Departmental procedures for evaluation of faculty are to be consistent with current policies and procedures of The Florida State University and the College of Arts and Sciences. Faculty are evaluated with respect to their assignment of responsibilities for the period of review. Tenured and tenure-track faculty are to be reviewed separately from non-tenure-track faculty.

Faculty data on activities in teaching, research and service are to be provided by the specified deadline, typically early in the spring semester. Data for each year’s review are from the previous two calendar years. Data are currently entered via the Faculty Evaluations portion of the FSU Biology Web Applications site; each faculty member has their own logon information that allows them to enter, edit, and, after the submission deadline, to review their own data. Faculty also provide an updated copy of their CV according to FSU formatting guidelines; it is preferred that this should be accomplished using the Dean of Faculties Faculty Vitae Database System, although a pdf copy of the current CV should be generated and uploaded to the departmental site by the submission deadline.

Staff Support: Completion of the faculty evaluation form can be onerous. Staff enter information on effort according to each faculty member’s assignment of responsibilities. Because the review covers a two-year period, staff help minimize duplicate data entry by initializing each faculty member’s site with all data from the previous review period after removing data (e.g., courses and publications) that are obviously from the year prior to the current review period. Class rosters and SPOT evaluations are available electronically for purposes of completing this form. Additional clerical assistance is available in Unit I and King, should you need assistance in completing this section. If you choose to ask for assistance, you will need to ensure that staff have ample lead time and also have access to the appropriate data and sections of the web-based form. Faculty are responsible for the accuracy and completeness of their own data.

Under Research, faculty approved that there should be space to recognize the development, maintenance, and distribution of creative resources not explicitly recognized in other categories on the annual evaluation form and in the Standard Vita. Examples include, but are not limited to, software programs, databases, and web sites.

Under the Publications section of Research, faculty specifically rejected the idea that ISI impact factor and journal rankings be included. Under the Grant Activity section of Research, faculty specifically rejected the idea that dollar amount of funding be included.

Under the Student Supervision & Academic Associates section of Teaching, “Own Academic Associates” should contain a list of students, trainees, and other academic personnel who are working under your supervision on research projects, particularly those students for whom you are major professor, while “Other Student Committees” should contain a list of students whose supervisory committees you are a member of, but not as major professor.

Faculty-approved Standardized Rating for First-Year Faculty: All untenured faculty should be evaluated, even in their first year, otherwise they are excluded from any potential cost of living raises or merit-based raises by university policy. It is recommended that first year faculty be ranked as satisfactory (S) or unsatisfactory (U), rather than a numeric ranking.
Faculty-approved Standardized Rating for Non-submitting Faculty: A term-limited Service Professor who does not submit the requested information by the deadline will receive a rating of "N" (for non-rated). Any other faculty member who does not submit the requested information by the deadline will receive a "U." Any faculty member who receives a "U" on the basis of non-submission caused by extraordinary circumstances beyond the faculty member's control may petition the Department Chair to change the "U" to an "N." This petition and the Chair's response will be maintained with the Department's record of ratings for the relevant year. A rating of "N" will be considered equivalent to a "U" in merit raise considerations by the Faculty Evaluation Committee(s). Rationale: Each year some faculty members do not submit the requested information or they submit it late. How to rate these faculty members is problematic and is an issue that each committee decides. This yearly decision is unnecessary and, being somewhat arbitrarily applied, erodes confidence in the process. The reasons for noncompliance vary widely, from low expectations of the outcome to illness. No simple solution can address all these reasons, but an institutionalized rating for non-submitting faculty would address the issue in a predictable, standardized, faculty-approved fashion.

Faculty-approved Standardized Rating System for All Faculty: Each member of the Faculty Evaluation Committee will assign a score ranging between 50 and 100 points for each submitting faculty member in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Each member of the Committee will also assign an overall score ranging between 50 and 100 points for each submitting faculty member. This overall score will be arrived at by whatever means the Faculty Evaluation Committee member deems appropriate.

Scoring will be considered as follows:

- \( \geq 95 \) = Exceptionally Meritorious (E)
- \( <95 \text{ but } \geq 90 \) = Very Meritorious (V)
- \( <90 \text{ but } \geq 75 \) = Meritorious (M)
- \( <75 \text{ but } \geq 65 \) = Satisfactory (S)
- \( <65 \) = Unsatisfactory (U)

Once each committee member has individually scored each submitting faculty member, the committee scores are compiled by a staff member. From the compiled data, the committee assigns numerical scores for teaching, research, service, and overall, and a qualitative rating (E, V, M, S or U) that are reported to each submitting faculty member along with overall statistics for that year.

Accountability by the Committee for Unsatisfactory Rating: The Faculty Evaluation Committee will provide a detailed written explanation to any faculty member who receives a "U" on the basis of completed forms submitted by the deadline. A copy of this letter will be sent to the Chair of the Department. This letter will be sent at the same time that other faculty are informed of ratings. A rebuttal may be submitted by the affected faculty member to the Chair of the Department (if submitted, the rebuttal will be maintained with the department's record of ratings for the relevant year). Rationale: A "U" (for Unsatisfactory) rating is demoralizing to a faculty member and is potentially detrimental. Although a "U" is sometimes appropriate, it should be assigned only for compelling reasons. A letter listing those reasons is owed to the affected colleague, if he or she submits the requested information by the deadline. Further, he or she should have the opportunity to rebut.