FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF INFORMATION PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE-LINE FACULTY

Approved by the School of Information Faculty on 22 April 2020
Replaces version approved on 12 April 2017
Updated with Guidelines for Promotion to Full Professor on 2 December 2020

INTRODUCTION

General criteria and procedures that govern the evaluation of faculty performance at Florida State University are established by:

1. the FSU Faculty Handbook (https://facultyhandbook.fsu.edu/),

2. the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the University and the United Faculty of Florida Chapter for FSU (http://uff-fsu.org/), and

3. the Resources developed by the University's Office of Faculty Development and Advancement (https://fda.fsu.edu/faculty-development/).

Specific criteria and procedures that complement these general criteria and procedures for tenure-line faculty in the School of Information are established by this document.

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Tenure-line faculty are reviewed annually by the Director of the School of Information, and by the School's Evaluation Promotion and Tenure Committee, which conducts Third Year Reviews and Promotion and Tenure reviews for tenure-line faculty below the rank of full professor.

Annual Reviews

Faculty in the School of Information are evaluated annually during the Spring semester by the Director of the School based on their assigned duties for the previous calendar year, and following procedures established by the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement.

As part of this annual review, faculty members not at terminal rank shall receive an Annual Progress toward Promotion letter from the Director that addresses their progress on research,

teaching, and service in terms of their Assignment of Responsibilities, and provides clear and specific feedback regarding what they need to accomplish to achieve promotion and/or tenure.

Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consult informally and frequently with their faculty mentor(s) or members of the School's Evaluation Promotion and Tenure committee about their progress toward promotion and/or tenure at any time.

Third Year Reviews

Untenured professors in tenure-earning positions shall receive an in-depth review of their progress toward promotion and tenure during the Spring semester of their third year of tenure-earning service. This review is intended to determine whether the faculty member is making adequate progress toward achieving promotion and tenure in the School of Information, and is conducted by the School's Evaluation Promotion and Tenure committee. The resulting report from this review takes the place of the Director's Annual Progress toward Promotion letter.

Candidates for Third Year Review must prepare an electronic binder of materials, including copies of the candidate's publications or creative activities, following the instructions as detailed in the most recent Promotion and Tenure Memo released by the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement with the following exceptions:

1. the Dean's letter, Director's letter, and Outside letters (and their related supporting materials) are not required to be included; and

2. the candidate's Discussion of Teaching, Research, and Service should include a detailed statement of their future goals and plan of work for research, teaching, and service.

These materials are due to the School's Evaluation Promotion and Tenure committee no later than the first Monday immediately following FSU's Spring Break. As long as the University's eBinder system cannot be used for conducting Third Year Reviews, these materials should be organized into folders and shared with the committee electronically.

Promotion and Tenure Reviews

Promotion- and/or tenure-eligible faculty will be considered for promotion and/or tenure during the Fall semester. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure must prepare an electronic binder of materials, including copies of the candidate's publications or creative activities, using the University's eBinder system, and following the instructions as detailed in the most recent Promotion and Tenure Memo released by the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement.

Candidates' eBinders will be reviewed by the School's Evaluation Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Tenured Faculty (in cases of tenure only), the School's Director, the College of Communication and Information's Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the College's Dean before being submitted to the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

In accordance with the School's mission statement, tenure-line faculty in the School of Information are expected to make continuing contributions to the information and technology professions by connecting people, information, and technology for the betterment of society through research, teaching, and service according to their Assignment of Responsibilities.

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor shall be based on recognition of demonstrated effectiveness in teaching, service, scholarly or creative accomplishments, and recognized standing in the discipline and profession at the national level.

Promotion to the rank of Professor shall be based on recognition of superior teaching, service, scholarly or creative accomplishments of high quality, and recognized standing in the discipline and profession at the international level.

Research

Tenure-line faculty in the School of Information are expected to produce scholarly and/or creative works according to their assignment of responsibilities, and meet the university's high expectations for research productivity and excellence as appropriate for their rank.

Criteria for promotion and/or tenure depend on both the quality and quantity of the candidate's scholarly and/or creative works, as well as the cohesiveness of the candidate's overall research agenda. Collaborative scholarship is encouraged and valued. In the case of collaborative work, candidates are expected to identify their contributions to the research effort, and the School's Evaluation Promotion and Tenure committee will consider these contribution levels, along with the type and quality of publication venues, when reviewing overall research productivity.

To guide the evaluation of faculty scholarly and/or creative activities in the multidisciplinary field of information studies, the School of Information has identified three research models. Candidates should choose one model that most closely represents their research contributions and explicitly identify that model in their Discussion of Teaching, Research, and Service statements. If their work departs from the model they have chosen in any significant way, or if candidates wish to propose an alternative model, this should be clearly explained and justified in that statement. Alternative models should emphasize the production of scholarly and/or creative

works that can be and will be peer reviewed, and should include benchmarks that align in overall amount of output to the existing models.

Social Sciences

This research model puts an emphasis on peer-reviewed journal articles.

Expectations at Third Year Review

1. At least two peer-reviewed journal articles accepted or published, and at least two other journal manuscripts in preparation or submitted.

2. Two grant proposals as PI or Co-PI (one of which is external to the University) submitted into competition to support their research agenda, or one funded grant.

3. Additional consideration will be given to peer-reviewed conference proceedings, peer-reviewed book chapters, and/or books accepted for publication or published by a university or other academic press using peer review.

Expectations for Promotion and Tenure

1. Eight or more peer-reviewed journal articles accepted or published.

2. Three grant proposals as PI or Co-PI (two of which are external to the University) submitted into competition to support their research agenda, or two funded grants.

3. Additional consideration will be given to peer-reviewed conference proceedings, peer-reviewed book chapters, and/or books accepted for publication or published by a university or other academic press using peer review.

Technology

This research model puts an emphasis on peer-reviewed scholarly conference proceedings from "prestige" conferences (typically those sponsored by organizations such as ACM, IEEE, etc.).

Expectations at Third Year Review

1. Three or four single- or collaboratively-authored research presentations at "prestige" scholarly conferences (with print or electronic proceedings) that have been peer reviewed. Faculty members are expected to act as primary contributor on at least some of

these proceeding publications. For collaboratively authored proceedings, faculty should include a statement detailing their percentage of contribution for each item.

2. One or two single- or collaboratively-authored research articles accepted or published in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal. Faculty members are encouraged to act as primary contributor whenever possible. For collaboratively authored publications, faculty should include a statement detailing their percentage of contribution for each item.

3. Two grant proposals submitted into competition to support their research agenda. It is strongly recommended that candidates either have served or be currently serving as PI or co-PI on a research grant at the time of their third year review.

4. Significant software and/or system development will also be considered as appropriate. Candidates should include any products or a discussion of the results of their software or system development work in their dossier. Additional outside letters may also be solicited, if justified by the nature of the candidate's research record. These additional letters may be from academic or corporate researchers as appropriate for the project, and should evaluate the candidate's work. Candidates should include any products or a discussion of the results of their software or system development work in their dossier.

Expectations for Promotion and Tenure

1. Six to ten single- or collaboratively-authored research presentations at "prestige" scholarly conferences (with print or electronic proceedings) that have been peer reviewed. Faculty members are expected to act as primary contributor on at least some of these proceeding publications. For collaboratively authored proceedings, faculty should include a statement detailing their percentage of contribution for each item.

2. Three single- or collaboratively-authored research articles accepted or published in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal. Faculty members are encouraged to act as primary contributor whenever possible. For collaboratively authored publications, faculty should include a statement detailing their percentage of contribution for each item.

3. Four grant proposals submitted into competition to support their research agenda. Significant experience as PI or Co-PI on grant projects is also expected.

4. Significant software and/or system development will also be considered as appropriate. Candidates should include any products or a discussion of the results of their software or system development work in their dossier. Additional outside letters may also be solicited, if justified by the nature of the candidate's research record. These additional

letters may be from academic or corporate researchers as appropriate for the project, and should evaluate the candidate's work. Candidates should include any products or a discussion of the results of their software or system development work in their dossier.

Humanities

This research model puts an emphasis on single-authored books published by a university or other academic press using peer review.

Expectations at Third Year Review

1. One single-authored book (which can be a revised dissertation) accepted for publication by a university or other academic press using peer review. The candidate should demonstrate that their manuscript has been peer reviewed by supplying comments made by outside reviewers contacted by the publisher.

2. One single-authored research article published in a peer reviewed scholarly journal, or in a book of essays published by a peer-reviewed press, and one additional single-authored research article either accepted for publication or published in a peer reviewed scholarly journal, or in a book of essays published by a peer-reviewed press.

3. One grant proposal submitted into competition to support their research agenda.

Expectations for Promotion and Tenure

1. One single-authored book published by a university or other academic press using peer review. The candidate should supply all published reviews of the book.

2. Research completed on a second single-authored book that can be (or has been) submitted to a university or other academic press using peer review. The candidate should demonstrate that research has been completed on this book by providing a summary of their research activities, and a ten-page précis of the book on which the candidate is working. This précis will identify what unique contribution this book will make in the context of other scholarship on the same subject.

3. Two single-authored research articles published in a peer reviewed scholarly journal, or in a book of essays published by a peer-reviewed press, and two additional single-authored research articles either accepted for publication or published in a peer reviewed scholarly journal, or in a book of essays published by a peer-reviewed press.

4. Three grant proposals submitted into competition to support their research agenda.

Teaching

Tenure-line faculty in the School of Information are expected to teach undergraduate and/or graduate courses according to their assignment of responsibilities, and meet the university's high expectations for teaching productivity and excellence as appropriate for their rank.

Expectations at Third Year Review

1. Evidence of well-planned and delivered courses following University regulations.

2. Student course evaluations have a median score of 3.5 or higher on SPCI #13 (overall assessment of instructor), or a demonstrated effort to improve teaching.

3. Peer reviews of teaching (at least one) show no major problems with teaching, or a demonstrated effort to improve teaching.

4. Evidence of willingness to assist with course revision, course development, curriculum planning, or other teaching-related activities such as instructional innovation, authorship of educational materials, or participation in professional organizations in the area of instruction.

5. Evidence of willingness to support independent student learning in the form of directed individual studies, internships, or research collaborations.

6. Demonstrated progress toward independently directing doctoral students, including serving on at least one doctoral supervisory committee.

Expectations for Promotion and Tenure

1. Evidence of well-planned and delivered courses following University regulations.

2. Student course evaluations have a median score of 3.5 or higher on SPCI #13 (overall assessment of instructor), or a demonstrated effort to improve teaching.

3. Peer reviews of teaching (at least two) show no major problems with teaching, or a demonstrated effort to improve teaching.

4. Evidence of sustained willingness to assist with course revision, course development, curriculum planning, or other teaching-related activities such as instructional innovation, authorship of educational materials, or participation in professional organizations in the area of instruction.

5. Evidence of sustained willingness to support independent student learning in the form of directed individual studies, internships, or research collaborations.

6. Demonstrated progress toward independently directing doctoral students, including acting as major professor for at least one doctoral student, and serving on at least one other doctoral supervisory committee.

Service

Tenure-line faculty in the School of Information are expected to serve on School, College, and/or University committees according to their assignment of responsibilities, and to provide regular service to their profession or academic discipline as appropriate for their rank.

Expectations at Third Year Review

1. Active, effective, and collegial participation on assigned committees in the School of Information (untenured faculty are typically assigned to one committee per academic year), including regular attendance and participation at committee meetings, and demonstrated willingness to serve as a member of subcommittees and other groups.

2. Active, effective, and collegial participation on one College or University committee, or active participation as liaison to another unit on campus, advisor to a student organization, or representative of the School at University functions.

3. Active, effective, and collegial service to the profession or academic discipline including but not limited to participating in professional organizations at the local, state, national, or international level, serving on the advisory board of a professional journal, serving as editor, associate editor, or manuscript reviewer for a peer-reviewed journal, academic press, or external funding agency, or providing non-funded professional service to the community.

Expectations for Promotion and Tenure

1. A consistent record of active, effective, and collegial participation on assigned committees in the School of Information, including regular attendance and participation at committee meetings, and demonstrated willingness to serve as a member of subcommittees and other groups. Participation in the leadership of committees and/or subcommittees, such as serving as a committee chair, is encouraged.

2. A consistent record of active, effective, and collegial participation on at least one College or University committee, or active participation as liaison to another unit on campus, advisor to a student organization, or representative of the School at University functions.

3. A consistent record of active, effective, and collegial service to the profession or academic discipline including but not limited to substantive participation in professional organizations at the local, state, national, or international level (e.g., chairing a standing committee, organizing a conference panel, serving as an officer, etc.), serving on the advisory board of a professional journal, serving as editor, associate editor, or manuscript reviewer for a peer-reviewed journal, academic press, or external funding agency, or providing non-funded professional service to the community.

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

A candidate seeking promotion to the rank of Professor must provide evidence of high quality and impactful scholarly work, superior teaching and mentoring, as well as demonstrated leadership in academic and/or professional organizations and/or in the community.

Overall, to be considered for this rank, the candidate must demonstrate substantive progress and distinction in achieving excellence in research, teaching, and service beyond that required at the Associate Professor level. Moreover, the iSchool recognizes that faculty involvement in governance and mentoring is critical for the life and success of academic units, universities, and professional organizations. It is expected that after tenure, faculty may take on more substantial service or administrative roles and responsibilities at the University or in their professions. In these cases, criteria for promotion to full professor will provide increased consideration to excellent and significant contributions to teaching, service, and/or administration, according to the candidate's Assignment of Responsibilities.

Research Criteria

- Evidence of nationally and/or internationally recognized expertise and scholarship in well-articulated and fully developed research area(s).

- Evidence of continued engagement and substantive impact in scholarly communication activities, such as publications and presentations.

- Demonstrated ability to support research activities through research grants, collaborations, and/or partnerships.

Teaching Criteria

- Evidence of effective teaching, advising, and mentoring of students.

- Evidence of increasing service on dissertation committees (either internally or externally) and/or directing doctoral dissertations (preferred).

- Contributions to curriculum and course development, and/or other instructional activities.

Service Criteria

- Evidence of active participation in governance at the school, college, and/or university levels and demonstrated leadership within those service/administrative roles.

- Significant academic and professional record and reputation of leadership and service to the field of study at the national or international level.

- Demonstrated leadership through service that positively impacts one or more of the following: scholarly associations, scholarly publishing, professional practice, or society.