

Bylaws for the School of Information, College of Communication and Information

Record of Substantive Revisions and Amendments to these Bylaws

Approved by the School of Information Faculty on 22 April 2020 Replaces version
approved on 28 February 2018

These are the bylaws for the School of Information in the College of Communication and Information at Florida State University. These bylaws were last approved on 22 April 2020 by a majority of the applicable voting members of the school and on 13 June 2022, by the College and the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement.

Preamble (optional)

These Bylaws are established to assist the School of Information (hereinafter, “the School”) with conducting its business efficiently and with fairness to all concerned.

I. Bylaws

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

B. Bylaws Revision.

1. Any member of the Faculty may propose amendments to these Bylaws.
2. Except in the case of an emergency, as determined by the Director or by a majority of the Faculty, proposed amendments to these Bylaws shall be distributed to the Faculty at least one week prior to the meeting at which they will be considered, and shall include a brief rationale written by those proposing the amendment(s).
3. A majority of the Faculty voting in the affirmative is required to adopt any amendment to these Bylaws.

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

II. Membership and Voting Rights

A. Faculty Membership. The faculty of the School of Information shall consist of those persons holding full-time, tenure-line and specialized faculty appointments at all ranks. The Faculty shall serve as the basic legislative body for the School of Information.

B. Department Membership. In addition to the faculty defined in II. A above, the following are members of the School of Information: full-time staff, Emeritus Faculty, individuals holding courtesy appointments, Doctoral Students, Post-Doctoral Scholars, and Visiting Scholars.

C. Faculty Voting Rights. All full-time faculty in the School, including tenure-line and specialized faculty, shall have the right to vote on all faculty matters except where otherwise specified.

1. A simple majority of the voting members of the Faculty shall constitute a quorum.
2. A simple majority of those voting in person, by proxy vote, by electronic vote, or by secret ballot shall determine the outcome in all votes of the Faculty. Another vote

shall be called for in the event of a tie, and this process will continue until the tie is broken.

3. Faculty may cast a proxy vote at any meeting from which they will be absent by notifying the Director (or their designated representative) in advance. The notification must include the name of the faculty member who will cast the proxy vote, and indicate the questions for which that faculty member is authorized to cast the proxy vote.
4. Faculty may cast (or be asked to cast) an electronic vote. The Director of the School shall be responsible for communicating the question and designating the individual to whom electronic ballots should be sent. Those voting shall exercise due caution to ensure their ballots are sent only to the individual designated to collect the votes.
5. Faculty may request a secret ballot vote on any issue. A secret ballot is required for any elections to office, personnel decisions, and promotion and/or tenure votes.
6. Three members of the Faculty, working separately, shall count and validate votes when using secret or electronic ballots. All secret or electronic ballots shall be maintained for inspection for at least ten working days.
7. Specialized faculty may not vote on issues related to the promotion and/or tenure of tenure-line faculty.
8. The Faculty may reflect upon and deliberate any issue of general interest to the School, College, or University, and make their recommendations known to the appropriate unit, individual, or committee.

D. Non-faculty Voting Rights. Non-faculty department members (identified in II.B.) do not have the right to vote on faculty matters.

III. Department Organization and Governance

A. Faculty Meetings.

1. The Faculty shall meet at least once during each of the Fall and Spring semesters.
2. Special sessions shall be held at the call of the Director, either on their own initiative or at the written request of no fewer than four members of the Faculty.
3. The Director shall be the presiding officer at the faculty meeting. If the Director is absent, a faculty member shall be appointed by the Director to preside over the meeting.
4. Any member of the Faculty or School committee may request that a discussion or action item be put on the agenda for a faculty meeting. The Director's Representative shall issue a call for agenda items at least one week prior to each faculty meeting.
5. The Director's Representative shall distribute the agenda for each faculty meeting to the Faculty at least one week prior to the meeting.
6. Meeting minutes from the most recent faculty meeting will be distributed to the Faculty at least one week prior to the next faculty meeting.

B. School Director Selection.

1. The Director is the chief academic and administrative officer of the School.
 - a. The Director must be a tenured member of the Faculty of the School.

- b. The Director is appointed by the Dean to a term of up to three years, as designated in the College Bylaws. On the recommendation of the Faculty, a Director may be reappointed for an additional term of up to three more years.
 - c. Six months before the term of the current Director is to expire, the Dean will contact the Faculty requesting recommendations for one or more candidates to serve as the next Director of the School. These candidates will be given the opportunity to present to the Faculty their vision, goals, and plans for the School.
 - d. Faculty will vote for the next Director by secret ballot. The results of the vote will be provided to the Dean, who will make the final appointment. The results of the vote will also be shared with the Faculty within five business days.
 - e. The Director is evaluated by the Dean and the Faculty (through the Evaluation Promotion and Tenure Committee) each year.
2. Associate Directors may be appointed to assist the Director in their duty as the chief academic and administrative officer of the School.
 - a. Associate Directors must be full-time faculty members (tenure-line or specialized) in the School.
 - b. Associate Directors are appointed by the Director, based on recommendations provided by the faculty.
 - c. Associate Directors serve terms of up to three years. These terms are renewable at the discretion of the Director, based on feedback provided by the faculty.
 - d. Associate Directors are evaluated by the Director and the Faculty (through the Evaluation Promotion and Tenure Committee) each year.
 3. In situations where no member of the Faculty is willing to serve as Director, or no candidate for the Director position is approved by the Faculty, then the Faculty will meet with the Dean of the College to determine an appropriate succession plan.

C. School Leadership and Committees.

1. The School employs three types of committees to accomplish its goals: Appointed Committees, Elected Committees, and Ad Hoc Committees. These committees have ongoing responsibilities as well as responsibilities that change from year to year.
 - a. Appointed Committees are charged with formulating policy and overseeing procedures that support the academic and operational concerns of the School.
 - i. The Members of each Appointed Committee, including its Chair, shall be appointed by the Director, in consultation with the Faculty, each year, and will normally be reappointed to the same committee for up to three years.
 - ii. Each Appointed Committee shall invite at least one currently enrolled student from each of the School's relevant degree programs to serve as a non-voting member of the committee as appropriate.
 - iii. The Director (or designee) will serve as an ex-officio member of each Appointed Committee.

- b. The School of Information's Elected Committee is the Evaluation Promotion and Tenure Committee.
 - i. Members of the Evaluation Promotion and Tenure Committee, including its Chair, shall be elected by a secret ballot vote no later than the end of March each academic year. Faculty members who are being considered for promotion and/or tenure (or whose spouse or partner is being considered for promotion and/or tenure), the Director of the School, and the Dean of the College are ineligible to be elected to this committee.
 - ii. Tenure-line faculty shall elect five eligible tenure-line faculty, including the Chair, to the Evaluation Promotion and Tenure Committee. Specialized faculty shall elect three eligible specialized faculty to the Evaluation Promotion and Tenure Committee. Tenure-earning faculty may be elected to the Evaluation Promotion and Tenure Committee, as long as tenured faculty members comprise a majority of the tenure-line faculty on the Evaluation Promotion and Tenure Committee.
 - iii. The Chair of the Evaluation Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be a tenured faculty member who has served on this committee at least once in the past three years. It is preferable that the Chair serve for two consecutive years and for no more than three consecutive years.
 - c. Ad Hoc committees may be formed each year and tasked in writing by the Faculty or the Director in order to enhance the School's ability to accomplish its mission.
 - i. Ad Hoc committees will normally complete their work within the confines of a single academic year.
 - ii. In situations where the activity of an Ad Hoc committee needs to be ongoing, the Faculty will be asked to advise the Director regarding their preference for continuing the Ad Hoc committee, moving the charge of the committee to an existing Appointed Committee, or establishing an additional Appointed Committee.
2. The Director shall update the School's committee structure as recommended by the Faculty, appoint members to the Appointed Committees, and ensure that elections for Elected Committees are held in a timely manner each year.
- a. The Director shall present the proposed committee structures and membership for the coming academic year, along with the charges and responsibilities of each committee, to the Faculty prior to the Fall faculty retreat each year.
 - b. Committees shall review, modify, and identify their goals and objectives for the current academic year at the Fall faculty retreat, and report on their committees' planned objectives at the first faculty meeting of the academic year.
 - c. The Faculty shall vote on any proposed revisions to the committee structure for the academic year following the Fall faculty retreat.
3. Responsibilities of School Committees

- a. The Education Committee is an Appointed Committee, comprising the chairs or co-chairs of each of the School's academic programs, that oversees curriculum and accreditation activities in the School.
- b. The Student Experience Committee is an Appointed Committee that oversees student scholarships and awards, student engagement, and extracurricular student activities in the School.
- c. The Operations Committee is an Appointed Committee that oversees administrative, financial, and operational activities in the School.
- d. The Personnel Committee is an Appointed Committee that handles the business of recruiting and selecting new faculty. The responsibilities of the Personnel Committee include:
 - i. Drafting job descriptions that are reflective of the School's research, teaching, and service needs in accordance with University policy.
 - ii. Advertising the position through online media, professional associations, and conference venues as required by and in accordance with University policy.
 - iii. Soliciting the assistance of other faculty to carry out the duties of recruitment efforts when necessary (e.g., contacting candidates, interviewing candidates, etc.).
 - iv. Informing the Faculty at key junctions of the recruitment process (e.g., job description, short list, evaluations, etc.), and making applications and evaluation materials (CVs, letters, statements) for all applicants available to the faculty throughout the process in accordance with University policy.
 - v. Recommending candidates to the Faculty, arranging campus visits, and soliciting faculty involvement during campus visits and throughout the process
 - vi. Completing and submitting all documentation to meet University requirements.
 - vii. The Chair is responsible for coordinating the activities of the committee and for making sure School, College, and University policies are followed. The Chair is also responsible for ensuring that all required reporting is completed accurately and that deadlines are met.
 - viii. After all candidates selected have visited campus, the committee will solicit faculty feedback regarding the appropriateness of the candidates for the positions. This feedback will be collected by secret ballot poll and a ranked-order list will be compiled. The results of the vote and rankings of candidates will be provided to the Faculty within three business days of the vote. This vote will serve to advise the Director and Dean regarding the Faculty's preferences.
- e. The Evaluation Promotion and Tenure Committee is an Elected Committee that conducts departmental merit reviews, considers all tenure-line and specialized faculty members who are eligible for promotion and/or tenure, and oversees the evaluation of the Director. The responsibilities of the Evaluation Promotion and Tenure Committee include:
 - i. Developing Annual Goals and conducting Departmental Merit Reviews for all Faculty each year using procedures and instruments

- approved by the faculty, and providing the results of these reviews to the Director and the Dean of the College.
- ii. Reviewing all tenure-line faculty who are eligible for Third Year Review, Promotion and/or Tenure, or Promotion to Full Professor as per the School's "Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Procedures for Tenure-Line Faculty." Only the tenure-line faculty members of the Evaluation Promotion and Tenure Committee conduct these reviews.
 - iii. Reviewing all specialized faculty who are eligible for Promotion to Rank II or Promotion to Rank III as per the School's "Promotion Criteria and Procedures for Specialized Faculty."
 - iv. Overseeing Peer Reviews of Teaching for all eligible faculty.
 - v. Evaluating the Director (and Associate Directors) each year, using procedures and instruments approved by the faculty, and providing the results of this evaluation to the Director and the Dean of the College. This evaluation must provide the opportunity for participation of all Faculty, and ensure that the provided feedback preserves the anonymity of the participants to the full extent possible.

D. Faculty Senators. All tenure-line faculty in the School are eligible to serve on the FSU Faculty Senate. In years where the School is responsible for electing a senator, the Director of the School shall hold a secret ballot vote no later than the end of February to select senators and their alternates. Only tenure-line faculty are eligible to vote for faculty senators.

E. Faculty Recruitment. See section III. C. 3 .d. i –vii Personnel Committee

F. Unit Reorganization. The Faculty shall have oral and/or written input into any changes to the organization of the unit, including the reorganization of the School of Information.

G. Emeritus and Emerita faculty. When a member of the Faculty retires, any faculty member can call for a vote of the Faculty to award the retiree the status of "Emeritus" or "Emerita" faculty member. If the majority vote is favorable, the Director of the School will forward a memo to the Dean of the College of Communication and Information, who will in turn forward a memo to the University's Office of Faculty Development and Advancement requesting that the status of "Emeritus" or "Emerita" be granted to the retiree by the University.

IV. Curriculum

The Faculty shall determine the requirements for academic degrees, establish admissions and grading policies, review the School's curriculum, approve course offerings, and act on any other academic matter of concern to the School of Information.

V. Annual Evaluation of Faculty on Performance and Merit

A. Peer Involvement in Annual Performance and Merit Evaluation. Each faculty member's performance will be evaluated relative to his or her assigned duties.

Each faculty member's performance will be rated annually using the following university rating scale:

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

See Appendix A annual evaluation process for tenure-line faculty classifications (beyond university policy).

See Section III. C. 3. e. i for faculty involvement in the merit evaluation process for all faculty classifications (beyond university policy).

B. Criteria for Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty. See Appendix B.

C. Criteria for Evaluation of Specialized Faculty. See Appendix C.

VI. Promotion and Tenure See Appendix B for Tenure-line faculty and Appendix C for Specialized faculty

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

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

C. Peer Involvement in Evaluation of Promotion and Tenure of Faculty. See Appendix B for Tenure-line faculty and Appendix C for Specialized faculty; see also III. C. iii. e

D. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure of Tenure-track Faculty. See Appendix B

E. Criteria for Promotion of Specialized Faculty. See Appendix C

Appendix A
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF INFORMATION
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS FOR FACULTY

Approved by the School of Information Faculty on 22 April 2020
Replaces version approved on 12 April 2017

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.

These annual performance evaluations by the Director are separate from the departmental merit reviews conducted by the Evaluation Promotion and Tenure Committee. In the event that the Director's annual performance evaluation differs substantially from the Evaluation Promotion and Tenure Committee's departmental merit review for any given faculty member, these differences should be addressed in the narrative that accompanies the Director's evaluation.

Faculty in the School of Information are expected to abide by the guidelines for faculty performance identified in the FSU Faculty Handbook and the Collective Bargaining Agreement between Florida State University and the United Faculty of Florida Chapter for FSU.

Faculty in the School of Information are expected to meet each of the following annual performance expectations unless they do not have an appointment in that specific area on their assignment of responsibilities:

1. Research: Evidence of ongoing scholarly and/or creative activities, according to their assignment of responsibilities and as appropriate for their rank. Evidence for research includes, but is not limited to:
 - a. Articles in refereed or non-refereed professional journals;
 - b. Books, book chapters, or book reviews;
 - c. Papers at conferences or other meetings of professional societies;
 - d. Applying for and/or obtaining external support for research; and
 - e. Scholarly and/or creative activity that has not yet resulted in publication.
2. Teaching: Evidence of well-planned and delivered courses following university rules, according to their assignment of responsibilities and as appropriate for their rank. Evidence for teaching includes, but is not limited to:

- a. Effectiveness in engaging students and stimulating learning;
 - b. Effectiveness in imparting knowledge and skills;
 - c. Effectiveness in developing critical thinking or creative abilities;
 - d. Course revision, course development, or curriculum planning; and
 - e. Adherence to accepted standards of professional behavior in instruction.
3. Service: Evidence of active contributions in service to the School, College, University, profession, and academic discipline, according to their assignment of responsibilities and as appropriate for their rank. Evidence for service includes, but is not limited to:
- a. Service on school, college, and university committees;
 - b. Service to professional organizations relevant to the academic discipline;
 - c. Participation in professional meetings, symposia, conferences, or workshops;
 - d. Professional service on governmental boards, agencies, or commissions; and
 - e. Professional service to the local community.

Appendix B
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

1. Evidence of nationally and/or internationally recognized expertise and scholarship in well-articulated and fully developed research area(s).
2. Evidence of continued engagement and substantive impact in scholarly communication activities, such as publications and presentations.
3. Demonstrated ability to support research activities through research grants, collaborations, and/or partnerships.

Teaching Criteria

4. Evidence of effective teaching, advising, and mentoring of students.
5. Evidence of increasing service on dissertation committees (either internally or externally) and/or directing doctoral dissertations (preferred).
6. Contributions to curriculum and course development, and/or other instructional activities.

Service Criteria

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

8. Significant academic and professional record and reputation of leadership and service to the field of study at the national or international level.
9. Demonstrated leadership through service that positively impacts one or more of the following: scholarly associations, scholarly publishing, professional practice, or society.

Appendix C
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF INFORMATION
PROMOTION CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES
FOR SPECIALIZED FACULTY

Approved by the School of Information Faculty on 03 March 2022
Replaces version approved on 22 April 2020

INTRODUCTION

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

4. the FSU Faculty Handbook (<https://facultyhandbook.fsu.edu/>),
5. the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the University and the United Faculty of Florida Chapter for FSU (<http://uff-fsu.org/>), and
6. 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 specialized faculty in the School of Information are established by this document.

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Specialized faculty are reviewed annually by the Director of the School of Information.

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 as specialized faculty in terms of their Assignment of Responsibilities, and provides clear and specific feedback regarding what they need to accomplish to achieve promotion.

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 at any time.

Promotion Reviews

Promotion-eligible specialized faculty will be considered for promotion during the Fall semester.

Candidates for promotion must prepare an electronic binder of materials, including copies of the candidate's publications or creative activities as appropriate, in electronic format following the instructions as detailed in the most recent Specialized Faculty Promotion Memo released by the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement.

Candidates' promotion files will be reviewed by the School's Evaluation Promotion and Tenure Committee, the School's Director, 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, specialized 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 according to their Assignment of Responsibilities and their Specialized Faculty track.

Promotion through the Specialized Faculty ranks is attained through meritorious performance of assigned duties in the faculty member's present position. Promotion to the second rank in each classification shall be based on recognition of demonstrated effectiveness in the areas of assigned duties. Promotion to the third and final rank in each classification shall be based on superior performance in the areas of assigned duties.

Promotion decisions shall take into account the following considerations for each track.

Teaching Faculty

Expectations for Promotion

Evidence of well-planned and delivered courses.

Summaries of data from current university-mandated student reviews.

Peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching.

Ability to teach multiple courses within a discipline/area.

Other teaching-related activities, such as instructional innovation, involvement in curriculum development, authorship of educational materials, and participation in professional organizations related to the area of instruction.

Research Faculty / Curator

Expectations for Promotion

Scholarly or creative accomplishments of high quality, appropriate to the field, in the form of books and peer-reviewed scholarly publications.

Success in obtaining external funding, as PI or Co-PI on grants.

Recognized standing in the discipline and profession, as attested to by letters from outstanding scholars outside the University.

Other research-related activities that contribute to the discovery of new knowledge, including development of new educational techniques and other forms of creative activity.

Evidence of research and other creative activity shall include, but not be limited to, published books, chapters in books, articles in refereed and un-refereed professional journals, musical compositions, exhibits of paintings and sculpture, works of performance art, papers presented at meetings of professional societies, reviews and research and creative activity that has not yet resulted in publication, display, or performance.

Instructional Specialist

Expectations for Promotion

Evidence of contributions in support of instruction, as attested to by internal letters from faculty members at FSU.

Other instructional support activities, such as instructional innovations, involvement in curriculum development, authorship of educational materials and participation in professional organizations related to the area of instruction.

Research Support

Expectations for Promotion

Evidence of contributions in support of research, as attested to by internal letters from collaborators at FSU.

Other research that contributes to the discovery of new knowledge.

Evidence of research and other creative activity shall include, but not be limited to, published books, chapters in books, articles in refereed and un-refereed professional journals, musical compositions, exhibits of paintings and sculpture, works of performance art, papers presented at meetings of professional societies, reviews and research and creative activity that has not yet resulted in publication, display, or performance.

Librarian

Expectations for Promotion

Demonstrated excellence in specialized area of librarianship.

Participation in continuing education in the form of appropriate academic course work, workshops, institutes or conferences.

Participation or membership in professional associations.

Attainment of an advanced degree.

Publications.

Evidence of commitment to the service concerns of the University or the community.

Appendix D
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF INFORMATION MENTORING
GUIDELINES

Approved by the School of Information Faculty on 13 January
2021 Replaces version approved on 22 April 2020

Mentoring relationships are vital for faculty success because they enable acculturation, acclimatization, advocacy, advice, and support throughout academic careers. All tenure-line and specialized faculty members not at terminal rank will be assigned a first-year faculty mentor by the Director of the School of Information, usually by the end of the mentee's first full semester. This document spells out the individual and shared responsibilities of faculty mentors and mentees in the School of Information.

Responsibilities of the faculty mentor include:

1. Helping the faculty mentee identify key contacts in the School, College, and University, and providing general information about "the way things work" at FSU.
2. Ensuring the faculty mentee has access to all relevant School and University documents, including the Bylaws of the School of Information, the School's criteria and procedures for promotion (and tenure) of tenure-line and specialized faculty (as appropriate), the FSU Faculty Handbook, the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the University and the United Faculty of Florida Chapter at FSU, and the online resources offered by the University's Office of Faculty Development and Advancement.
3. Attend, if requested, the faculty mentee's annual review with the Director. The information gained at this meeting will be used to inform advice, suggestions, and mentoring plans.
4. Offering advice and suggestions regarding the faculty mentee's research, teaching, and service activities according to their assignment of responsibilities and as appropriate for their rank. This support may include advice on committee service, reviewing manuscripts or research proposals, discussing research ideas, and advising on balancing workload responsibilities.
5. Encouraging the faculty mentee to keep on track as they work toward promotion and/or tenure, and checking to see whether the required progress-toward-promotion materials (such as peer teaching evaluations) are being collected in their digital and/or physical personnel folders.

6. Assisting the faculty mentee with preparing their promotion materials, such as identifying potential external reviewers, reviewing personal statements, and answering other content-based questions about the promotion process.

Responsibilities of the faculty mentee include:

1. Working with the Director to identify a mentor and timing of the mentor assignment. The mentee will also communicate with the Director about changing mentors if the need arises.
2. Arranging for at least one meeting per semester with their mentor to discuss activities, issues, or concerns regarding the faculty mentee's work at FSU.
3. Considering all mentoring needs, including the need for multiple School of Information mentors (e.g., a teaching mentor and a research mentor), as well as mentors external to the School.¹
4. Keeping the faculty mentor current and informed about the faculty mentee's research, teaching, and service activities according to their assignment of responsibilities and as appropriate for their rank, with raising any issues or concerns.
5. Carefully reviewing and asking the faculty mentor or members of the School's Evaluation Promotion and Tenure committee for any needed clarification about, all relevant School and University documents, including the Bylaws of the School of Information, the School's criteria and procedures for promotion (and tenure) of tenure-line and specialized faculty (as appropriate), the FSU Faculty Handbook, the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the University and the United Faculty of Florida Chapter at FSU, and the online resources offered by the University's Office of Faculty Development and Advancement. The mentee assumes the responsibility of locating these documents by working with the mentor and the iSchool administration.
6. Proactively managing progress toward promotion by seeking out advice from the mentor or other faculty members; reviewing promotion-related documents; making sure that the required progress-toward-promotion materials (such as peer teaching evaluations) are being collected in their digital and/or physical personnel folder; and preparing promotion materials in a timely manner.

¹ Mentoring needs may be illustrated using a tool such as a Mentoring Map (<https://ncfdd-production-file-uploads.s3.amazonaws.com/media/399d28e3-a382-44b1-8bfa-4394ad6148d5-MentoringMap-Interactive.pdf>)

Shared responsibilities between faculty mentor and mentee include:

1. Understanding the types of needs mentoring can address. The Suggested Reading listed in this policy is a source of more information about mentoring.
2. Actively maintaining the mentor/mentee relationship by seeking and welcoming advice, opinions, or assistance from others as needed.

Suggested Reading

Florida State University Office Faculty Development and Advancement. *Faculty mentorship*. <https://fda.fsu.edu/faculty-awards/faculty-mentorship>

Florida State University Office of Research Development. *Research mentoring: Resources for mentors and mentees*. <https://www.research.fsu.edu/research-offices/ord/research-mentoring-information-for-mentors-and-mentees/>

Appendix E
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF INFORMATION PEER REVIEW OF
TEACHING GUIDELINES

Approved by the School of Information Faculty: 22 April 2020
Replaces version approved on 18 November 2015

Tenure-line faculty should have at least one peer review of teaching before their Third Year Review, and at least one more peer review of teaching before their Promotion and Tenure review.

Specialized faculty on the Teaching Faculty track should have at least two peer reviews of teaching before their promotion reviews (and are required to have two peer reviews of teaching within the last 12 months before going up for promotion).

All tenure-line or specialized faculty at any rank may request a peer review of teaching at anytime. The Director of the School may also request a peer review of teaching for any faculty member at any time, in consultation with the faculty member.

If possible, the peer review team should consist of one senior faculty member and one junior faculty member, and if applicable, the senior faculty member should be the instructor's mentor.

Peer Review of Teaching Procedures:

1. Instructor and reviewer(s) select a specific class meeting for the observation.
2. Instructor completes the Peer Review of Teaching Pre-Observation Form (see below), and shares it with the reviewer(s) at least one week prior to the observed class session.
3. Instructor being observed provides reviewer(s) with all needed materials (such as access to the course website) at least one week prior to the observed class session
4. Reviewer(s) attend the class session, complete the Peer Review of Teaching Summary Form (see below) and share with the instructor being evaluated.
5. Instructor being evaluated has the opportunity to seek clarifications, correct errors, etc. before the Peer Review of Teaching Summary is considered complete.
6. Reviewer(s) and instructor sign the Peer Review of Teaching Summary, and send it to the Director of the School for placement in the instructor's permanent file

Note that the instructor and reviewer(s) may choose to meet prior to and/or after the observation, but this is neither required nor expected.

PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING PRE-OBSERVATION FORM

Name of Instructor Observed:

Names of Peer Reviewers:

Course Number and Title:

Venue of course (online or face-to-face):

Number of Students Enrolled in Course:

Date of Class Observation:

How many students typically attend this class, and is attendance required?

What is the topic of the class on the observation date?

What do you hope to accomplish in this class session?

What teaching techniques and materials will you use in this class session?

Will this class represent a typical sample of your teaching? If not, what will be different?

Are there particular challenges you have encountered while teaching this course this semester?

What substantive activities related to this session have the students completed outside of class?

PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING SUMMARY FORM

Name of Instructor Observed:

Names of Peer Reviewers:

Course Number and Title:

Venue of course (online or face-to-face):

Number of Students Enrolled in Course:

Date of Class Observation:

Content (materials presented in class, readings, materials presented outside class (including the organization of the course website, syllabus, and related materials), relation of materials to course or session objectives, appropriateness of materials to level of course, etc.):

Instruction (teaching techniques used, clarity of presentation, clarity of expectations for students, the degree to which the goal of the class was achieved, how the instructor dealt with any challenging situations or setbacks during the class, the instructor's mastery of the topic, etc.):

Interaction (interaction between instructor and students or among students, inside and outside class session; instructor's respect for students; feedback given to students during class; clarity of communication; etc.):

Overall summary (highlight observed strengths and specific suggestions for improvement):

Reviewer 1 signature & date:

Reviewer 2 signature & date:

Instructor signature & date:

THIS FORM NOT TO EXCEED ONE PAGE WHEN COMPLETED (remove all text in parenthesis, including this statement, after using it for content guidance)