

FSU-4.033 Faculty Evaluations.

(1) Purpose, Scope and Sources of Evaluation.

~~(a) Each faculty member, tenured and non-tenured, shall be evaluated at least once annually on the basis of his or her individual total performance in fulfilling responsibilities to the University. The basic purpose of the evaluation is faculty improvement in the functions of teaching, research, service, and any other duties that may be assigned, with the resulting enhancement of learning, cultural advancement and the production of new knowledge. This evaluation shall precede and be considered in recommendations and final decisions on tenure, promotions, salary increments, and retention or termination.~~

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

~~(c) The performance of each faculty member shall be evaluated in accordance with the policy of the Board of Regents expressed in Board of Regents Rule 6C-5.005, F.A.C., Florida State University procedures for implementation of Board of Regents policy, school and departmental criteria and procedures on annual evaluation of faculty.~~

~~(d) The evaluation of each faculty member with respect to teaching, research or creative activity and service shall be the responsibility of each departmental chairman (or equivalent) in accordance with SUS Rules. The following minimum procedures shall be employed by the departmental chairman (or equivalent) in arriving at the faculty evaluation:~~

~~Evidence of Performance—Implementing SUS policy, the departmental chairman (or equivalent) shall request each member of the faculty to submit to him annually, evidence of his performance in teaching, research or creative activities, and service (and other University duties where appropriate), together with any interpretive comments or supporting data which the faculty member deems appropriate in evaluating his or her performance.~~

~~When appropriate, each faculty member shall submit annually to the departmental chairman (or equivalent) the results of the administration of SIRS student evaluation instrument or any equivalent tool subsequently adopted by the University. In conjunction with this submission, the faculty member may also present such other evidence of teaching effectiveness as deemed to be~~

~~appropriate in the circumstances. Such evidence may include alternative evaluations by students, faculty or administrators. The departmental chairman (or equivalent) may also devise alternative means of assessing teaching effectiveness.~~

~~(e) If a faculty member is on leave of absence for all or part of one or more academic years, the last evaluation preceding the commencement of the leave of absence shall suffice in meeting the annual evaluation requirement. For purposes of salary determination, promotion or tenure, and at the option of the faculty member, the departmental chairman (or equivalent) may review such relevant information as the faculty member wishes to present concerning teaching, research or service during the period of his leave. Such performance shall be evaluated in the manner prescribed above.~~

~~(2) Reporting Procedures.~~

~~(a) A written summary of the evaluation of the faculty member will be prepared annually and discussed with the faculty member concerned. A Faculty Evaluation Summary Form based upon the Board of Regents Rules shall be used. This Faculty Evaluation Summary shall be prepared annually as of June 15 of each year on each member of the faculty. The faculty shall be those defined by the Florida State University Constitution.~~

~~(b) The evaluator will normally be the departmental chairman (or equivalent). In those schools and colleges designated by the Executive Vice President, the evaluator will be the Dean. Each evaluator shall be familiar with Rule 6C-5.005, F.A.C., of the Board of Regents Rules for a definition of procedure and data to be used in the annual evaluation of the faculty. The Faculty Evaluation Summary will be reviewed by the appropriate administrative officer which will normally be the Dean of the College or School in which the faculty member holds his faculty position. When the Dean of a School or College is designated the evaluator, the Faculty Evaluation Summary will be reviewed by the Division Provost.~~

~~(c) Personnel holding joint appointments in other areas, departments or divisions shall be evaluated using the same form but such summary shall be marked concurrent. Each departmental chairman (or equivalent) shall evaluate the faculty member only with respect to his principal duties within that unit. Such concurrent summaries shall be forwarded to the Dean of the School or College in which the faculty member holds a faculty position. This procedure is to insure that each person holding a faculty position is evaluated annually and that all factors are considered in such an evaluation.~~

~~(d) Departmental chairman (or equivalent) shall be evaluated by their respective Deans and such Faculty Evaluation Summary reviewed by the Division Provost.~~

~~(e) A special report may be required in cases where the Dean disagrees with his departmental chairman (or equivalent) as outlined below. In the event of the termination of a faculty member, whether it be voluntary or involuntary, at a date other than May or June, a special report will be prepared. A special report may also be required when directed by the President, Executive Vice President, or the Dean of the Faculties.~~

~~(f) After completion of the Faculty Evaluation Summary by the departmental chairman (or equivalent) such summary will be discussed with the faculty member concerned by the evaluator. The faculty member may attach to the summary any statement he desires. In addition, in the case of an unsatisfactory evaluation, the departmental chairman (or equivalent) shall fully document the unsatisfactory performance prior to discussion with the faculty member. The departmental chairman (or equivalent) will propose in written form to the faculty member specific recommendations to assist the faculty member in achieving at least a satisfactory rating. The recommendation should be implemented within an academic year. Examples of recommendations could include: study at another university or even study on the campus of FSU (course titles and particular professors should be specified); provision to work with or to observe the work of an outstanding professor; participation in departmental staff development programs, etc. After discussion is completed and attachments made (if any), the faculty member will indicate that the evaluation has been reviewed by signing the Summary and indicating the number of pages attached to it.~~

~~(g) Upon the completion of the discussion with the faculty member, the Faculty Evaluation Summary will be forwarded to the Dean. If the Dean agrees with it, he shall so indicate by affixing his signature. In the event he disagrees, the Dean may discuss his area of disagreement with the preparer of the summary at which time two courses of action are available to the Dean:~~

~~1. The Dean may submit his own Evaluation Summary, or~~

~~2. The Chairman (or equivalent) may revise the original summary. Departmental chairmen (or equivalent) are encouraged to discuss the Faculty Evaluation Summary with their respective deans prior to discussion with the faculty member being evaluated. When a Special Faculty Evaluation Summary is prepared, the original Faculty Evaluation Summary must be attached to the special summary.~~

~~(3) Disposition of Summary.~~

~~(a) When the overall performance of a faculty member is satisfactory or better and the Summary has been reviewed by the Dean (or Division Provost where the Dean is the evaluator), the Faculty Evaluation Summary will be filed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file together with any attachments. The contents of the faculty evaluation file shall be confidential and shall not be disclosed except to the faculty member evaluated and those whose duties require access.~~

~~(b) When the overall performance is less than satisfactory, the Faculty Evaluation Summary shall be forwarded to the President of the University via the Division Provost and the Dean of the Faculties with appropriate recommendation as to action to be taken as outlined in the Board of Regents Rules.~~

~~(4) Provision for Appeal.~~

~~(a) In the event that a faculty member is dissatisfied with the Faculty Evaluation Summary, this procedure allows the faculty member to register his or her disagreement in writing. In addition, review may be sought through normal administrative channels.~~

~~(b) If the faculty member is not satisfied with the summary prepared by the departmental chairman or equivalent, he may present his or her request for review in writing to the Dean within ten (10) days after being informed of the chairman's evaluation. Unless a request for review is in writing, the faculty member will have no right to insist on time limits, but nothing should preclude a Dean from acting on all complaints. The Dean, like the departmental chairman (or equivalent), should have complete freedom of action in seeking to settle or resolve differences concerning evaluation summaries and presumably his efforts will be largely conciliatory. The Dean shall within ten (10) days of receipt of the written request for review meet with the faculty member to discuss the request, and the Dean shall within fifteen (15) days of receipt of the written request reach his decision.~~

~~(c) If the faculty member is not satisfied with the Dean's decision, he may request in writing a review from the Division Provost within ten (10) days after the Dean's decision. The Division Provost shall within ten (10) days of receipt of the written grievance meet with the member to discuss his request. The Division Provost shall within twenty (20) days of the receipt of the written request reach his decision.~~

~~(d) The appeal of the decision of a Division Provost may be made to the chief academic officer~~

~~via the Dean of the Faculties. Such a report for review should be made in writing within ten (10) days after the Provost's decision. The chief academic officer shall within ten (10) days of the receipt of the written grievance meet with the faculty member to discuss his request. The chief academic officer shall within twenty (20) days of the receipt of the written request reach his decision.~~

~~Specific Authority BOG Regulation 1.001(3)(j) , Reg. Procedure July 21, 2005 . Law Implemented 240.227(1), 240.245 FS. History New 9-30-75, Formerly 6C2-4.33.~~