

SCHOOL OF COMMUNICATION BYLAWS

(Revisions approved by a majority of the faculty, September 20, 2014)

Article I. Purpose and Implementation

Section 1. These Bylaws are created to assist in the effective and efficient governance of the School of Communication at the Florida State University. They are subject to the higher authority of regulations adopted by the University, the Faculty Senate, The Florida State Board of Trustees, the Florida Board of Governors, and statutes adopted by the Florida Legislature. They must be in accord with the Bylaws of the College of Communication and Information.

Section 2. Adoption. These Bylaws must be endorsed by majority vote of the Faculty of the School and approved by the Dean of the College.

Section 3. Revision. In every year ending in 5 or 0 the School Director shall appoint a special committee to review and update these Bylaws. Any departmental committee, including the Executive Committee, may initiate amendments or revisions at any time in the academic year.

Article II. Membership of the School Assembly

Section 1. The principal legislative authority of the School shall rest in the School Assembly. This shall consist of all faculty members tenured or in tenure-earning positions, service professors, specialized faculty, and visiting faculty members holding the rank of assistant professor or above. Instructors, visiting professors appointed for less than an academic year, post-doctoral fellows, emeritus faculty, and those holding courtesy or adjunct appointments may participate in Assembly deliberations but shall not have the right to vote.

Section 2. The School of Communication shall be composed of two divisions, the Integrated Marketing Communication Division (IMC) and the Media and Communication Studies Division (MCS). Each faculty member of the School will also be a member of one of these two divisions.

Section 3. The IMC and MCS faculty shall each form and operate a separate Divisional Faculty Assembly that will have the responsibilities and powers of divisional assembly.

Section 4. The IMC and MCS Divisions shall develop and implement Bylaws to assist in the effective and efficient governance of the separate divisions. The actions by the two divisional faculty assemblies will be separate, independent and non-binding on the School of Communication. These divisional bylaws (See Appendices A and B) shall apply only to that division. These School of Communication Bylaws and the rules of the bodies enumerated in Article 1, Section 1 above shall supersede any Division Bylaws should a conflict of documents arise.

Section 5. The School Director and Director of Doctoral Studies shall encourage organization of a Communication Graduate Student Association.

Article III. Meetings and Powers of the School Assembly

Section 1. The School Assembly shall meet in regular session at least once each semester during the regular academic year and may meet on special call during the summer. Only emergency decisions identified as such by the School Director, with the advice of the Dean, may be made during the summer term if one-fourth or more of the faculty are unavailable. Dates and times of meetings shall be established by the School Director, and the time designated shall be as free as possible from conflicting school classes and other activities.

Section 2. Special meetings may be called by the School Director, or on written request from five voting members of the Assembly.

Section 3. Presiding Officer. The School Director shall normally preside at meetings of the Assembly. In the absence of the School Director, he/she shall assign another member of the Executive Committee the responsibility of presiding.

Section 4. Agenda. The School Director shall prepare and distribute to all faculty members an agenda for each meeting of the Assembly. Items may be added to the agenda on request by individual members to the director. Should the director be reluctant to add an item, it can be added upon the written request by a group of any three members.

Section 5. Powers of the School Assembly. The Assembly shall :

a. receive reports from departmental committees, directors of undergraduate and graduate studies, and those faculty coordinating majors or emphasis areas. It shall take whatever action on these reports seems appropriate.

b. not discuss specific cases of tenure, promotion, salary increments, nor serve as an appeals committee on grievances.

c. discuss any other matter it chooses and offer its opinion or advice to the upper authorities.

Section 6. Minutes. The Director shall appoint a member or secretary to keep minutes for each meeting of the School Assembly. These minutes shall record members present, topics discussed, and include the results of all formal votes cast. The minutes will not attempt to summarize Assembly debate or arguments on either side of controversial issues.

Section 7. Proxies or Absentee Ballots.

Proxies or absentee ballots may be permitted only under the following unusual circumstances: A faculty member who feels strongly about an issue before the faculty, and who for reasons of health or professional obligations must miss a critical meeting, upon receiving the School Director's permission to do so, may cast a proxy or absentee ballot. Faculty members wishing to use proxies or absentee ballots are encouraged to inform themselves and their colleagues on the issues.

Article IV. School Director

Section 1. The School Director shall be the chief administrative officer of the School. The School Director shall serve as its principal financial officer, authorizing all regular expenditures, preparing an annual budget and an annual financial report at the end of each fiscal year, redistributing budgets at the end of a fiscal year, and meeting emergencies of all kinds.

Section 2. The School Director shall, in cooperation with selected faculty member(s), plan an in-depth orientation for all new teaching assistants. The School Director shall, in cooperation with the Associate Director or other selected faculty member(s), review the results of teaching instruments used to evaluate teaching assistants and adjuncts, including any in-house document. This will include coordinating the review of master's level GAs on a regular basis. This may include teaching evaluations of lead TAs, and other evaluative measures in accordance with the GAU contract.

Section 3. The School Director may appoint an Associate or Assistant School Director, a Director of Doctoral Studies, a Director of the Integrated Marketing Communication Division and a Director of the Media and Communication Studies Division. These officers serve at the pleasure of the School Director and may be removed and replaced on his/her sole initiative.

Section 4. The School Director shall coordinate the academic program of the School Department, reconciling the conflicting demands of various curricular majors and emphasis areas, then allocating resources (assistantships, adjunct appointments, capital outlay, and expense funds) to meet the needs of the School. The School Director shall serve as liaison officer and school representative (or shall designate such representatives) to officers and bodies outside the School.

Section 5. The term of office of the School Director shall be for three academic years beginning July 1st, renewable indefinitely by mutual consent.

Section 6. Six months before the end of each three- year term for the School Director , the Dean of the College shall consult the School Director concerning his/her willingness to serve or another term. If the School Director wishes to be relieved, the Dean shall initiate proceedings (Section 7) for selection of a new School Director. If the School Director is willing to continue, the Dean shall, without the participation of the School Director, poll the faculty. A majority vote of confidence in the School Director shall constitute a recommendation to the Dean that the School Director be appointed for another term of three academic years.

Section 7. Whenever for any reason the office of School Director becomes vacant, or will soon become vacant, the Dean shall appoint a Search Committee broadly representative of the faculty, and, if a majority of the faculty approves, the Committee shall submit the name of its nominee to the Dean for approval. Upon approval of the Dean, this person shall immediately become Director-Designate and serve on the Executive Committee. Further, the Director-Designate shall assume the Director position on July 1st.

Section 8. If the Director position becomes vacant due to unforeseen circumstances and there is a Director-Designate, the Director-Designate will immediately assume the Directorship. If there is no Director-Designate, the Dean will appoint an Acting School Director and will appoint a Search Committee as described in Article IV Section 7.

Section 9. Recall. Any five voting members of the School Assembly may at any time initiate a petition asking for a vote of confidence in the School Director . When this is received by the Dean he/she shall submit a secret ballot to the membership of the School Assembly. Two-thirds of the voting membership of the Assembly shall be required to vote “no confidence” prior to the expiration of a regular term. Whenever this is certified, the Dean shall relieve the School Director of administrative duties, appoint an Acting School Director, and initiate a search for a new School Director , whose initial appointment shall be for a term of three academic years.

Article V. Other Administrative Roles Within the School

Section 1. The School Director shall appoint, upon recommendation by the faculty in each Division, a Director of the IMC Division and a Director of the MCS Division.

Section 2. The duties of the two Divisional Directors will include submitting recommendations to the School Director regarding undergraduate admissions, Masters admissions, funding offers to Masters students within budget allocations, annual evaluation of faculty members (via a process to be contained in Divisional Bylaws – See Appendices A and B), merit pay increases, assignments of responsibility, summer teaching assignments and rotations, course scheduling, faculty peer evaluations, initial review of course and program changes, appointing search committees, and making hiring recommendations. The Directors may be assigned additional duties beyond these by the School Director.

Section 3. The Director of Doctoral Studies shall be appointed by the School Director. The Director will chair the Doctoral Studies Committee (see below) to enhance the quality and effectiveness of the doctoral program. The Director of Doctoral Studies will also be responsible for recruiting, orientation, and tracking of doctoral students for the Department’s entire doctoral program.

Article VI. Standing Committees Section 1.

Executive Committee

Part 1. Membership. The School Director shall preside over the four- to seven-member committee with a voice and a vote. Ex –officio voting members of the Executive Committee shall be the Assistant or Associate Director (if one is appointed), the Director-Designate (if there is one), the immediate past School Director or Department Chair, and the Directors of the IMC Division, MCS Division and Doctoral Program. The School Director MAY appoint additional faculty members to the Executive Committee to represent fairly the various interests of the School.

The Executive Committee shall meet regularly on call of the School Director.

Part 2. Duties. The Executive Committee has as its charge the welfare of the School as a whole and serves as an advisory body to the School Director on policy matters. It makes necessary recommendations to the faculty and suggests guidelines for the annual assignment of duties and modification thereof, and for the annual evaluation procedure.

Section 2. Academic Affairs Committee.

Part 1. Membership. This five-member committee shall be elected by the faculty, with each Division electing two members and the School Director appointing the fifth member.

At least two members will be elected from among faculty holding Graduate Faculty Status. At least four members will be tenured or tenure-earning faculty.

The School Director shall be an ex-officio nonvoting member of this committee, available for consultation but not expected to attend all committee meetings.

Part 2. Responsibilities. This committee shall review and recommend to the College Academic Affairs Committee changes, additions and deletions to courses, programs, certificates, course mapping, and other matters under the purview of the College committee. The School Academic Affairs Committee will recommend to the School faculty matters of admissions, advising sheets, and curriculum not under the purview of the College Academic Affairs Committee.

Part 3. "Faculty and staff members are expected to be familiar with and follow the Florida State University Substantive Change Policy as found on the university web site <http://provost.fsu.edu/sacs>."

Section 3. Doctoral Program Committee (DPC)

Part 1. Composition. The Director of Doctoral Studies shall chair this committee. The School Director shall be a nonvoting ex-officio member who may attend if they wish or are asked but are not counted in determination of a quorum.

4

Joining these ex-officio members on DPC will be two elected faculty members, one elected by each Division each year in August. Eligibility for election to the DPC shall include all faculty with GFS.

Part 2. Responsibilities. The DPC shall coordinate recruitment of doctoral students for all programs in the department, review applications for admission to the doctoral program, encourage doctoral student participation in CGSA, receive from curricular major coordinators recommendations concerning both admission and funding, make recommendations to the School Director for funding of new and continuing doctoral students, and recommend to the School Director candidates for fellowship and assistantship awards.

The DPC will conduct reviews and make recommendations to the Director, Dean, and the Graduate School regarding initial and continuing Graduate Faculty Status for school faculty. School criteria for GFS shall be included and updated as needed as Appendix A of these School Bylaws.

The DPC will review the work and progress of all new doctoral students at the end of the second completed semester. Major professors will conduct an annual review of all doctoral students, with special attention to doctoral students who have not yet reached candidacy. In consultation with the major professor, the committee shall recommend termination of students not making satisfactory progress toward a degree.

In addition, the DPC will coordinate external reviews of the doctoral program. It will write a brief annual report on the doctoral program for the School Director, Dean of the College, and the University's Dean of The Graduate School.

The DPC will revise and update as necessary the Guide to Doctoral Studies documents for doctoral programs. It is responsible for long-range planning, for the maintenance of academic standards, and for bringing needed recommendations to the School Assembly.

Section 4. Appeals Committee.

When a student grade appeal is filed, the School Director will appoint a grade appeal committee following university procedures.

Section 5. Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee.

Part 1. Membership. All tenured faculty members shall be eligible to stand for election as members of the Faculty Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee, with the exception of the School Director. All members of the Departmental Assembly may vote in the elections of PT&E Committee members. Elections will take place in January of each year, following guidelines supplied by the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement.

A) The School Faculty Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee will be composed of four members, with two members elected by and from each division. Each division will elect one member each year for a two year term (staggered two year terms).

B) The School representatives for the College P and T Committee will be composed of two faculty members. Each division will elect one member to serve on the College Committee.

Part 2. Promotion and Tenure Consideration for Tenure Track Faculty. Each year, the two members elected from each division will undertake a preliminary review of materials and nomination of candidates for tenure and promotion from that division for consideration by the School Promotion, Tenure

5

and Evaluation Committee. This will include preliminary review of faculty not holding tenure and/or holding rank below that of professor. Evaluation shall include appropriate measuring instruments and in-class observations of teaching. Faculty will be given a two week notice prior to classroom visits. In addition to teaching effectiveness, evaluation shall include research and service as described in the Faculty Handbook.

All the members of the Faculty Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee shall evaluate all tenured or tenure track faculty with the exception of the school's Director who is evaluated by the Dean. Based on these evaluations and in consultation with the faculty member, the Faculty Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee may recommend consideration for promotion and/or tenure. This process shall take place during the spring semester prior to the preparation of promotion/tenure folders during the summer and early fall semester. It is preliminary to and distinct from the formal recommendation process and vote in Fall semester. A recommendation that a faculty member be considered for promotion and tenure during this preliminary procedure does not obligate the Faculty Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee to forward a favorable recommendation after reviewing the candidate's folder during the formal promotion and tenure process. If a candidate is recommended to prepare a binder, the divisional PT&E representatives will work with the School Director and the candidate to prepare the binder.

On the occasion of each annual review the School Director shall apprise the faculty member of the requirements for promotion and tenure and evaluate his/her progress toward meeting those standards. On the occasion of the second and fourth year of progress on a tenure-earning line (in the fourth and eighth semesters of service or the equivalent), a faculty member will prepare materials for the Faculty Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee to review. The divisional representatives will prepare a formal second or fourth year review letter for review and approval of the whole P&T committee.

This letter will be included in the materials the Faculty Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee sees when a candidate seeks tenure and/or promotion.

A narrative from the Faculty Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee that summarizes the review (2nd, 3rd, or 4th, as the case may be) should come from the committee to the Chair or Dean. A suggested format, which may be modified or expanded, for such use is:

Summary of Meeting

The PT&E committee reviewed the candidate _____ for promotion (and/or tenure). A majority of the committee expressed that the candidate's binder provided evidence that the candidate (did not meet/met/exceeded/far exceeded) the norm for his or her discipline in the area of research (similar sentences can be used for teaching and service). Comments were made regarding the candidate's strength/weakness in the area of _____, as evidenced by _____.

Faculty members should consult the current School of Communication statement on Criteria for Promotion and Tenure and the statement on Annual Evaluation and Merit Procedures.

Part 3. Promotion of Specialized Faculty. The process of evaluating specialized faculty for promotion shall follow similar steps as outlined in Step 2. Differences include,

- a) If allowed by the faculty contract, the promotion review committee for specialized faculty will consist of a committee-of-the-whole, defined as all specialized faculty in the unit except the candidate to be reviewed. If this is not allowed by the faculty contract, one specialized faculty

member will be elected to serve on the PTE committee for the purpose of reviewing promotion of specialized faculty only.

- b) The review process and preparation of materials shall take place during the same spring semester.
- c) Promotion criteria for specialized faculty are outlined in Appendix D.
- d) Annual evaluation and merit reviews of specialized faculty will follow the processes and criteria described in Appendix E.

Part 4. Sustained Performance Evaluations (SPE). The PTE committee and the School Director will review the annual evaluations of any regular tenured faculty member of the school who has been in rank as an associate or full professor for seven years after the last promotion or after receiving tenure, or for seven years after the faculty member's last SPE. The annual evaluations shall include all material included in the evaluation file for the faculty member. Following guidelines provided by the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement, the sustained performance review results and recommendations will be forwarded to the Dean.

Section 6. Election Committee.

Part 1. An elections committee of two members shall be appointed by the School Director in the fall of each year. This committee shall be responsible for determining the preferences of faculty members and preparing a ballot for a fall or spring election to the Academic Affairs Committee; school PT&E and college P&T Committee; and the Doctoral Program Committee.

Part 2. No faculty member shall serve on more than two of the following committees: Executive; Academic Affairs; Doctoral Policy. The School Director may ask any faculty member to serve on an additional committee if that is necessary to meet departmental needs.

Section 7. Special (ad hoc) Committees. The School Director may appoint, with the advice of the Executive Committee, special committees for such purposes as a search once a new faculty position in the School has been authorized. Ad hoc committees are discharged once their report has been received and acted upon.

Section 8. Quorum. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the voting members of the Departmental Assembly. In each of the School committees the common law requirement of a majority of the membership shall prevail.

Section 9. Parliamentary Authority. In all cases not covered by these Bylaws or by such Standing Rules as the Assembly or committees of the School shall establish, the parliamentary authority shall be the most recent edition of *Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure*.

Section 10. Amendment

Part 1. Proposed amendments shall normally be presented to a regular or special session of the School Assembly for information and preliminary discussion, and placed on the agenda of the next session of the Assembly for debate and vote. If the second session referred to herein comes at least one week after introduction and preliminary discussion, a majority vote of the members present and voting shall be sufficient to adopt the amendment.

Part 2. Emergency Amendments. In case of emergency as judged by the School Director and affirmed by majority vote of the Assembly, a two-thirds affirmative vote of the entire membership of the School Assembly shall be sufficient to adopt an amendment at the time of its first introduction. Such vote

7

must be preceded by open discussion and debate in the Assembly. Voting tabulations can consist of a combination of written proxy ballots and/or votes cast during an assembly meeting.

Appendix A: School of communication Graduate Faculty Status Policy Appendix B:

School of Communication Promotion and Tenure Policy

Appendix C: School of Communication Annual Evaluation and Merit Procedures for Tenure-Track Faculty Appendix

D: School of Communication SF Promotion Procedures

Appendix E: School of Communication Annual Evaluation and Merit Procedures for Specialized Faculty Note: No divisional by-laws have been created to date.

8

Appendix A: SCHOOL OF COMMUNICATION GRADUATE FACULTY STATUS POLICY

(Approved by unanimous faculty vote, December 2, 2009) (Approved by the Dean of The Graduate School, December 7, 2009)

Florida State University Definition of GFS: Membership in the Graduate Faculty of the School of Communication authorizes faculty to teach all graduate level courses, to sit on all graduate level committees, to chair all graduate student dissertation committees, and to participate fully in all components of graduate education, research, and service. Limitation or removal of any of these authorizations from individual GFS faculty is delegated to the unit level authority where such assignments are made.

Florida State University GFS Limitations/Restrictions: Faculty holding GFS are expected to actively engage in graduate education through teaching, mentoring and research supervision. They should show evidence of research-based scholarship and/or creative work resulting in peer reviewed publications or equivalent work.

School of Communication GFS Nomination Criteria: The faculty member under consideration for nomination to Graduate Faculty Status must, subject to consideration of special circumstances, have

- (1) completed a doctoral degree or equivalent from an accredited institution for higher learning,
- (2) proven expertise in the teaching area, and
- (3) evidence of scholarly creative/research activity through at least one peer-reviewed journal article or book chapter, scholarly book, or juried creative work within a five-year period prior to GFS nomination. Extensive professional experience or expertise may be evaluated in lieu of this criterion.

School of Communication GFS Nomination Process: The nomination for GFS begins with the individual faculty member requesting in writing an evaluation by the Doctoral Program Committee (DPC). If the faculty member is found to be ineligible for GFS, then the DPC will communicate this information to the faculty member in writing, highlighting the criteria that must be met. If the DPC finds that the faculty member meets the eligibility criteria, then a formal nomination in writing will be made to the school director. Then, the school director, through the School Elections Committee, will poll the then-current GFS faculty members. As noted in the FSU Faculty Handbook, appointment to GFS must be by affirmative supermajority (2/3) vote of the GFS faculty of the School, with subsequent approval by the director, dean, and the Dean of the Graduate School.

School of Communication GFS Authority: Upon receiving GFS, the faculty member is eligible to

- (1) teach graduate courses within the School,
- (2) serve on and chair master's supervisory and thesis committees within the School (tenure-track faculty only), and
- (3) serve on doctoral supervisory and dissertation committees within the School (tenure-track faculty only).

Note: Specialized faculty must hold co-MDS and co-DDS to serve in the roles outlined in points 2 and 3 above.

Additional Criteria for Serving as University Representative on Doctoral Dissertation Committees: To serve as the University Representative on a doctoral dissertation committee outside the School of Communication, the faculty member must

- (1) hold GFS, and
- (2) be tenured (according to FSU policy).

9

No separate nomination process is needed to serve as University Representative; the status will be considered automatically conferred with tenure (for faculty holding GFS).

Additional Criteria for Directing Dissertations within the School of Communication (Tenure-track faculty): In order to direct doctoral dissertations within the School of Communication, the faculty member must

- (1) hold GFS,
- (2) have successfully passed her/his third year annual review, and
- (3) have served as a member of at least one completed doctoral dissertation committee.

To be considered for this responsibility, the faculty member will follow the same general procedure as outlined in the School of Communication GFS Nomination Process described above. Also, tenure-track faculty members with this distinction are eligible to serve on the Doctoral Program Committee. Finally, faculty appointed at the Associate or Full level will automatically be eligible to direct dissertations.

Graduate Teaching Status (GTS) will be open to teaching or research specialized faculty in the school, as well as adjuncts and visiting scholars. GTS confers the eligibility to teach graduate courses. Specialized faculty (SF) must hold co-MDS or co-DDS to participate as an additional member on committees and/or co-direct a thesis or dissertation per the criteria outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Additional Criteria for Co-Directing Dissertations within the School of Communication (SF faculty): Specialized faculty members are eligible to serve as co-directors of doctoral dissertations along with a tenure-track faculty member who holds doctoral directing GFS. In order to co-direct doctoral dissertations within the School of Communication, the specialized faculty member must

- (1) hold GTS and co-DDS,
- (2) have served on the School of Communication faculty for at least three years, and
- (3) have served as a member of at least one completed doctoral dissertation committee.

To be considered for this responsibility, the GTS faculty member will follow the same general procedure as outlined in the School of Communication GFS Nomination Process described above.

Doctoral Student Supervisory Committee Requirements: According to University policy, the supervisory committee will consist of a minimum of four members of the faculty who have Graduate Faculty Status (GFS), one of whom is the university representative of the faculty drawn from outside the student's department/school and who holds tenure.

Master's Student Supervisory Committee Requirements: For both thesis and capstone creative project committees at the master's level, the supervisory committee will consist of a minimum of three members of the faculty who all have Graduate Faculty Status (GFS). At least two faculty members must be from within the student's department/school. The third member can be either from within the student's department/school or from another unit on campus.

10

APPENDIX B: CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

School of Communication, Florida State University
(Approved by the Faculty, April 26, 2006)

Decisions to grant tenure and/or promotion are among the most critical in the life of a university. In general, Florida State University evaluates candidates for tenure and/or promotion based on their performance in teaching, research and/or creative accomplishments, and service. This document outlines specific criteria that the School of Communication Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation (PT&E) Committee will apply to candidates. These criteria are consistent with the *Collective Bargaining Agreement*, FSU's *Faculty Handbook*, and FSU's "University Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion." They serve both as a guide for the candidate as (s)he works toward tenure and/or promotion and as a standard of evaluation for members of the departmental PT&E committee. As such, they require careful, deliberate planning by each faculty member who expects to be considered for tenure and/or promotion, and responsible, objective and informed consideration by all who are involved in review and recommendations.

Each faculty member who serves on the PT&E committee ultimately applies his or her judgment to the record of those eligible for tenure and/or promotion. These criteria, if met, should enhance but not guarantee a candidate's likelihood of obtaining tenure and/or promotion. Furthermore, a faculty member who meets the school's criteria is not automatically guaranteed a positive vote at the school, college and university levels.

I. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure in the School of Communication

A. General

1. A doctoral degree from an accredited institution or the highest degree appropriate in the field of specialization.
2. Recognition of demonstrated effectiveness in teaching, service, and scholarly or creative accomplishments.
3. Recognized standing in the discipline and profession.

B. Teaching and Student Committees

1. Evidence of established and consistently strong performance in teaching, as assessed through student and peer evaluations. More specifically, student evaluations of teaching should indicate:

a. A median score of four or higher on Item 13 "Overall Assessment of Instructor" of the SPOT/SUSSAI evaluation form for the candidate in nearly every class taught during the three years immediately preceding candidacy for tenure and promotion.

b. A median score falling on the positive end of the scale for nearly all other instruction-related items on the state-required SUSSAI measure, as well as nearly all instruction-related items on the university-approved SPOT evaluation form, for the candidate in nearly every class taught during the three years immediately preceding candidacy for tenure and promotion.

c. Evidence of steady (or improving, as the case may be) SPOT and SUSSAI ratings over the three years immediately preceding candidacy for tenure and promotion. Improvement is particularly expected in classes taught multiple times.

11

2. Evidence that the candidate's courses are of appropriate intellectual rigor and demand, as assessed through syllabi, evaluations of student performance, and other course materials. With regard to the evaluation of student performance, the grade distribution in the candidate's classes should generally be in keeping with the School of Communication's grade inflation policy (though it is recognized that some classes, such as skills-based or graduate-level courses, do not fit this formula as well as others).

3. Demonstrated commitment to serving on undergraduate honors theses/projects, master's theses/projects, and/or doctoral dissertation committees.

C. Research and Creative Achievement

1. Evidence of an emerging national reputation and recognition based on the quality of research and creative achievement through journal articles, books, book chapters, and/or creative works.

2. A continued record of accomplishment in research and creative work showing a positive pattern of professional development. This record is demonstrated through the:

a. Quantity of the Work: The binder of a typical candidate for tenure and promotion is expected to reflect an average of two publications and/or creative works for every year the candidate was in rank at FSU.

b. Process of review: Works should be blind, peer reviewed; juried; non-blind, peer reviewed; or invited. Generally, those works which are blind, peer reviewed and/or juried (i.e., with a reasonable chance of being rejected) will be afforded the greatest weight.

c. Status of Outlet: Status can be demonstrated through reporting of (when appropriate or available) acceptance rates for journals, festivals, and exhibits; reviews of or acknowledged reputation of the outlet or venue; significance of the work to the field; indexing (for scholarly journals, particularly ISI); and acknowledged reputation of the press (for books and book chapters) and editor(s) (for book chapters).

d. Authorship: The role of the candidate in each project should be clearly reported. In general, a candidate must demonstrate the ability to be an independent scholar/artist who has over time moved away from his/her dissertation work. Also, (s)he should be a significant contributor to a majority of the works listed.

e. Scope and Quality of Work: Scope and quality can be established in a variety of ways including favorable critical reviews, citations, repeated showings of videos, repeated performances, circulation or audience figures, etc.

3. Research and creative work that is distinct, as much as possible, from teaching activities.
4. Confirmation of these criteria and standards of quantity and quality of work by outside letter writers. Candidates may provide the names of outside reviewers to the school director. The school director has the prerogative to select a combination of these and other reviewers in consultation with the candidate and the divisional representative of the PT&E Committee. Outside reviewers of candidates for full professor are expected to be full professors employed

12

at peer or “aspirational” (i.e., an institution with qualities to which FSU aspires) Research Intensive institutions. In addition, the school director should be able to make a strong argument that the letter writer is a recognized authority on the candidate’s area of research or creative activity, especially if the letter writer is not employed at a Research Intensive institution.

D. Service

1. Candidates are expected to have demonstrated an active, constructive role in their unit’s and the overall discipline’s service.
2. Evidence of service might include contributions to the college, university and academic profession through membership on committees, as well as manuscript review for journals and/or active membership in associations and divisions, and committees within those associations.

II. Criteria for Promotion to Professor in the School of Communication

A. General

1. A doctoral degree from an accredited institution or the highest degree appropriate in the field of specialization.
2. Recognition of superior teaching, service, scholarly and/or creative accomplishments of high quality.
3. Recognized standing in the discipline and profession as attested to by three letters from competent scholars outside of the University.

B. Teaching and Student Committees

1. Evidence of established and consistently strong performance in teaching, as assessed through student and peer evaluations. More specifically, student evaluations of teaching should indicate:
 - a. A median score of four or higher on Item 13 “Overall Assessment of Instructor” of the SPOT/SUSSAI evaluation form for the candidate in nearly every class taught during the three years immediately preceding candidacy for promotion.
 - b. A median score falling on the positive end of the scale for nearly all other instruction-related items on the state-required SUSSAI measure, as well as nearly all instruction-related items on the university-approved SPOT evaluation form, for the candidate in nearly every class taught during the three years immediately preceding candidacy for promotion.
 - c. Evidence of steady (or improving, as the case may be) SPOT and SUSSAI ratings over the three years immediately preceding candidacy for promotion. Improvement is particularly expected in classes taught multiple times.
2. Evidence that the candidate’s courses are of appropriate intellectual rigor and demand, as assessed through syllabi, evaluations of student performance, and other course materials. With regard to the evaluation of student performance, the grade distribution in the candidate’s classes should generally

be in keeping with the School of Communication's grade inflation policy (though it is recognized that some classes, such as skills-based or graduate-level courses, do not fit this formula as well as others).

13

3. Quantity and quality of contributions while serving as a chair, member, and/or outside member of committees for undergraduate honors theses/projects, master's theses/projects and doctoral dissertations. Candidates for full professor are expected to have directed doctoral dissertations (preferred) or served as an outside member on committees in their area of expertise.

C. Research and Creative Achievement

1. Evidence of an established national and/or international reputation and recognition based on the quality of research and creative activity through journal articles, books, book chapters, and/or creative works.
2. Strong evidence that the scholarly research that has been published or appeared in refereed/peer-reviewed journals and/or evidence of creative work that has appeared in competitive or juried venues. Journals and venues should largely be what are considered top-tier for the field.
3. A continued record of accomplishment in research and creative work showing a positive and sustained pattern of professional development. This record is demonstrated through the:
 - a. Quantity of the Work: The binder of a typical candidate for promotion is expected to reflect a minimum average of at least one publication and/or creative works for every year the candidate was in rank at FSU. Years in which a candidate served in an administrative position (e.g., school director) would not be included in calculating the average.
 - b. Process of review: Works should be blind, peer reviewed; juried; non-blind, peer reviewed; or invited. Generally, those works which are blind, peer reviewed and/or juried (i.e., with a reasonable chance of being rejected) will be afforded the greatest weight.
 - c. Status of Outlet: Status can be demonstrated through reporting of (when appropriate or available) acceptance rates for journals, festivals, and exhibits; reviews of or acknowledged reputation of the outlet or venue; significance of the work to the field, indexing (for scholarly journals, particularly ISI); and acknowledged reputation of the press (for books and book chapters) and editor(s) (for book chapters).
 - d. Authorship: The role of the candidate in each project should be clearly reported. Also, (s)he should be a significant contributor to a majority of the works listed.
 - e. Scope and Quality of Work: Scope and quality can be established in a variety of ways including favorable critical reviews, citations, repeated showings of videos, repeated performances, circulation or audience figures, etc.
4. Research and creative work that is distinct, as much as possible, from teaching activities.
5. Confirmation of these criteria and standards of quantity and quality of work by outside letter writers. Candidates may provide the names of outside reviewers to the school director. The school director has the prerogative to select a combination of these and other reviewers in consultation with the candidate and the divisional representative of the PT&E Committee. Outside reviewers of candidates for full professor are expected to be full professors employed

14

at peer or “aspirational” (i.e., an institution with qualities to which FSU aspires) Research Intensive institutions. In addition, the school director should be able to make a strong argument that the letter writer is a recognized authority on the candidate’s area of research or creative activity, especially if the letter writer is not employed at a Research Intensive institution.

D. Service

- a. Candidates are expected to have demonstrated an active, leadership role in service in their discipline/profession and at school, college and/or university level.
- b. Evidence of service might include contributions to the school, college, and/or university through mentoring and leadership on committees, and to the academic profession through leadership roles in professional associations (e.g., committee or division chairs, association-wide offices) or professional journals (e.g., editor, editorial board member).

15

APPENDIX C: Annual Evaluation and Merit Procedures for Tenure-Track Faculty

School of Communication, Florida State University
(Approved by the Faculty, February 6, 2013)

The School of Communication is composed of two divisions, Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC) and Media and Communication Studies (MCS). Annual evaluation provides the basis for merit pay considerations. These processes are governed by the FSU Faculty Handbook and the UFF/FSU Collective Bargaining Agreement (2012-2013).

Each January each division elects one member to the Faculty Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation Committee (PT&E) to serve for a two year term (staggered two year terms). Normally, members will be elected to two year terms, with one member from each division elected each year.

These four members (two from each division) undertake annual evaluation ratings, and also serve as the School of Communication faculty promotion and tenure review committee.

Following a format agreed upon by the School, early each spring each faculty member provides information, a narrative summary, and self-evaluation of his/her teaching, research/creative, and service during the preceding calendar year. Faculty members should address the criteria and provide the types of evidence on teaching, research/creative, and service as outlined in the School of Communication statements on Tenure and Promotion or Specialized Faculty Promotion. The Director shall provide his/her material to the dean instead of the PTE for his/her own evaluation.

The PT&E meets, reads these reports and the assignments of responsibility, and discusses them and rates them in writing as to Teaching, Research/Creative, Service, Other, Spoken English, and Overall/Progress in Rank. Committee members provide scores and written feedback to the director for tabulation. The director will keep these scores confidentially until the end of that year’s annual evaluation process at which point the raw scores will be shredded.

Individual committee member scores shall never be added to a faculty member’s Evaluation File.

These ratings use a five point scale:

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

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

16

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

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

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

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

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

The School Director tabulates these scores for each candidate and provides a median and mean score to each faculty member in the annual evaluation letter.

The Division Director for the relevant division and School Director meet with each individual faculty and provide an oral review of that faculty member. Professors may request a meeting with the Dean present. Based upon review of the assignment of responsibility, binders, the meeting with the faculty member, and the PT&E scores and comments, the Division Director drafts an annual evaluation letter, including comments on progress in rank. The School Director will finalize this evaluation, and provide it to the faculty member and add it to the faculty member's file. The Division Director/ School Director may choose to quote from PT&E comments if appropriate and will also provide the mean and median scores PT&E has given the faculty member in the categories of evaluation. The Director may adjust the PT&E's ratings in her/his annual evaluation based on information about the faculty member's work that may not appear in the other materials the PT&E has seen.

Merit:

When merit allocations are announced, the School Director will review annual evaluation scores from the faculty committee since the last merit award, and provide rank ordered recommendations to the Dean.

Meritorious, performance is that which meets or exceeds the high expectations for the position classification and department/unit.

General:

If the faculty member is in agreement with the Director's annual evaluation of her/his work, s/he signs the summary evaluation form. The original shall be placed in the faculty member's official evaluation file by the director. If there is disagreement, the faculty member first meets with the School Director to seek resolution. If that does not produce an outcome acceptable to the faculty member, s/he may appeal to the College Dean. If

that outcome is not satisfactory to the faculty member, s/he may appeal to the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement, following procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook and Collective Bargaining Agreement.

17

APPENDIX D: School of Communication Specialized Faculty Promotion Procedures

School of Communication, Florida State University
(Approved by the Specialized Faculty, April 16, 2014)
(Approved by a Majority of the School Assembly, May 6, 2014)

Criteria for Promotion, Specialized Faculty

Promotion in the specialized faculty ranks is attained through meritorious performance of assigned duties in the faculty member's present position. This document outlines specific criteria that the School of Communication Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation (PT&E) Committee will apply to candidates for Specialized Faculty promotion. These criteria are consistent with the *Collective Bargaining Agreement*, *FSU's Faculty Handbook*, and FSU's minimum requirements for specialized faculty promotion and policies for non-tenure track promotion. They serve both as a guide for the candidate as (s)he works toward promotion and as a standard of evaluation for members of the school P&T committee.

Specialized Faculty are encouraged to review the specific details in the Specialized Faculty Promotion Guidelines and Teaching Track Checklist provided by the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement.

I. Criteria for Promotion to Teaching Faculty II in the School of Communication

A. General

1. Masters degree and five (5) years at the "Teaching Faculty I" rank
or Bachelors degree and seven (7) years at the "Teaching Faculty I" rank
2. Recognition of "demonstrated effectiveness" in the areas of assigned duties.

B. Teaching and Student Committees

1. Evidence of established and consistently strong performance in teaching, as assessed through student and peer evaluations. More specifically, student evaluations of teaching should indicate:
 - a. A median score of "4" to "5" (or equivalent score on the "Excellent / Very Good" end of the scale) on the "Overall Assessment of Instructor" item of the SUSSAI evaluation forms for the candidate in nearly every class taught during the three years immediately preceding candidacy for promotion.
 - b. A median score falling on the "Excellent / Very Good" end of the scale for nearly all other instruction-related items on the state-required SUSSAI measure, as well as nearly all instruction-related items on the university-approved SPOT evaluation form, for the candidate in nearly every class taught during the three years immediately preceding candidacy for promotion.
 - c. Evidence of steady (or improving, as the case may be) SPOT and SUSSAI ratings over the three years immediately preceding candidacy for promotion. Improvement is particularly expected in classes taught multiple times.
2. Evidence that the candidate's courses are of appropriate intellectual rigor and demand, as assessed through syllabi, evaluations of student performance, and other course materials. With regard to the evaluation of student performance, the grade distribution in the candidate's classes should generally be in keeping with the School of Communication's grade inflation

policy (though it is recognized that some classes, such as skills-based or graduate-level courses, do not fit this formula as well as others).

3. Evidence that the candidate's teaching demonstrated achievements and appropriate instructional activities selected from the following:
 - a. nomination for one or more teaching / career recognition awards
 - b. directed, coordinated or staffed one or more short courses or workshops for external audiences
 - c. supervision of Teaching Assistants
 - d. supervision of Directed Individual Studies
 - e. supervision of Internships
 - f. served as a committee member for an undergraduate honor's thesis.

C. Service

1. Candidates are expected to have demonstrated an active, constructive role in their unit's service.

Evidence of service might include contributions to the school, college, university and academic profession through membership on committees, or leadership in student activities.

II. Criteria for Promotion to Teaching Faculty III in the School of Communication

A. General

1. Ph.D. (or terminal degree) or five (5) years experience at the "Teaching Faculty II" ranks.
2. Recognition of "superior performance" in the areas of assigned duties.

B. Teaching and Student Committees

1. Evidence of established and consistently strong performance in teaching, as assessed through student and peer evaluations. More specifically, student evaluations of teaching should indicate:
 - a. A median score of "4" to "5" (or equivalent score on the "Excellent / Very Good" end of the scale) on the "Overall Assessment of Instructor" item of the SUSSAI evaluation forms for the candidate in nearly every class taught during the three years immediately preceding candidacy for promotion.
 - b. A median score falling on the "Excellent / Very Good" end of the scale for nearly all other instruction-related items on the state-required SUSSAI measure, as well as nearly all instruction-related items on the university-approved SPOT evaluation form, for the candidate in nearly every class taught during the three years immediately preceding candidacy for promotion.
 - c. Evidence of steady (or improving, as the case may be) SPOT and SUSSAI ratings over the three years immediately preceding candidacy for promotion. Improvement is particularly expected in classes taught multiple times.

2. Evidence that the candidate's courses are of appropriate intellectual rigor and demand, as assessed through syllabi, evaluations of student performance, and other course materials. With regard to the evaluation of student performance, the grade distribution in the candidate's classes should generally

be in keeping with the School of Communication's grade inflation policy (though it is recognized that some classes, such as skills-based or graduate-level courses, do not fit this formula as well as others).

3. Evidence that the candidate's teaching demonstrated achievements and appropriate instructional activities selected from the following:
 - a. nominated for an FSU teaching or advising award and submitted binder to the committee
 - b. received one or more teaching / career recognition awards
 - c. directed, coordinated or staffed one or more short courses or workshops for external audiences
 - d. supervision of Teaching Assistants
 - e. supervision of Directed Individual Studies
 - f. supervision of Internships
 - g. served as a committee member for an undergraduate honor's thesis
 - h. proven ability to teach multiple courses within a discipline/major
 - i. independently developed and taught a new course in the School
 - j. other teaching-related activities, such as instructional innovation, involvement in curriculum development,
 - k. authorship of educational materials,
 - l. participation in professional organizations related to the area of instruction.

C. Service

1. Candidates are expected to have demonstrated an active, leadership role in service in their discipline/profession and at school, college and/or university level.
2. Evidence of service might include contributions to the school, college, and/or university through mentoring and leadership on committees, or in leadership in student activities.

20

APPENDIX E: Annual Evaluation and Merit Procedures for Specialized Faculty

School of Communication, Florida State University
(Approved by the Specialized Faculty, April 16, 2014)
(Approved by a Majority of the School Assembly, May 6, 2014)

The School of Communication Specialized Faculty Evaluation (SFE) committee, acting as a "committee of the whole" shall undertake annual evaluation ratings.

Following a format agreed upon by the School, early each spring each Specialized Faculty member provides information, including a self-evaluation of his/her teaching, service, and research/creative activities, where applicable, during the preceding calendar year. Faculty members should address the criteria and provide the types of evidence on teaching, service, and research/creative activities as outlined in the School of Communication statements on evaluation and promotion of Specialized Faculty.

The SFE committee meets, reads these reports and the assignments of responsibility, and discusses them and rates them anonymously in writing, where applicable, as to Teaching, Service, Research/Creative, Other, Spoken English, and Overall/Progress in Rank.

These ratings use a five point scale:

5. Substantially Exceeds High Expectations – This describes a faculty member who far exceeds performance expectations during the evaluation period and achieves an extraordinary accomplishment or recognition in teaching, service, research/creative activities
4. Exceeds FSU's High Expectations: This describes an individual who exceeds expectations during the evaluation period by virtue of demonstrating noted achievements or recognition in teaching, service, research/creative activities

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

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

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

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

A Performance Improvement Plan is required when a Specialized Faculty member receives a "Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations" rating.

The School Director tabulates the rating scores for each candidate and provides a median and mean score to each Specialized Faculty member in the annual evaluation letter.

21

The Division Director for the relevant division and School Director meet with each individual faculty and provide an oral review of that faculty member. Specialized Faculty III may request a meeting with the Dean present. Based upon review of the assignment of responsibility, binders, the meeting with the faculty member, and the SFE scores and comments, the Division Director drafts an annual evaluation letter, including comments on progress in rank. The School Director will finalize this evaluation, and provide it to the faculty member and add it to the faculty member's file. The Division Director/ School Director may choose to quote from SFE comments if appropriate and will also provide the mean and median scores the SFE committee has given the faculty member in the four categories of evaluation. The Director may adjust the SFE's ratings in her/his annual evaluation based on information about the faculty member's work that may not appear in the other materials the SFE committee has seen.

Merit:

When merit allocations are announced, the School Director will review annual evaluation scores from the faculty committee since the last merit award, and provide rank ordered recommendations to the Dean.

Meritorious, performance is that which meets or exceeds the high expectations for the position classification and department/unit.

General:

If the faculty member is in agreement with the Director's annual evaluation of her/his work, s/he signs the summary evaluation form and returns a copy to the Director to be placed in the College file. If there is disagreement, the faculty member first meets with the School Director to seek resolution. If that does not produce an outcome acceptable to the faculty member, s/he may appeal to the College Dean. If that outcome is not satisfactory to the faculty member, s/he may appeal to the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement, following procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook and Collective Bargaining Agreement.

22