consist of five tenured or tenure-track faculty members, who are appointed by the Chair at the beginning of each academic year, subject to majority approval by the Policy Committee.

(2) Faculty not appointed to the committee may indicate their interest in serving on this committee to the Policy Committee, which will assist the Department Chair with yearly appointments.

(3) Appointed faculty who wish to withdraw or end their service may indicate this to the Policy Committee.

(4) The Graduate Committee is responsible for

[i] recruiting PhD students

[ii] evaluating applications for admission and financial aid in the department's doctoral program

[iii] departmental policies related to both master's and doctoral programs, and admission to candidacy.

[iv] determining the curriculum of the Graduate Program.

[v] appointing annual ad-hoc committees to administer and grade Preliminary Examinations.

Normally and historically all new Department tenure-track faculty were appointed in expectation that they could teach at the graduate and the undergraduate level. However, the Graduate College has imposed upon the Department the further requirement of a 2/3 vote of all existing holders of Graduate Faculty Status (GFS) to approve a new faculty member for GFS. Cognizant of our historical position on new hires and the provisions of the hiring process, the Graduate Committee is authorized to prescribe the manner of the faculty vote for GFS for new faculty.

Departmental policy is that faculty members be recommended for Master's and Ph.D. directive status whenever their scholarly accomplishments are such as to satisfy requirements of proven scholarship at the graduate level. This includes publications, service on M.S. and Ph.D. committees, as well as successful graduate teaching. The determination to approve a faculty member for Master's and Ph.D. directive status will be made by the Graduate Committee.

Specialized faculty members are eligible for Graduate Teaching Status (GTS), and faculty from other departments are eligible for "Courtesy Graduate Teaching Status" for specified courses. The determination to approve a faculty member for GTS or

courtesy GTS will be made by the Graduate Committee, with appropriate additional action as required by the Graduate College as necessary.

4. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committees

The makeup of Departmental Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committees will be as follows:

- (1) The Tenure committee will consist of all tenured faculty members.
- (2) The committee for promotion to full professor will consist of all full professors.
- (3) The committee for promotion to associate professor will consist of all tenured faculty.
- (4) The committee for third-year review of Assistant Professors will consist of all tenured faculty.
- (5) The committee for promotion of specialized faculty consists of all tenured faculty and specialized faculty members in rank or above.
- (6) The Appointment committee for voting on new recruits of all full-time faculty, as identified by the acting ad-hoc Hiring Committee, to the Department will consist of all faculty in rank and above.

These committees will make recommendations regarding promotion and tenure for tenure-track faculty, and promotion for specialized faculty, as appropriate for each case. The committee's actions will be guided by the department's adopted standards for faculty evaluation and promotion, which are contained in the Promotion and Tenure Standards document.

Two members of the Tenure committee will be elected by the Tenure Committee to serve as the representatives of the department on the COSSPP Promotion and Tenure Committee.

5. Undergraduate Committee

- (1) In addition to the Director of Undergraduate Studies, who is an ex-officio, non-voting member, the committee will consist of five tenured or tenure-earning faculty members and one specialized faculty member.
- (2) Committee members are appointed by the Chair at the beginning of each academic year, subject to majority approval by the Policy Committee.
- (3) The Committee shall elect a Chair at the beginning of the Fall semester to serve for the year. The Chair will become a non-voting member, responsible for organizing committee meetings and maintaining the agenda.
- (4) Faculty not appointed to the committee may indicate their interest to the Policy Committee, which will assist the Department Chair with yearly appointments.
- (5) Appointed faculty who wish to withdraw or end their service may indicate this to the Policy Committee.
- (6) The Undergraduate Committee has overall responsibility for the Department's undergraduate program. This committee must review all academic policy changes affecting the undergraduate program, including curriculum changes, undergraduate awards, and instructor approval for economics courses at FSU satellite campuses.

Curriculum changes include adding or removing courses, changing course numbers, and revising major requirements. All curriculum decisions will be presented to the full faculty for final consideration and vote.

Ad Hoc Committees

The Chair may request that the Policy Committee appoint ad hoc committees as circumstances will from time to time require. Members of ad hoc committees must be approved by a majority vote of the Policy Committee. Ad hoc committees will be dissolved at the end of the Spring semester in each academic year.

A summary of all committee meetings will be sent to faculty not more than one week after each meeting.

Committee Assignments

Members of Undergraduate, Graduate, and any Ad Hoc Committees will be nominated by the Chair, and must be approved by a majority of the Policy Committee.

At the Fall General Faculty meeting, the makeup of the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committees will be affirmed by a majority vote of faculty. In the absence of a majority vote, committee members will be nominated by the Chair, approved with a majority vote of the Policy Committee, then selected with a majority vote of the voting faculty via secret ballot.

At the Fall General Faculty meeting, the makeup of the Annual Evaluation Committee will be determined by a random draw of eligible tenured, tenure-earning, and specialized faculty, as determined by the composition of the committee. Faculty on leave, sabbatical, or who have circumstances that prevent him/her from serving will be excluded. Any eligible faculty member who has not served on the committee for more than three consecutive academic years will be automatically placed on the committee.

At the Fall General Faculty meeting, and after the Annual Evaluation Committee has been selected, the Policy Committee will be determined by a random draw of eligible tenured, tenure-earning, and specialized faculty, as determined by the composition of the committee. Faculty on leave, sabbatical, or who have circumstances that prevent him/her from serving will be excluded. Any eligible faculty member who has not served on the committee for more than three consecutive academic years will be automatically placed on the committee.

D. Faculty Senators. The Department will participate in the election of Faculty Senate candidates through the College of Social Sciences and Public Policy procedure. Selected candidates are responsible for attending meetings of the Faculty Senate and inform the Department of developments affecting the Department or its members.

E. Faculty Recruitment. See Section III.C. regarding ad-hoc hiring committees and Appointment Committee.

F. Unit Reorganization. If there should be any discussion of unit reorganization affecting the department, individual faculty members as well as the Policy Committee shall have the right to participate in said discussion.

IV. Curriculum

Faculty members can exercise control over the development and review of curriculum through the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees described in Section III.C above.

V. Annual Evaluation of Faculty on Performance and Merit

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

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

See Appendices 2 and 3.

B. Criteria for Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty. *Describe department-specific criteria for evaluation of tenure-track faculty in the areas of:*

- 1) Teaching.**
- 2) Scholarship/Research.**
- 3) Service.**
- 4) Other** [*Add categories as needed*]

See Appendix 1: Detailed Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

C. Criteria for Evaluation of Specialized Faculty. *Describe department-specific criteria for evaluation of specialized faculty in the position-relevant areas of:*

- 1) Teaching.**
- 2) Scholarship/Research.**

3) Service.**4) Other** [*Add categories as needed*]

See Appendix 1: Detailed Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

VI. Promotion and Tenure

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

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

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

See Appendix 1: Detailed Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

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

See Appendix 1: Detailed Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

E. Criteria for Promotion of Specialized Faculty.

See Appendix 1: Detailed Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

Appendix 1

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS DETAILED GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

I . Department of Economics Detailed Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure for Tenure Faculty

A . Preamble

1 . The Department expects superior intellectual achievement in research and teaching and professional service appropriate to rank. The following are the Department's guidelines for faculty submitting a binder for either promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure or promotion to Full Professor.

2 . In these guidelines, the term "*top placement*" for a publication shall refer to publications in the most prestigious North American and European general interest journals, some of the affiliated journals with the above, the most prestigious journals in obviously related disciplines, and the highest quality field journals in the faculty member's field.

3 . The determination of the highest quality general interest journals and the highest quality field journals (and there may be more than one in some fields) is a dynamic evaluation. In a given year for each candidate in a given field, the members of the personnel committee and tenured faculty should take the following into advisement: relevant evaluations from the external letters, internal evaluations from faculty in the field, and from external rankings. However, it is noted that algorithmic or survey rankings of journals often do not correlate beyond the very most prestigious general interest journals and may reflect the biases of whoever constructs the ranking. As such, such external rankings of journals should not be taken as dispositive.

B . Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

1 . Research

a) Overview of guidelines for evaluating research: Faculty should evaluate candidates for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure on their research productivity and quality of journal placements, the inherent quality and impact of the research, and the potential for future research productivity.

i) Quantity and quality of publications: The Department generally expects six to eight publications in refereed journals, with at least two, and preferably three, top placements.

The Department encourages and prioritizes quality, so the personnel committee and tenured faculty may allow a tradeoff of fewer publications if the quality of placements and the quality of the research is extraordinarily high. The contribution of other refereed publications such as book reviews, publication "letters," comments, and chapters in refereed volumes shall be discussed and evaluated on a case by case basis. Books are not typically expected of Assistant Professors of Economics; if a candidate submits for

the binder a book reviewed and accepted by a major academic press, the department will need to judge its contribution to the profession on an ad hoc basis, consistent with the quality goals expressed above.

ii) Inherent quality of the research: The inherent quality of the research should be evaluated both internally (from department faculty reading the papers) and externally (from the external letters).

iii) Future research potential: Evidence of future research productivity can be gauged from such things as manuscripts in “revise and resubmit” status, submitted manuscripts, working papers, ongoing grants to support future research, and the coherence and quality of the candidate’s research statement.

iv) Internal and external discussions should include the impact of the candidate’s research. However, given the severe review and publication lags that are a reality in the Economics profession, citation counts, and similar citation-related metrics are not by themselves a reliable indicator of research impact for Assistant Professors in Economics.

v) Assistant Professors in Economics are not traditionally expected to be PIs on external funding, but the existence of such grant activity shall be considered a positive component of a successful tenure case. The Department notes that in Economics, non-governmental grants from foundations and the equivalent are becoming an increasingly vital source of external funding.

vi) To the greatest extent possible, the faculty member submitting the narrative of the discussion of the tenured faculty to the candidate’s binder shall note directly how the discussion indicated that the candidate did or did not meet the criteria above.

vii) Florida State University has unambiguously conveyed to the Department that standards for promotion and tenure may be dynamic, commensurate with the aspirations of the department to maintain and increase its national reputation. However, the nature of this dynamism is to be determined by the department. In order to preserve the opportunity for ongoing improvement while providing stability of expectations to candidates, the Department of Economics commits to clearly articulating the relevant current standards to new hires and to faculty in their first, second, and third tenure-clock years. The department will hold the standards at the time of the candidate’s third-year review as the relevant standards for the candidate applying for promotion and tenure on schedule between the fifth and sixth year. For a candidate who forgoes application on schedule and instead applies for promotion and tenure between the sixth and seventh year, the relevant standards will be those in effect at the time of the candidate’s fourth-year annual evaluation.

2 . Teaching

a) We expect all of our faculty to excel in their teaching and encourage continued development and improvement in teaching among all tenure-track faculty. At the time of an application for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, the binder should document clear evidence of high-quality teaching.

- b) Although we do not expect junior faculty to receive official university award recognition for outstanding teaching, such distinction may be considered in evaluating candidacy for promotion and tenure.
- c) Student evaluations can be a partially useful tool for evaluating teaching , but the limitations of student evaluations are well-known, and they should not constitute the corpus of evaluation for teaching quality. Other factors must be considered. These other factors can include, as appropriate, such as diverse evidence as: willingness to accept difficult course assignments, willingness to prepare new courses, service to the Department's M.S. program, pedagogical innovations and quality of syllabi, service in Honors in the Major theses, offering appropriate DIS courses, mentoring undergraduates in preparation for post-graduate work and education, scholarly mentoring across the campus, and other similar activities.
- d) Assistant Professors in Economics are not generally expected to have Chaired a doctoral committee; however, service as a committee member and/or informal mentoring of doctoral students should be considered positive indicators.
- e) We will strive to honor and recognize outstanding teaching. However, excellence in teaching shall not be a substitute for performance in research that does not meet our standards as described above in the decision for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.

3 . Service

- a) In Economics, Assistant Professors have minimal expectations for service, either internal or external. The successful candidate should be a good departmental citizen, participating in activities such as recruiting and seminar series and in minimally demanding service on committees, and making the beginnings of a track record externally in areas such as reviewing for major journals or funding agencies.
- b) We will strive to honor and recognize outstanding service. However, excellence in service shall not be a substitute for performance in research that does not meet our standards as described above in the decision for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.

C . Guidelines for Promotion to Full Professor

1 . Research

- a) Overview of guidelines for evaluating research: There is no university "clock" for applications by Associate Professors for Promotion to Full Professor. Nevertheless, the structure of what evidence the department should seek in evaluating a proposed Promotion to Full Professor applies regardless of when the faculty member applies for Promotion to Full Professor.
- i) Candidates for Promotion to Full Professor should show a portfolio of sustained research activity, quality of placement, inherent quality of research, and potential for further research productivity and quality well beyond the record that provided for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure. The criteria for evaluation are the same as described in the sections above for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:

productivity, quality of placement, inherent quality of research, impact, and potential for future productivity.

ii) It is common that the circumstances of Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure is an opportunity for a faculty member to develop new research agendas with greater risk and potential reward. For this reason, the Department recognizes that there may be more unevenness in research productivity coming off of Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure. Nevertheless, a faculty member should only apply for Promotion to Full Professor when that person can demonstrate a record of sustained quantity and quality of scholarship beyond the point of promotion and tenure. In addition, the binder should include evidence for future productivity, such as submitted manuscripts, "revise and resubmit" requests, working papers, grant proposals to support future research, and the coherence and quality of the candidate's research statement.

iii) Candidates for Promotion to Full Professor should demonstrate an extant research record and a commitment to future research productivity commensurate with a significant national and emerging international recognition. Evidence of such "recognition" can include co-authorships on publications, extra-mural research affiliations, memberships in national and international associations, invited presentations, honors and awards, and external grants. Evidence of such recognition can, in addition, be discerned from the external letters of recommendation.

iii) To the greatest extent possible, the faculty member submitting the narrative of the discussion of the personnel committee for promotion to Full Professor to the candidate's binder shall note directly how the discussion indicated that the candidate did or did not meet the criteria above.

iv) To the extent that the Department is increasing its expectations for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, likewise the reference guidelines of departmental expectations for a candidate for Promotion to Full Professor should generally be those in place two years before the application to submit a binder for Promotion to Full Professor.

2 . Teaching

a) We expect all of our faculty to excel in their teaching and encourage continued development and improvement in teaching among all tenure-track faculty. At the time of an application for Promotion to Full Professor, the binder should document clear evidence of high-quality teaching. Specifically, a candidate for Full Professor is expected to have matured in his or her teaching performance relative to accomplishments appropriate for promotion to Associate Professor.

b) Although we do not have as a requirement that faculty receive university award recognition for outstanding teaching, such distinction may be considered in evaluating candidacy for promotion to Full Professor.

c) Student evaluations can be a partially useful tool, but the limitations of student evaluations are well-known, and they should not constitute the corpus of evaluation of teaching for promotion to Full Professor. Other factors must be considered. These other factors can include, as appropriate: willingness to accept difficult and key course assignments, willingness to prepare new courses, service to the Department's M.S. program, pedagogical innovations and quality of syllabi, service on Honors in the Major

theses (especially if Chairing theses), offering appropriate DIS courses, mentoring undergraduates in preparation for post-graduate work and education, scholarly mentoring across the campus, and other similar activities. Across these venues, there should be demonstrated maturity relative to the expectations for an Assistant Professor seeking Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.

d) By the time of consideration for Promotion to Full Professor, most candidates are expected to have a track record of service as a Chair on doctoral committees. However, where appropriate to the candidate's professional skills, the maturing Associate Professor seeking Promotion to Full Professor may demonstrate the expected doctoral committee service by repeated and significant service as a regular committee member. Teaching in the Ph.D. core is not required, but it is a further indication of commitment to the doctoral program. Regardless of the specific path, excellence in mentoring doctoral students is expected.

e) We will strive to honor and recognize outstanding teaching. However, excellence in teaching shall not be a substitute in the decision for Promotion to Full Professor against performance in research that does not meet our standards as described above.

3 . Service

a) An Associate Professor seeking promotion for Full Professor should exhibit sustained growth in service, both internal and external, on a trajectory befitting the expectations of service required for a Full Professor at any prestigious "Research-1" university. Examples of additional internal service can include service on more demanding committees at the department, college, or university level; serving as departmental representative to internal programs; willingness to take on more time-intensive ad hoc assignments for the department or college; organizing research seminars involving our faculty, and so forth. Examples of additional external service could include sustained reviewing activities or service on editorial boards; organizing sessions at professional meetings; or service on governing committees for professional associations; and so forth.

b)We will strive to honor and recognize outstanding service. However, excellence in service shall not be a substitute in the decision for Promotion to Full Professor against performance in research that does not meet our standards as described above.

D. Amendments

1. General Force Period.

These guidelines shall remain in force as written until amended. Amendments for either rank can be made by the following process.

a) Any three faculty that are members of the rank's personnel committee can propose amendments. Such an amendment must first be approved, following at least two weeks public notice to all Department faculty, by a majority vote of that rank's personnel committee. Following that vote, again with a further two week's public notice to all faculty, the proposed amendment must be approved by a majority vote of the entire faculty.

b) Any amendment to these guidelines shall only take effect at the beginning of the subsequent academic year.

2. Other Sunset

There is no other “sunset” provision for these guidelines.

II . Department of Economics Detailed Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure for Specialized Teaching Faculty

A. Guidelines for promotion to Teaching Professor II

For promotion from Teaching Professor I to Teaching Professor II, teaching faculty must demonstrate teaching excellence and satisfactory service. Candidates will be evaluated on five factors. The order in which these measures are listed below should serve as a guide to the evaluators of their relative importance.

Student Teaching Evaluations

Peer Evaluations

Other Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness or Pedagogical Innovations

SMALC Scores

Service

1. Student Evaluations

a) Limits of student evaluations are well-known, and they can provide only a minimum standard, and a flexible one at that.

b) Candidates for promotion must meet a minimum standard on student evaluations: The target is that candidates should earn an average of median scores of 4.0 or higher on SPCI items 12 and 13 (“overall course content rating” and “overall rating for instructor”) for all courses (dropping a section with the lowest scores). For upper-level core courses, instructors who do not meet this standard may submit additional documentation to show teaching effectiveness (for example, a comparison to the median scores of other instructors teaching upper-level core courses).

c) Evaluators should take into consideration class size, course difficulty, number of new preps in a semester, whether a class was online or face-to-face, and other mitigating factors. Willingness to teach difficult classes that tend to garner lower student evaluation scores should not penalize a candidate for promotion.

2. Peer Evaluation

a) Teaching faculty should be evaluated at least once each semester by other teaching faculty,

b) All applicable rules in the Faculty Manual and Collective Bargaining Agreement regarding peer visitation evaluations shall be followed.

c) At least one peer evaluation per year shall be performed by another Teaching Faculty in the Department of Economics. However, if the Department Chair believes that the

small number of department teaching faculty is a problem for repeat evaluations, the Chair may invite Teaching Faculty from elsewhere in the university to conduct the second evaluation.

d) Peer evaluations should indicate that there are no significant problems with instruction. If any persistent problems are indicated, candidates for promotion are expected to explain how they are improving their instruction based on this feedback. Faculty must determine whether the plan for improvement is satisfactory.

3. Other Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness or Pedagogical Innovations

Candidates for promotion may present other evidence of teaching effectiveness, such as mentoring, academic advising, service on Honors Thesis committees, and teaching awards. Presentations at teaching conferences, teaching more than four course preps over five years, developing pedagogical innovations and/or adoption of innovations by other institutions, developing new courses, publications in teaching journals, instructor's manuals, textbooks, and other books can be considered but are not required.

4. SMALC Scores

a) All faculty teaching core courses administer SMALC questions to all their students. These standardized questions are devised and agreed upon by the faculty teaching the core courses. The results are submitted to the university, with 75% of students expected to achieve a score of 70% or better.

b) Each teaching faculty shall calculate the percent of students achieving 70% or better on the SMALC questions for each core course section taught, and then average across all these sections. The resulting average should not be below 75%.

c) If the average SMALC score across course sections is below 75%, faculty should take into consideration class size, course difficulty, number of new preps in a semester, whether a class was online or face-to-face, and other mitigating factors. Willingness to teach difficult classes that tend to garner lower SMALC scores should not penalize a candidate for promotion.

d) Teaching faculty who do not teach core courses cannot be evaluated on the basis of SMALC scores. The weight for the SMALC scores is transferred to teaching evaluations.

5. Service

Teaching Professor I faculty have minimal service expectations. Service in administrative roles, extracurricular work with students, mentoring, serving on committees, organizing seminars, and other contributions can be considered in promotion, but shall not be a substitute for quality teaching.

B. Guidelines for promotion to Teaching Professor III

Being equivalent to a Full Professor, teaching faculty with the rank of Teaching Professor III are expected to achieve a higher standard of performance. Promotion to

the rank Teaching Professor III requires evidence of an established and productive academic teaching career in Economics, in addition to the standard qualification required of the Teaching Professor II. A candidate must meet the minimum standard for student evaluations and SMALC scores, and then will also be evaluated on one significant additional service component and one significant additional teaching component, plus one significant additional component of the candidate's choice (either teaching or service). See items 4. and 5. below for examples of significant additional teaching and service components. If the evidence of superlative service and teaching are not determinative or are unclear, faculty may then consider peer evaluations. The order in which these measures are listed below should serve as a guide to the evaluators of their relative importance.

Additional Evidence of Superior Teaching

Additional Evidence of Superior Service

Additional Evidence of Service or Teaching Effectiveness of the Candidate's Choice

Student Teaching Evaluations

Peer Evaluations

SMALC Scores

1. Superior Teaching

A candidate for promotion to Teaching Professor III must have additional evidence of teaching excellence. This can include:

- Recognition inside the university, such as teaching awards or other special honors or recognition for teaching excellence or innovation
- Recognition outside the university, such as invitations to present on teaching at other universities, conferences, or to teach external short courses
- Developing pedagogical innovations and/or adoption of innovations by other institutions
- Developing new courses
- Willingness to accept difficult and key course assignments
- Presenting teaching techniques or technologies at teaching conferences
- Teaching abroad and/or leading students in international programs, as well as documentation of the outcomes of such activities
- Presenting and publishing original research on economic education
- Training graduate students in teaching
- Teaching service to the broader community (such as Unconquered by Debt, a financial literacy outreach program).

2. Superior Service

A candidate's service to the department, the university, and the teaching profession should be exemplary, going above and beyond the normal performance of duties.

Examples of service may include, but are not limited to:

- Serving on or chairing division, college, and/or university committees
- Serving in the faculty senate or in other faculty governance roles
- Serving as the sponsor for discipline-related student activities and/or organizations

- Assisting discipline-related student organizations or groups in competitions
- Performing administrative assignments at division, center, college, or university levels
- Performing official activities in the recruitment and/or selection of students or faculty
- Participating in governance and/or operations of professional organizations
- Reviewing articles for journals and other publications
- Serving as editor or editorial board member for journals or books
- Consulting for government agencies or other institutions

3. Additional Evidence of Service or Teaching Effectiveness of the Candidate's Choice

As noted above, this should be an area of significance and excellence submitted to the binder for promotion that is a choice of the candidate.

4. Student Teaching Evaluations

A candidate for promotion to Teaching Faculty III should again meet the minimum standard of 4.0 or higher on SPCI items 12 and 13 ("overall course content rating" and "overall rating for instructor") for all courses, dropping a section with the lowest scores. For upper-level core courses, instructors who do not meet this standard may submit additional documentation to show teaching effectiveness (for example, a comparison to the median scores of other instructors teaching upper-level core courses).

5. Peer Evaluation

- a) All applicable rules in the Faculty Manual and Collective Bargaining Agreement regarding peer visitation evaluations shall be followed.
- b) Peer evaluations are likely to catch problems during promotion from Teaching Faculty I to II, but evaluation of teaching by other faculty can be used for promotion from Teaching Faculty II to III if other factors are not determinative or can work against a candidate for promotion if peer evaluations indicate that there are new problems in a candidate's teaching.

6. SMALC Scores

- a) All faculty teaching core courses administer SMALC questions to all their students. These standardized questions are devised and agreed upon by the faculty teaching the core courses. The results are submitted to the university, with 75% of students expected to achieve a score of 70% or better.
- b) Each teaching faculty shall calculate the percent of students achieving 70% or better on the SMALC questions for each core course section taught, and then average across all these sections. The resulting average should not be below 75%.
- c) If the average SMALC score across course sections is below 75%, faculty should take into consideration class size, course difficulty, number of new preps in a semester, whether a class was online or face-to-face, and other mitigating factors. Willingness to teach difficult classes that tend to garner lower SMALC scores should not penalize a candidate for promotion.

d) Teaching faculty who do not teach core courses cannot be evaluated on the basis of SMALC scores. The weight for the SMALC scores is transferred to teaching evaluations.

C. Amendments

1. General Force Period.

These guidelines shall remain in force as written until amended. Amendments for either rank can be made by the following process.

a) Any three faculty that are members of the rank's personnel committee can propose amendments. Such an amendment must first be approved, following at least two weeks public notice to all Department faculty, by a majority vote of that rank's personnel committee. Following that vote, again with a further two week's public notice to all faculty, the proposed amendment must be approved by a majority vote of the entire faculty.

b) If these provisions are amended during an academic year, there shall be one subsequent buffer academic year before the new guidelines take effect.

2. Initial Starting Buffer Upon Adoption

To the extent that these guidelines add additional requirements for specialized teaching faculty promotions in addition to those in effect in the 2021-2022 Academic Year, such new requirements will only become active in the 2023-2024 Academic Year.

3. Other Sunset

There is no other "sunset" provision for these guidelines.

III. Name and Effective Date of These Provisions

This document shall be known as the "**Department of Economics Detailed Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure**" and shall begin in force at the beginning of Academic Year 2022-2023. This document supports but is not a part of the department bylaws. These provisions have independent existence until amended by the processes herein.

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS DETAILED GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

I . Department of Economics Detailed Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure for Tenure-Track Faculty

A . Preamble

- 1 . The Department expects superior intellectual achievement in research and teaching and professional service appropriate to rank. The following are the Department's guidelines for faculty submitting a binder for either promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure or promotion to Full Professor.
- 2 . In these guidelines, the term "*top placement*" for a publication shall refer to publications in the most prestigious North American and European general interest journals, some of the affiliated journals with the above, the most prestigious journals in obviously related disciplines, and the highest quality field journals in the faculty member's field.
- 3 . The determination of the highest quality general interest journals and the highest quality field journals (and there may be more than one in some fields) is an evolutionary process. In a given year for each candidate in a given field, the members of the personnel committee and tenured faculty should take the following into advisement: relevant evaluations from the external letters, internal evaluations from faculty in the field, and external rankings. However, it is noted that algorithmic or survey rankings of journals often do not correlate beyond the very most prestigious general interest journals and may reflect the biases of whoever constructs the ranking. As such, such external rankings of journals should not be taken as dispositive.
4. To the greatest extent possible all department faculty (acting as mentors), committee chairs and members, and department leadership shall strive to keep candidates for promotion and/or tenure apprised of where they stand with regards to these standards.
5. All references to years are meant to denote official "tenure clock time" as recorded with the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement.

B . Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

1 . Research

a) Overview of guidelines for evaluating research: Faculty should evaluate candidates for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure on their research productivity and quality of journal placements, the inherent quality and impact of the research, and the potential for future research productivity.

i) Quantity and quality of publications: The Department generally expects six to seven publications in refereed journals with preferably three top placements. The Department encourages and prioritizes quality, so the personnel committee and tenured faculty may allow a tradeoff to five total publications if the quality of placements and the quality of the research are extraordinarily high. The contribution of other refereed publications such as book reviews,

publication “letters,” comments, and chapters in refereed volumes shall be discussed and evaluated on a case by case basis. Books are not typically expected of Assistant Professors of Economics; if a candidate submits for the binder a book reviewed and accepted by a major academic press, the department will need to judge its contribution to the profession on an ad hoc basis, consistent with the quality goals expressed above.

ii) Inherent quality of the research: The inherent quality of the research should be evaluated both internally (from department faculty reading the papers) and externally (from the external letters).

iii) Future research potential: Evidence of future research productivity can be gauged from such things as manuscripts in “revise and resubmit” status, submitted manuscripts, working papers, ongoing grants to support future research, and the coherence and quality of the candidate’s research statement.

iv) Internal and external discussions should include the impact of the candidate’s research. However, given the severe review and publication lags that are a reality in the Economics profession, citation counts, and similar citation-related metrics are not by themselves a reliable indicator of research impact for Assistant Professors in Economics.

v) Assistant Professors in Economics are not traditionally expected to be PIs on external funding, but the existence of such grant activity shall be considered a positive component of a successful tenure case. The Department notes that in Economics, non-governmental grants from foundations and the equivalent are becoming an increasingly vital source of external funding.

vi) To the greatest extent possible, the faculty member submitting the narrative of the discussion of the tenured faculty to the candidate’s binder shall note directly how the discussion indicated that the candidate did or did not meet the criteria above.

vii) Florida State University has unambiguously conveyed to the Department that standards for promotion and tenure may evolve, commensurate with the aspirations of the department to maintain and increase its national reputation. However, the nature of this evolution is to be determined by the department. In order to preserve the opportunity for ongoing improvement while providing stability of expectations to candidates, the Department of Economics commits to clearly articulating the relevant current standards to new hires and to faculty in their first, second, and third tenure-clock years. The department will hold the standards at the time of the candidate’s third-year review as the relevant standards for the candidate applying for promotion and tenure on schedule between the fifth and sixth year. For a candidate who forgoes application on schedule and instead applies for promotion and tenure between the sixth and seventh year, the relevant standards will be those in effect at the time of the candidate’s fourth-year annual evaluation.

2 . Teaching

a) We expect all of our faculty to excel in their teaching and encourage continued development and improvement in teaching among all tenure-track faculty. At the time of an application for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, the binder should document clear evidence of high-quality teaching.

b) Although we do not expect Assistant Professors to receive official university award recognition for outstanding teaching, such distinction may be considered in evaluating candidacy for promotion and tenure.

c) Student evaluations can be a partially useful tool for evaluating teaching , but the limitations of student evaluations are well-known, and they should not constitute the corpus of evaluation for teaching quality. Other factors must be considered. These other factors can include, as appropriate, such as diverse evidence as: willingness to accept difficult course assignments, willingness to prepare new courses, service to the Department's M.S. program, pedagogical innovations and quality of syllabi, service in Honors in the Major theses, offering appropriate DIS courses, mentoring undergraduates in preparation for post-graduate work and education, scholarly mentoring across the campus, and other similar activities.

d) Assistant Professors in Economics are not generally expected to have Chaired a doctoral committee; however, service as a committee member and/or informal mentoring of doctoral students should be considered positive indicators.

e) We will strive to honor and recognize outstanding teaching. However, excellence in teaching shall not be a substitute for performance in research that does not meet our standards as described above in the decision for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.

3 . Service

a) In Economics, Assistant Professors have minimal expectations for service, either internal or external. The successful candidate should be a good departmental citizen, participating in activities such as recruiting and seminar series and in minimally demanding service on committees, and making the beginnings of a track record externally in areas such as reviewing for major journals or funding agencies.

b) We will strive to honor and recognize outstanding service. However, excellence in service shall not be a substitute for performance in research that does not meet our standards as described above in the decision for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.

C . Guidelines for Promotion to Full Professor

1 . Research

a) Overview of guidelines for evaluating research: There is no university “clock” for applications by Associate Professors for Promotion to Full Professor. Nevertheless, the structure of what evidence the department should seek in evaluating a proposed Promotion to Full Professor applies regardless of when the faculty member applies for Promotion to Full Professor.

i) Candidates for Promotion to Full Professor should show a portfolio of sustained research activity, quality of placement, inherent quality of research, and potential for further research productivity and quality well beyond the record that provided for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure. The criteria for evaluation are the same as described in the sections above for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure: productivity, quality of placement, inherent quality of research, impact, and potential for future productivity.

ii) It is common that the circumstances of Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure is an opportunity for a faculty member to develop new research agendas with greater risk and potential reward. For this reason, the Department recognizes that there may be more unevenness in research productivity coming off of Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.

Nevertheless, a faculty member should only apply for Promotion to Full Professor when that person can demonstrate a record of sustained quantity and quality of scholarship beyond the point of promotion and tenure. In addition, the binder should include evidence for future productivity, such as submitted manuscripts, “revise and resubmit” requests, working papers, grant proposals to support future research, and the coherence and quality of the candidate’s research statement.

iii) Candidates for Promotion to Full Professor should demonstrate an extant research record and a commitment to future research productivity commensurate with a significant national and emerging international recognition. Evidence of such “recognition” can include the development and leadership of collaborative research efforts, extra-mural research affiliations, honors and recognition from or leadership positions in national and international associations, invited presentations, honors and awards, and external grants. Evidence of such recognition can, in addition, be discerned from the external letters of recommendation.

iv) To the greatest extent possible, the faculty member submitting the narrative of the discussion of the personnel committee for promotion to Full Professor to the candidate’s binder shall note directly how the discussion indicated that the candidate did or did not meet the criteria above.

v) To the extent that the Department is increasing its expectations for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, likewise the reference guidelines of departmental expectations for a candidate for Promotion to Full Professor should generally be those in place two years before the application to submit a binder for Promotion to Full Professor.

2 . Teaching

a) We expect all of our faculty to excel in their teaching and encourage continued development and improvement in teaching among all tenure-track faculty. At the time of an application for Promotion to Full Professor, the binder should document clear evidence of high-quality teaching. Specifically, a candidate for Full Professor is expected to have matured in his or her teaching performance relative to accomplishments appropriate for promotion to Associate Professor.

b) Although we do not have as a requirement that faculty receive university award recognition for outstanding teaching, such distinction may be considered in evaluating candidacy for promotion to Full Professor.

c) Student evaluations can be a partially useful tool, but the limitations of student evaluations are well-known, and they should not constitute the corpus of evaluation of teaching for promotion to Full Professor. Other factors must be considered. These other factors can include, as appropriate: willingness to accept difficult and key course assignments, willingness to prepare new courses, service to the Department’s M.S. program, pedagogical innovations and quality of syllabi, service on Honors in the Major theses (especially if Chairing theses), offering appropriate DIS courses, mentoring undergraduates in preparation for post-graduate work and

education, scholarly mentoring across the campus, and other similar activities. Across these venues, there should be demonstrated maturity relative to the expectations for an Assistant Professor seeking Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.

d) By the time of consideration for Promotion to Full Professor, most candidates are expected to have a track record of service as a Chair on doctoral committees. However, where appropriate to the candidate's professional skills, the maturing Associate Professor seeking Promotion to Full Professor may demonstrate the expected doctoral committee service by repeated and significant service as a regular committee member. Teaching in the Ph.D. core is not required, but it is a further indication of commitment to the doctoral program. Regardless of the specific path, excellence in mentoring doctoral students is expected.

e) We will strive to honor and recognize outstanding teaching. However, excellence in teaching shall not be a substitute in the decision for Promotion to Full Professor against performance in research that does not meet our standards as described above.

3 . Service

a) An Associate Professor seeking promotion for Full Professor should exhibit sustained growth in service, both internal and external, on a trajectory befitting the expectations of service required for a Full Professor at any prestigious "Research-1" university. Examples of additional internal service can include service on more demanding committees at the department, college, or university level; serving as departmental representative to internal programs; willingness to take on more time-intensive ad hoc assignments for the department or college; organizing research seminars involving our faculty, and so forth. Examples of additional external service could include sustained reviewing activities or service on editorial boards; organizing sessions at professional meetings; or service on governing committees for professional associations; and so forth.

b) We will strive to honor and recognize outstanding service. However, excellence in service shall not be a substitute in the decision for Promotion to Full Professor against performance in research that does not meet our standards as described above.

D. Amendments

1. General Force Period.

These guidelines shall remain in force as written until amended. Amendments for either rank can be made by the following process.

a) Any three faculty that are members of the rank's personnel committee can propose amendments. Such an amendment must first be approved, following at least two weeks public notice to all Department faculty, by a majority vote of that rank's personnel committee. Following that vote, again with a further two week's public notice to all faculty, the proposed amendment must be approved by a majority vote of the entire faculty.

b) Any amendment to these guidelines shall only take effect at the beginning of the subsequent academic year.

2. Other Sunset

There is no other “sunset” provision for these guidelines.

II . Department of Economics Detailed Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure for Specialized Teaching Faculty

Preamble

To the greatest extent possible all department faculty (acting as mentors), committee chairs and members, and department leadership shall strive to keep candidates for promotion apprised of where they stand with regards to these standards.

A. Guidelines for promotion to Teaching Professor II

For promotion from Teaching Professor I to Teaching Professor II, teaching faculty must demonstrate teaching excellence and satisfactory service. Candidates will be evaluated on five factors. The order in which these measures are listed below should serve as a guide to the evaluators of their relative importance.

Student Teaching Evaluations

Peer Evaluations

Other Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness or Pedagogical Innovations

SMALC Scores

Service

1. Student Evaluations

- a) Limits of student evaluations are well-known, and they can provide only a minimum standard, and a flexible one at that.
- b) Candidates for promotion must meet a minimum standard on student evaluations: The target is that candidates should earn an average of median scores of 4.0 or higher on SPCI items 12 and 13 (“overall course content rating” and “overall rating for instructor”) for all courses (dropping a section with the lowest scores). For upper-level core courses, instructors who do not meet this standard may submit additional documentation to show teaching effectiveness (for example, a comparison to the median scores of other instructors teaching upper-level core courses).
- c) Evaluators should take into consideration class size, course difficulty, number of new preps in a semester, whether a class was online or face-to-face, and other mitigating factors. Willingness

to teach difficult classes that tend to garner lower student evaluation scores should not penalize a candidate for promotion.

2. Peer Evaluation

- a) Teaching faculty should be evaluated at least once each semester by other teaching faculty,
- b) All applicable rules in the Faculty Manual and Collective Bargaining Agreement regarding peer visitation evaluations shall be followed.
- c) At least one peer evaluation per year shall be performed by another Teaching Faculty in the Department of Economics. However, if the Department Chair believes that the small number of department teaching faculty is a problem for repeat evaluations, the Chair may invite Teaching Faculty from elsewhere in the university to conduct the second evaluation.
- d) Peer evaluations should indicate that there are no significant problems with instruction. If any persistent problems are indicated, candidates for promotion are expected to explain how they are improving their instruction based on this feedback. Faculty must determine whether the plan for improvement is satisfactory.

3. Other Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness or Pedagogical Innovations

Candidates for promotion may present other evidence of teaching effectiveness, such as mentoring, academic advising, service on Honors Thesis committees, and teaching awards. Presentations at teaching conferences, teaching more than four course preps over five years, developing pedagogical innovations and/or adoption of innovations by other institutions, developing new courses, publications in teaching journals, instructor's manuals, textbooks, and other books can be considered but are not required.

4. SMALC Scores

- a) All faculty teaching core courses administer SMALC questions to all their students. These standardized questions are devised and agreed upon by the faculty teaching the core courses. The results are submitted to the university, with 75% of students expected to achieve a score of 70% or better.
- b) Each teaching faculty shall calculate the percent of students achieving 70% or better on the SMALC questions for each core course section taught, and then average across all these sections. The resulting average should not be below 75%.
- c) If the average SMALC score across course sections is below 75%, faculty should take into consideration class size, course difficulty, number of new preps in a semester, whether a class was online or face-to-face, and other mitigating factors. Willingness to teach difficult classes that tend to garner lower SMALC scores should not penalize a candidate for promotion.

d) Teaching faculty who do not teach core courses cannot be evaluated on the basis of SMALC scores. The weight for the SMALC scores is transferred to teaching evaluations.

5. Service

Teaching Professor I faculty have minimal service expectations. Service in administrative roles, extracurricular work with students, mentoring, serving on committees, organizing seminars, and other contributions can be considered in promotion, but shall not be a substitute for quality teaching.

B.. Guidelines for promotion to Teaching Professor III

Being equivalent to a Full Professor, teaching faculty with the rank of Teaching Professor III are expected to achieve a higher standard of performance. Promotion to the rank Teaching Professor III requires evidence of an established and productive academic teaching career in Economics, in addition to the standard qualification required of the Teaching Professor II. A candidate must meet the minimum standard for student evaluations and SMALC scores, and then will also be evaluated on one significant additional service component and one significant additional teaching component, plus one significant additional component of the candidate's choice (either teaching or service). See items 4. and 5. below for examples of significant additional teaching and service components. If the evidence of superlative service and teaching are not determinative or are unclear, faculty may then consider peer evaluations. The order in which these measures are listed below should serve as a guide to the evaluators of their relative importance.

Additional Evidence of Superior Teaching

Additional Evidence of Superior Service

Additional Evidence of Service or Teaching Effectiveness of the Candidate's Choice

Student Teaching Evaluations

Peer Evaluations

SMALC Scores

1. Superior Teaching

A candidate for promotion to Teaching Professor III must have additional evidence of teaching excellence. This can include:

- Recognition inside the university, such as teaching awards or other special honors or recognition for teaching excellence or innovation
- Recognition outside the university, such as invitations to present on teaching at other universities, conferences, or to teach external short courses

- Developing pedagogical innovations and/or adoption of innovations by other institutions
- Developing new courses
- Willingness to accept difficult and key course assignments
- Presenting teaching techniques or technologies at teaching conferences
- Teaching abroad and/or leading students in international programs, as well as documentation of the outcomes of such activities
- Presenting and publishing original research on economic education
- Training graduate students in teaching
- Teaching service to the broader community (such as Unconquered by Debt, a financial literacy outreach program).

2. Superior Service

A candidate's service to the department, the university, and the teaching profession should be exemplary, going above and beyond the normal performance of duties. Examples of service may include, but are not limited to:

- Serving on or chairing division, college, and/or university committees
- Serving in the faculty senate or in other faculty governance roles
- Serving as the sponsor for discipline-related student activities and/or organizations
- Assisting discipline-related student organizations or groups in competitions
- Performing administrative assignments at division, center, college, or university levels
- Performing official activities in the recruitment and/or selection of students or faculty
- Participating in governance and/or operations of professional organizations
- Reviewing articles for journals and other publications
- Serving as editor or editorial board member for journals or books
- Consulting for government agencies or other institutions

3. Additional Evidence of Service or Teaching Effectiveness of the Candidate's Choice

As noted above, this should be an area of significance and excellence submitted to the binder for promotion that is a choice of the candidate.

4. Student Teaching Evaluations

A candidate for promotion to Teaching Faculty III should again meet the minimum standard of 4.0 or higher on SPCI items 12 and 13 (“overall course content rating” and “overall rating for instructor”) for all courses, dropping a section with the lowest scores. For upper-level core courses, instructors who do not meet this standard may submit additional documentation to show teaching effectiveness (for example, a comparison to the median scores of other instructors teaching upper-level core courses).

5. Peer Evaluation

- a) All applicable rules in the Faculty Manual and Collective Bargaining Agreement regarding peer visitation evaluations shall be followed.
- b) Peer evaluations are likely to catch problems during promotion from Teaching Faculty I to II, but evaluation of teaching by other faculty can be used for promotion from Teaching Faculty II to III if other factors are not determinative or can work against a candidate for promotion if peer evaluations indicate that there are new problems in a candidate’s teaching.

6. SMALC Scores

- a) All faculty teaching core courses administer SMALC questions to all their students. These standardized questions are devised and agreed upon by the faculty teaching the core courses. The results are submitted to the university, with 75% of students expected to achieve a score of 70% or better.
- b) Each teaching faculty shall calculate the percent of students achieving 70% or better on the SMALC questions for each core course section taught, and then average across all these sections. The resulting average should not be below 75%.
- c) If the average SMALC score across course sections is below 75%, faculty should take into consideration class size, course difficulty, number of new preps in a semester, whether a class was online or face-to-face, and other mitigating factors. Willingness to teach difficult classes that tend to garner lower SMALC scores should not penalize a candidate for promotion.
- d) Teaching faculty who do not teach core courses cannot be evaluated on the basis of SMALC scores. The weight for the SMALC scores is transferred to teaching evaluations.

C. Amendments

1. General Force Period.

These guidelines shall remain in force as written until amended. Amendments for either rank can be made by the following process.

a) Any three faculty that are members of the rank's personnel committee can propose amendments. Such an amendment must first be approved, following at least two weeks public notice to all Department faculty, by a majority vote of that rank's personnel committee. Following that vote, again with a further two week's public notice to all faculty, the proposed amendment must be approved by a majority vote of the entire faculty.

b) If these provisions are amended during an academic year, there shall be one subsequent buffer academic year before the new guidelines take effect.

2. Initial Starting Buffer Upon Adoption

To the extent that these guidelines add additional requirements for specialized teaching faculty promotions in addition to those in effect in the 2021-2022 Academic Year, such new requirements will only become active in the 2023-2024 Academic Year.

3. Other Sunset

There is no other "sunset" provision for these guidelines.

III. Name and Effective Date of These Provisions

This document shall be known as the "**Department of Economics Detailed Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure**" and shall begin in force at the beginning of Academic Year 2022-2023. This document supports but is not a part of the department bylaws. These provisions have independent existence until amended by the processes herein

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS
ANNUAL EVALUATIONS CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES
Adopted 02-21-2022 for two-year evaluation period 2020-2021

As required by the University, the Department of Economics annual evaluations are made in the Spring semester of each year. In preparation for this, each faculty member is required to provide an updated two-year summary form (see attached), together with any supporting material the faculty member cares to submit that relates to professional work. Faculty who have been in the Department for less than two years need not provide evidence on teaching and service prior to arrival at FSU. Non-tenure track (specialized) teaching faculty will not be evaluated for research unless they have specifically requested that their assignment of responsibilities contain a component for research (and if such is consistent with their appointment code).

As a substitute for submitting the two-year summary form, faculty may elect to submit a two-year short CV from FEAS (Faculty Expertise and Advancement System). If so, the faculty should email the Department Chair to request the substitute. The Department Chair will download the CV and required teaching reports then send to the Annual Evaluation Committee, copying the faculty member for confirmation. The faculty member is welcome to attach supporting material and commentary to the original email request.

Faculty will be given at least two weeks notice of the due date for submission of their vita and supporting documents. Supporting material is optional, but may include copies of a limited number of publications and working papers, a brief description of special course preparations or materials, and other information relevant to the evaluation but not reflected in the vita or teaching reports. Failure to submit a form on time shall be grounds for a "Does Not Meet" rating if the Annual Evaluation Committee believes its review process has been unnecessarily hampered by the tardy submission. The faculty member is obliged to furnish the required information, even if it is late.

Following receipt of the summary form (or FEAS short CV) and supplemental materials, the Annual Evaluation Committee members shall individually review the information provided and make recommendations to the Chair regarding ratings. As described in the Department Bylaws, specialized faculty members will participate in evaluations and committee deliberations for specialized faculty only, and will not be present when tenured and tenure-track faculty are being discussed. Each Annual Evaluation Committee member shall submit to the Chair a numerical score for each of the applicable evaluation areas (teaching and service for specialized faculty; research, teaching, and service for tenured and tenure-track faculty). Specialized faculty will not submit ratings for tenured or tenure-track faculty. Committee members do not rate themselves and may not evaluate faculty with a conflict of interest, as outlined in the bylaws. Moreover, committee members may not be present for deliberations or votes concerning themselves or any faculty member with whom they have a conflict of interest.

Each committee member's recommendations are to reflect his or her best professional judgment of the evidence available. The rating scale will go from 1 (lowest accomplishment) to 10 (highest accomplishment) for each of the three categories: teaching, research, and service. The Annual Evaluation Committee may, but is not required to, meet before submitting their final numbers to the Department Chair. Each Annual Evaluation Committee member has the option to submit to the Chair any comments on faculty performance along with their numerical scores.

Upon receipt of the Annual Evaluation Committee's numbers, the Chair will use the assignment of responsibility percentages to create an overall faculty evaluation weighted number (using the median score from each faculty member's scores in each category) from 1- 10. Since committee members do not rate themselves, the Chair will construct a score based on the Sass procedure in place of the missing own score, and then obtain a median score, as outlined in the Department's Bylaws. Until such time as a formal addendum to the bylaws is provided, describing the specific details of the language "based on the Sass procedure", the Chair shall follow the procedure described as the "Isaac Variation to the Sass Adjustment", which is based on the Sass procedure and written to adapt to the use of medians as opposed to averages (please see the attached "Supplement to Annual Evaluation Committee Procedures Proposal").

Consistent with University standards, the following scoring ranges shall be applied when determining the University Assessment.

- 1 – 2.5: Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations
- 2.51 – 4.99: Official Concern
- 5.00 – 6.49: Meets FSU's High Expectations
- 6.50 – 7.49: Exceeds FSU's High Expectations
- 7.50 – 10.00: Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations

The Department Chair shall convey to each faculty member his/her rankings on the Department's 1-10 scale as well as the resulting five-fold University Assessment (above). The Department Chair, to the best of his/her ability, shall also provide each faculty member a narrative assessment based upon the numerical assessments of Annual Evaluation Committee, any formally submitted comments from the Annual Evaluation Committee, and the Chair's own observations of the professional development of the faculty member.

The productivity rating is for evaluation of a faculty member's scholarly productivity in the previous two years. That portion of a faculty member's duties that are assigned by an administrator outside the department shall be evaluated by that administrator. If faculty annual assignments and ratings are determined by another unit, the department will evaluate teaching, research, and departmental service and submit such evaluations to the unit in an advisory capacity.

Faculty evaluations will consider the fact that the mission of the Florida State University is that of a "comprehensive, graduate-research university offering undergraduate, graduate, advanced graduate, and professional programs of study, conducting extensive research, and providing service to the public" and that the Department of Economics participates in every aspect of this mission. Contract and grant activity will be evaluated based on its contribution to the research, teaching, and service mission of the Department, as outlined below.

Research

Research activity in economics is expected to lead to publication, generally in the form of journal articles or scholarly books. In evaluating research consideration will be given to the quality of the research output, judged in part by the place of publication and the type of work the publication represents. Also, major articles and books presenting extensive research work will be valued more highly than minor articles or comments. Book reviews are included as a publication item but are given relatively little weight. Textbooks are considered research output, but generally will be

weighted less than a research book. Refereed articles in major economics journals and research books published by prestigious publishing houses generally will be weighted more heavily than research reports and other publications. However, in considering whether a piece of research work has been published in a top-quality location some consideration will be given to the nature of the work and hence to the publication outlet that would be appropriate for it.

A part of the faculty member's research activity is considered to be work in progress. Indicators of work in progress include draft manuscripts, working papers, papers presented at professional meetings, seminar presentations at FSU and other universities, grant proposals, and funded research.

Teaching

Teaching is considered to comprise not only classroom teaching, but also outside-of-class meetings with students, including directing graduate students, sitting on honors, masters and doctoral committees, and reading graduate examinations. Unwillingness to assume a share of such assignments may affect one's merit evaluation.

Quality of teaching, by University regulation, must include evaluation through the SPCI instrument, which each instructor must administer in all of his/her classes each semester. Copies of these evaluations must be included with submitted materials and be reviewed by the Annual Evaluation Committee. Given the University regulations on this matter, failure to provide SPCI ratings will result in an "unsatisfactory" rating for teaching. In addition, faculty may submit peer review evaluations of teaching, whether or not such review has been required by University policy. Faculty members are also invited to submit other evidence of teaching quality that they consider would be helpful in the review process.

Service

Major service assignments ordinarily are made only for special service activities that are planned in advance of the academic year. These would include serving as Chair, as Graduate or Undergraduate Advisor, developing special instructional or research materials, and the like. Since smooth functioning of the Department and of the University depends upon faculty participation in committee work, recruitment and other administrative duties, some work of this nature will be considered a part of a faculty member's ordinary professional obligations. Normally each faculty member will receive a small service assignment to reflect these obligations. It is the philosophy of the Department that these academic/administrative tasks should be borne relatively equally and an unwillingness to accept a share of such assignments may affect one's merit evaluation.

Since other professional service activity usually is initiated by a faculty member independent of any administrative assignment, a major professional service contribution will be considered in the merit evaluation, even if no prior service assignment had been made. Other professional service includes, but need not be limited to: holding office in a professional association, participating in professional meetings as a discussant or session chair, service on the editorial review board for a journal, serving as a journal referee, testimony before a legislative body, preparation of a report for a governmental agency, significant public speaking or media appearances of a professional nature, and service on major college, university or university system committees.

When merit pay is available

The Department Chair shall be bound by the ordinal rankings of the Annual Evaluation Committee when making his or her merit salary recommendations to the Dean.

The Department Chair shall seek the advice of the Annual Evaluation Committee on using an approximately continuous merit assignment when making his or her merit salary recommendations to the Dean. The Chair is also restricted by the language of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, viz: “Meritorious performance is now defined ...as ‘performance that meets or exceeds the expectations’ of the position.”

Supplement to Annual Evaluation Committee Procedures Proposal

1 Preamble

This document provides a narrative and exposition of the “Isaac Variation to the Sass Adjustment” formula, proposed by the Annual Evaluation Committee (AEC) to be applied by the Chairperson of the Department of Economics in aggregating ratings of faculty by the Annual Evaluation Committee. The narrative was first written by Mark Isaac and then adapted by Luke Boosey to incorporate notation and to make the language consistent with other documentation proposed by the AEC in February 2022.

2 The Problem

Suppose there are N faculty to be rated. Let M denote both the subset of faculty on the AEC and the number of such faculty, such that $M < N$. Let R_{ik} denote the rating given by rater i to faculty member k .

For example, consider a hypothetical set of ratings for one of the rating categories (e.g., Teaching), provided in Figure 1, which is reproduced from the accompanying Excel spreadsheet. The rankers are in the columns. The faculty being ranked are the rows. In this hypothetical example, there are five (5) AEC members rating 10 total faculty.

| Hypothetical Evaluations in One Category | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|---------|-------|------|
| | Alpha | Bravo | Charlie | Delta | Echo |
| Alpha | NA | 7.7 | 7.3 | 7 | 6.9 |
| Bravo | 7.9 | NA | 7.1 | 7.4 | 6.9 |
| Charlie | 8.4 | 7.8 | NA | 7.9 | 7.4 |
| Delta | 7.8 | 8.1 | 6.9 | NA | 6.8 |
| Echo | 8.2 | 7.3 | 7 | 7.7 | NA |
| Foxtrot | 8.3 | 7.8 | 6.9 | 7.8 | 7.3 |
| Golf | 8.5 | 7.9 | 7.7 | 8 | 7.5 |
| Highland | 8.3 | 7.3 | 6.9 | 7.8 | 7.3 |
| Inset | 7.5 | 7.9 | 7.4 | 7 | 6.5 |
| Journey | 8.2 | 7.3 | 6.9 | 7.7 | 7.2 |

Figure 1: Hypothetical set of ratings received by the Chair

Notice the “NA” in some of the diagonal boxes. This represents AEC faculty not rating themselves (i.e., $R_{ii} = \text{“NA”}$). This is the source of the problem originally addressed by Tim Sass (former faculty in the FSU Department of Economics). The problem is that if the Department Chair were to calculate either the average (as previous evaluation procedures required) or the median (as more recent procedures and the current bylaws require), the AEC members may potentially be disadvantaged or

advantaged by having one fewer raw score. The problem is not in the ordinal ratings of one faculty versus another; rather, the problem lies in the possibility that cardinally, some faculty may be more generous or more harsh, even for the same ordinal rankings.

Indeed, the example demonstrates this possibility. The cardinal ratings returned by AEC member “Delta” are simply those returned by “Alpha” minus 0.5. Similarly, the ratings returned by “Echo” are simply those returned by “Bravo” minus 1.0. The problem can then be seen in plain view. A rater (AEC member) may be disadvantaged (advantaged) if that rater’s cardinal level is more generous (stingy) than some central tendency. To be more specific, “Alpha” is a generous rater; but if we include only the other four ratings for “Alpha”, then they do not get the benefit of having a fifth rating that reflects their own generous cardinality. This is representative of the problem we are trying to remedy. Likewise, the opposite problem arises for “Echo”, who is relatively stingy, and thus may benefit from not being subject to the more stingy rating that they provide for every other faculty member.

3 The Solution

The ultimate goal is to create a placeholder value, P_i , to replace the missing value of R_{ii} , for each rater i , which counteracts the potential unfairness bias described above. The first step is to create a temporary placeholder for each rater, called T_i (for temporary). This is captured in Figure 2 below, taken from the accompanying Excel spreadsheet (Sheet 2). The “NA” for each rater has been replaced with an entry (colored in red to indicate the temporary status). The initial temporary score T_i is calculated as the average of the ratings for rater i provided by the other $M - 1$ raters.

$$T_i = \frac{1}{M-1} \sum_{j \in M/\{i\}} R_{ij}$$

Of course, this does not address the fairness problem described above.

| Hypothetical Evaluations in One Category | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|---------|-------|------|
| | Alpha | Bravo | Charlie | Delta | Echo |
| Alpha | 7.225 | 7.7 | 7.3 | 7 | 6.9 |
| Bravo | 7.9 | 7.325 | 7.1 | 7.4 | 6.9 |
| Charlie | 8.4 | 7.8 | 7.875 | 7.9 | 7.4 |
| Delta | 7.8 | 8.1 | 6.9 | 7.4 | 6.8 |
| Echo | 8.2 | 7.3 | 7 | 7.7 | 7.55 |
| Foxtrot | 8.3 | 7.8 | 6.9 | 7.8 | 7.3 |
| Golf | 8.5 | 7.9 | 7.7 | 8 | 7.5 |
| Highland | 8.3 | 7.3 | 6.9 | 7.8 | 7.3 |
| Inset | 7.5 | 7.9 | 7.4 | 7 | 6.5 |
| Journey | 8.2 | 7.3 | 6.9 | 7.7 | 7.2 |

Figure 2: Temporary Placeholder Ratings for each Rater, T_i

We proceed to construct a Sass adjustment term for each rater, S_i , such that the placeholder value, $P_i = T_i + S_i$. The following describes the construction of S_i :

- For each rater i , let $R_i(-i)$ denote the average rating given by rater i to all other faculty (including the other raters),

$$R_i(-i) = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{k \neq i} R_{ik}.$$

- Next, for each rater i , we calculate the average of the $R_j(-j)$ values for each $j \neq i$. That is,

$$\bar{R}_i = \frac{1}{M-1} \sum_{j \in M/\{i\}} R_j(-j)$$

This can be interpreted as the “average of the other raters’ average ratings”

- Finally, we calculate the Sass adjustment term as follows:

$$S_i = R_i(-i) - \bar{R}_i$$

This provides us with a measure of how much i ’s average rating of everyone else differs from the average overall rating of the other raters.

| Hypothetical Evaluations in One Category | | | | | |
|--|------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| | Alpha | Bravo | Charlie | Delta | Echo |
| Alpha | 7.225 | 7.7 | 7.3 | 7 | 6.9 |
| Bravo | 7.9 | 7.325 | 7.1 | 7.4 | 6.9 |
| Charlie | 8.4 | 7.8 | 7.875 | 7.9 | 7.4 |
| Delta | 7.8 | 8.1 | 6.9 | 7.4 | 6.8 |
| Echo | 8.2 | 7.3 | 7 | 7.7 | 7.55 |
| Foxtrot | 8.3 | 7.8 | 6.9 | 7.8 | 7.3 |
| Golf | 8.5 | 7.9 | 7.7 | 8 | 7.5 |
| Highland | 8.3 | 7.3 | 6.9 | 7.8 | 7.3 |
| Inset | 7.5 | 7.9 | 7.4 | 7 | 6.5 |
| Journey | 8.2 | 7.3 | 6.9 | 7.7 | 7.2 |
| $R_i(-i)$ | 8.12222222 | 7.67777778 | 7.12222222 | 7.58888889 | 7.08888889 |
| \bar{R}_i | 7.36944444 | 7.48055556 | 7.61944444 | 7.50277778 | 7.62777778 |
| S_i | 0.75277778 | 0.19722222 | -0.49722222 | 0.08611111 | -0.53888889 |

Figure 3: Calculating the Sass Adjustment, S_i

For example, for the rater $i = \text{“Alpha”}$, the average rating given by “Alpha” to other faculty is $R_i(-i) = 8.1222$. Similarly, for “Alpha”, the average of other raters’ average ratings, $\bar{R}_i = 7.36944$. The difference is $S_i = 0.752778$.

We then calculate the placeholder value for rater i as

$$P_i = T_i + S_i.$$

With the placeholder ratings calculated, the Department Chair can then proceed to calculate the median score for each faculty.

See the final product in Figure 4 below.

| Hypothetical Evaluations in One Category | | | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|--------|
| | Alpha | Bravo | Charlie | Delta | Echo | Median |
| Alpha | 7.9778 | 7.7 | 7.3 | 7 | 6.9 | 7.3 |
| Bravo | 7.9 | 7.5222 | 7.1 | 7.4 | 6.9 | 7.4 |
| Charlie | 8.4 | 7.8 | 7.3778 | 7.9 | 7.4 | 7.8 |
| Delta | 7.8 | 8.1 | 6.9 | 7.4861 | 6.8 | 7.4861 |
| Echo | 8.2 | 7.3 | 7 | 7.7 | 7.0111 | 7.3 |
| Foxtrot | 8.3 | 7.8 | 6.9 | 7.8 | 7.3 | 7.8 |
| Golf | 8.5 | 7.9 | 7.7 | 8 | 7.5 | 7.9 |
| Highland | 8.3 | 7.3 | 6.9 | 7.8 | 7.3 | 7.3 |
| Inset | 7.5 | 7.9 | 7.4 | 7 | 6.5 | 7.4 |
| Journey | 8.2 | 7.3 | 6.9 | 7.7 | 7.2 | 7.3 |

Figure 4: Final Placeholder Ratings for each Rater, $P_i = T_i + S_i$, and the resulting Median scores

4 Final Discussion & Historical Context

This procedure for computing the Sass adjustment with medians is, in some sense, “brittle”. An obvious question is whether the change in a rater’s evaluation is by the full amount of the S_i adjustment (compared to the naive approach of simply taking the median for i of the other $M - 1$ raters’ scores for rater i). The answer is, in general, no.

Take as an example the rater $i = \text{‘Alpha’}$. Naively, using just the other four raters, the median for Alpha is determined by the average of 7.0 and 7.3, which is 7.15. In contrast, the procedure above produces a median score of 7.30 for Alpha (using the four scores plus the Final Placeholder Score of 7.9778). The good thing is that these all go in the right direction; e.g., Alpha’s rating rises slightly. However, the Median function can be rather “brittle” to small changes in data. You can see this by comparing the absolute change in the medians from the naive approach to the approach outlined above.

For Alpha, the median increases by 0.15; the same is true for Bravo (an increase by 0.15), while for Delta, the median increases by 0.118. In contrast, for Charlie, the median is reduced by 0.05, while for Echo, the median is reduced by 0.2. These calculations are also provided in Sheet 7 of the accompanying spreadsheet, in column Q. The “brittleness” of the procedure is seen with regards to the adjustment *as a proportion of S_i* . In particular, note that these differ by an order of magnitude—Alpha’s median increases by 19.9% of the S_i (0.7528), whereas Bravo’s median increases by 76% of the S_i (0.1972); similarly, Delta’s median increases by 137% of the S_i (0.0861), while Charlie and Echo have their medians reduced by around 10% and 37% of their S_i values (−0.4972 and −0.5389), respectively.

A return to using averages does not suffer from this disparity in the proportion of S_i that impacts

each rater, as can be seen from Sheet 8 in the accompanying spreadsheet (Column R). Mathematically, it must follow that each rater's average adjusts by one-fifth of their Sass adjustment, in the example, or by $1/M$ when there are M raters. This results in scores that are equivalent to those that would have been produced under the Sass procedure, as originally described to Mark Isaac when he was Department Chair. In that original procedure, several steps described above are unnecessary. Rather, the Department Chair could simply calculate each Sass adjustment, S_i , divide by M and add the resulting fraction, S_i/M , of the Sass adjustment to each rater's average. When the Department switched to using medians, the original approach of computing S_i and dividing by M , then adding to the median obtained from the $M - 1$ other raters' scores did not translate. This led to the "Isaac Variation of the Sass Adjustment". However, as can be seen from the explanation above, the Isaac Variation can be applied to averages in a way that produces adjusted averages that are identical to what would be given by the original Sass procedure.

Name:.....

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

Annual Evaluation for Tenured/Tenure-Earning Faculty: [Dates]

Please provide information for the period since 1 January [Year]

*For purposes of the '12 hour file,' mark those items new since last year with a double asterisk **.*

| |
|----------------------------|
| Section 1: Research |
|----------------------------|

[For publications give a full bibliographical citation, including co-authors etc. If journal is included in the 'ISI database' please so note. In keeping with our decision about outlets for publication, feel free to include a statement about the status and reputation of the journal or other outlet, or your reason for publishing in it, particularly if the journal is not well known in economics.]

Refereed journal articles published:

Refereed journal articles accepted for publication:

Other scholarly publications (*books, chapters in books, reports, etc.*):

Work in progress:

Contract and Grant Activity- Proposals submitted:

Contract and Grant Activity- Proposals approved (*title, funder, \$ amount*):

Contract and Grant Activity- Current activity:

Papers presented and other meeting participation:

Invited lectures, seminars, or other presentations:

Other professional activity (*e.g. Editorial board memberships*):

Refereeing (*for journals, publishers, grant agencies, etc.*):

Professional association (*membership, offices, etc.*):

Outside letters for P&T decisions at other Universities:

| |
|----------------------------|
| Section 2: Teaching |
|----------------------------|

Recognitions and Awards (*indicate award and group presenting award*):

Primary teaching:

A. Attach a copy of a Teaching Summary Report.

FEAS+ may be accessed by visiting <https://feas.fsu.edu>.
Enter your FSU credentials
Select the box "Report" under Generate on the top-right
In the drop-down box, select Teaching Summary Report
In the second drop-down box, select 2 Years
Select "Generate Report"
Save the .rtf file when prompted

B. Attach a copy of SPCI Overall Evaluation Summary

Select the box "Report" under Generate on the top-right
In the drop-down box, select SPCI Overall Evaluation Summary
In the second drop-down box, select 2 Years
In the third drop-down box, it is your discretion to select either of the following:

- Exclude SPCI Semester with COVID-19 Disruption, or
- Include all SPCI Evaluations in the Reporting Period

Select "Generate Report"
Save the .rtf file when prompted

C. Attach a copy of SPCI Evaluation – 13 Questions

Select the box "Report" under Generate on the top-right
In the drop-down box, select SPCI Evaluation – 13 Questions
In the second drop-down box, select 2 Years
In the third drop-down box, it is your discretion to select either of the following:

- Exclude SPCI Semester with COVID-19 Disruption, or
- Include all SPCI Evaluations in the Reporting Period

Select "Generate Report"
Save the .rtf file when prompted

The committee will focus on the following four questions:

- 1) Question 5: I learned a great deal in this course
- 2) Question 11: The instructor demonstrated mastery of the subject matter
- 3) Question 12: Overall course content rating
- 4) Question 13: Overall instructor rating

Faculty are also encouraged, but not required, to provide the Department with a copy of their full SPCI reports, which will be made available to the Annual Evaluation Committee for evaluation purposes.

Full SPCI reports included? Yes ____ No ____

Notes regarding any of the above classes:

(Indicate any that were new to you and include additional explanatory notes.)

Other teaching:

(List and explain any teaching that was not captured in the above reports.)

Student supervisory committee service (indicate member or chair)

A. Undergraduate Honors Thesis:

B. MS Thesis and Extended Paper:

C. PhD:

| |
|---------------------------|
| Section 3: Service |
|---------------------------|

Administrative assignments:

Department, College, or University committee memberships:

Service to the community (include popular media appearances, public lectures, and the like):

| |
|--|
| Section 4: Personal Statement/Commentary (not required) |
|--|

*[Any commentary on information provided, or other personal statement in amplification of above information, that the faculty member feels is relevant to the evaluation. This could, for example, draw attention to particular activities or accomplishments that the individual feels are particularly meritorious. **Limited to one page.**]*

Name:.....

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

Annual Evaluation for Specialized Faculty: [Dates]

Please provide information for the period since 1 January [Year]

*For purposes of the '12 hour file,' mark those items new since last year with a double asterisk **.*

| |
|----------------------------|
| Section 1: Teaching |
|----------------------------|

Recognitions and Awards (*indicate award and group presenting award*):

Primary teaching:

A. Attach a copy of a Teaching Summary Report.

FEAS+ may be accessed by visiting <https://feas.fsu.edu>.

Enter your FSU credentials

Select the box "Report" under Generate on the top-right

In the drop-down box, select Teaching Summary Report

In the second drop-down box, select 2 Years

Select "Generate Report"

Save the .rtf file when prompted

B. Attach a copy of SPCI Overall Evaluation Summary

Select the box "Report" under Generate on the top-right

In the drop-down box, select SPCI Overall Evaluation Summary

In the second drop-down box, select 2 Years

In the third drop-down box, it is your discretion to select either of the following:

- Exclude SPCI Semester with COVID-19 Disruption, or
- Include all SPCI Evaluations in the Reporting Period

Select "Generate Report"

Save the .rtf file when prompted

C. Attach a copy of SPCI Evaluation – 13 Questions

Select the box "Report" under Generate on the top-right

In the drop-down box, select SPCI Evaluation – 13 Questions

In the second drop-down box, select 2 Years

In the third drop-down box, it is your discretion to select either of the following:

- Exclude SPCI Semester with COVID-19 Disruption, or
- Include all SPCI Evaluations in the Reporting Period

Select "Generate Report"

Save the .rtf file when prompted

The committee will focus on the following four questions:

- 1) Question 5: I learned a great deal in this course
- 2) Question 11: The instructor demonstrated mastery of the subject matter
- 3) Question 12: Overall course content rating
- 4) Question 13: Overall instructor rating

Faculty are also encouraged, but not required, to provide the Department with a copy of their full SPCI reports, which will be made available to the Annual Evaluation Committee for evaluation purposes.

Full SPCI reports included? Yes ____ No ____

D. Attach a copy of Grade Distribution Report

Select the box "Report" under Generate on the top-right

In the drop-down box, select Grade Distribution Report with +/- Grades

In the second drop-down box, select 2 Years

Select "Generate Report"

Save the .rtf file when prompted

Notes regarding any of the above classes:

(Indicate any that were new to you and include additional explanatory notes.)

Other teaching:

(List and explain any teaching that was not captured in the above reports.)

| |
|---------------------------|
| Section 2: Service |
|---------------------------|

Faculty Advisor to Student Groups:

(Identify group, provide description of activities and estimated hours spent with each group)

Workshops and conferences attended:

(Be sure to indicate if you presented or attended, or both):

Undergraduate Honors Thesis:

(indicate member or chair, name of student, and thesis title)

Administrative assignments:

Service to the community or University:

(popular media appearances, public lectures, and the like)

Journal reviews:

Textbook reviews or contribution:

Letters of Recommendation:

(Provide approximate number since prior evaluation, do not list specific names)

Other:

| |
|--|
| Section 3: Personal Statement/Commentary (not required) |
|--|

*[Any commentary on information provided, or other personal statement in amplification of above information, that the faculty member feels is relevant to the evaluation. This could, for example, draw attention to particular activities or accomplishments that the individual feels are particularly meritorious. Examples include new technology or pedagogy initiated in the classroom and specific service to student groups. **Limited to one page.**]*