



BYLAWS OF THE COASTAL AND MARINE LABORATORY IN THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH, FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

Table of Contents

PREAMBLE.....	2
MISSION AND VISION.....	2
ARTICLE I. MEMBERSHIP	3
ARTICLE II. OFFICERS	3
ARTICLE III. FACULTY MEETINGS	4
ARTICLE IV. COMMITTEES	5
ARTICLE V. "SUNSET" PROVISION	8
ARTICLE VI. AMENDMENTS TO THE BYLAWS.....	8
Appendix I. REVIEW ANNUALLY	9
Appendix II – Procedures for FSUCML Faculty Annual Evaluation	10
Appendix III. FSUCML Standards for Recommendation for Promotion.....	20
Appendix IV – FSUCML Faculty Advancement & Promotion	22
Appendix V. Directions for Promotion Binders for Promotion to Research Faculty II or III	24
Appendix VI. Faculty Mentoring Program.....	27

BYLAWS OF THE COASTAL AND MARINE LABORATORY IN THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH, FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

Approved by secret ballot on October 18, 2018 by a unanimous vote of the members of the faculty at the Florida State University Coastal and Marine Laboratory

PREAMBLE

Good – even excellent – bylaws do not guarantee that the Florida State University Coastal and Marine Laboratory (FSUCML) business will be conducted efficiently and equitably. Under these bylaws, the FSUCML will prosper as it should only if its faculty members act conscientiously and responsibly at faculty meetings and on FSUCML and University committees – this in addition to conducting research, mentoring well, and rendering service to the public and outside organizations. These bylaws adhere to and are consistent with University policies found in the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement (<http://fda.fsu.edu>) and the FSU-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement (<http://uff-fsu.org/uff-at-work/bargaining/>). In the process of refining and improving FSUCML operations, faculty and staff members are expected to be familiar with and follow, the Florida State University Substantive Change Policy (<https://sacs.fsu.edu/substantive-change-policy/>).

MISSION AND VISION

The **mission** of the FSUCML is to conduct pioneering, interdisciplinary research on coastal and marine ecosystems, to mentor the next generation of problem solvers, and to leverage scientific outcomes and expertise through engagement with stakeholders to optimize marine management and conservation.

Our **vision** for the next 10 years is to become a leader in conducting and supporting exceptional research that advances marine ecosystem science and conservation, addressing questions that are local to global in scope, range from the molecular to the ecosystem in scale, and involve the human communities within which the marine laboratory is imbedded. We will continue to build a comprehensive team of passionate scientists and staff who appreciate the regional pristine environment and support the collaborative nature of the lab.

ARTICLE I. MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. Membership

Membership in the FSUCML shall include:

- Full time or part time non-tenure-track and tenure-track faculty (hereafter referred to as “FSUCML faculty”) and full time, temporary, or part-time appointees, including those serving as instructors, visiting faculty appointees, courtesy appointees, adjunct appointees, postdoctoral fellows, research associates, and associates in research.
- Administrative and Professional personnel;
- University Service Personnel System personnel.

Section 2. Faculty positions

Candidates for FSUCML faculty positions shall be recommended to the Vice President for Research subsequent to an affirmative majority vote of the faculty.

Candidates for FSUCML Courtesy Research Faculty positions shall be recommended to the FSUCML Faculty by affirmative majority vote.

Section 3. Voting members

Only the following shall be entitled to vote in FSUCML faculty meetings and by mail ballot: FSUCML faculty members and other faculty affiliated with the FSUCML who have been granted voting privileges in writing. All FSUCML faculty members holding Graduate Faculty Status (GFS) in the Department of Biological Science or the Department of Earth Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences shall be entitled to participate in evaluation of, and to vote on matters pertaining to FSUCML graduate policy. Such voting rights are also provided to FSUCML faculty under the Department of Biological Science bylaws (ratified 09-18-2009).

ARTICLE II. OFFICERS

Section 1. Director

A. Authority and duties of the Director

1. The Director shall serve as the chief administrative officer of the FSUCML.
2. The Director shall call and preside over faculty meetings and prepare agendas for such meetings.
3. The Director, in conjunction with the Executive Committee, shall establish committees for the conduct of FSUCML affairs, as provided in Article IV.
4. The Director shall call and preside over meetings of the Executive Committee on a regular basis, at least monthly during the academic year.
5. The Director shall regularly report to the Executive Committee and the faculty the actions he or she performs in administering FSUCML affairs.
6. The Director shall be responsible for keeping a personnel evaluation file for each FSUCML faculty member.
7. The Director shall establish the Assignments of Responsibilities for each FSUCML faculty member. This will be issued annually in writing, and will outline duties and responsibilities in research, mentoring, service, and other specific duties and responsibilities.
8. The Director shall apprise annually, in writing, each FSUCML faculty member who is eligible for promotion of his or her progress toward promotion (based in part on input from the FSUCML Research Faculty Evaluation Committee, Article IV Section 1 B3).

9. The Director, after consultation with the Research Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Executive Committee, shall make recommendations to the GFS-issuing department concerning the termination or restriction of Graduate Faculty Status for any faculty member.
11. The Director, serving as principal financial officer of the FSUCML, shall:
 - a. supervise receipt and expenditures of all moneys;
 - b. prepare an annual operating budget, which the Director shall present to the faculty as early in the academic year as circumstances permit;
 - c. prepare an annual financial report, which will be presented to the members of the FSUCML as soon as is practicable after the end of the fiscal year.
12. The Director shall supervise and coordinate the recruiting of new faculty members.
13. The Director, after receiving recommendations of the Research Faculty Evaluation Committee, shall make recommendations for salaries of faculty to the Vice President for Research.
14. Except when provided for otherwise, the Director or the Director's designee shall serve as liaison officer and FSUCML representative to officers and bodies outside the FSUCML.

Section 2. Associate Director of Research (est. 2012)

The Director shall appoint a faculty member of the FSUCML to serve as Associate Director of Research on a three-year rotating basis. Authorities and duties of the Associate Director of Research (ADOR) are listed below. An additional stipend goes with the responsibility.

1. The ADOR shall have oversight of developing scientific equipment requests that support the needs of FSU scientists.
2. The ADOR shall have oversight of scheduling for the R/V Apalachee to resolve scheduling conflicts by prioritizing vessel use.
3. The ADOR shall have oversight of scheduling and distribution of experimental space at the marine laboratory for FSUCML, FSU, and visiting scientists. This includes the use of communal laboratory spaces relative to need and timeframe of use.
4. The ADOR shall review and approve research plans submitted by scientists applying to work at the FSUCML to ensure compliance with state and federal permitting requirements, ACUC protocols, and scientific validity with an eye to ensuring that scientists do not overlap in terms of their use of space and that the work will have no adverse effects on the surrounding habitats.
5. The ADOR shall ensure that ACUC protocols for the laboratory are submitted in a complete and timely fashion and is available or designated an alternate for all ACUC on-site reviews of the FSUCML.
6. The ADOR and director shall lead in developing NSF facilities improvement proposals for the lab to ensure timely completion of proposal requirements and submission.
7. The ADOR shall have the ability to sign for the Director, in the Director's absence.

ARTICLE III. FACULTY MEETINGS

Section 1. Kinds and frequency of meetings

The faculty of the FSUCML shall meet in regular session once each month during the regular academic year on the third Wednesday of each month.

Additional sessions may be called by the Director or the Director's designated representative (1) on the Director's own initiative, or (2) at the request of the faculty.

Section 2. Presiding over meetings

The Director shall normally preside at faculty meetings. In the absence of the Director, another voting member designated by the Director shall preside.

Section 3. Agenda items

The Director shall solicit agenda items from the faculty prior to each faculty meeting. The Director shall prepare the agenda, and distribute copies to the members prior to the meeting.

Section 4. Quorum

Two-thirds of the voting members of the FSUCML shall constitute a quorum at any faculty meeting.

Section 5. Minutes

One of the FSUCML Administrative Assistants shall serve as secretary. In the absence of the secretary, the Director shall appoint a substitute. The duties of the secretary shall be:

- to record the minutes of FSUCML meetings;
- to distribute copies of minutes to all FSUCML faculty members as soon as practicable and prior to the next meeting;
- to keep in the FSUCML office and on the FSUCML Server K drive a complete file of FSUCML minutes.
- to be responsible for preparation and distribution of ballots for all secret votes and serve as teller by counting and reporting all ballot votes.

Section 6. Minutes disposition

The first order of business at each meeting shall be disposition of the minutes of the previous meeting. Minutes appear in the FSUCML Faculty Dropbox

Section 7. Obligation to attend

Each voting member of the FSUCML shall consider attendance at FSUCML meetings an obligation to be disregarded only for good reason. The secretary shall record in the minutes the names of all voting members absent from each meeting.

Section 8. By-law distribution

Copies of these bylaws shall be distributed with the announcement of the first faculty meeting of the academic year and shall be maintained on the FSUCML website under Policies and Procedures.

ARTICLE IV. COMMITTEES

All committees except the Promotion Committee shall serve in an advisory capacity to the Director. Election of committee members shall occur in April by either paper or electronic secret ballot. Formal announcement of FSUCML committees shall occur immediately thereafter and go into effect at the beginning of the fall semester.

Section 1. Standing Committees

A. The Executive Committee

1. This committee shall be the principal coordinating committee of the FSUCML.
2. The committee shall consist of the following members:
 - the Director, who shall Chair the Executive Committee;
 - a non-voting staff member appointed by the Director;
 - one member elected by the FSUCML from the ranks of faculty members entitled to vote; who can also call meetings in the absence of the Director.
 - The Director may invite non-voting representatives of units outside the FSUCML when subjects relevant to their programs arise.
3. All committee members shall serve one-year renewable terms.
4. The committee shall meet on a regular basis as often as needed, but at least monthly.
5. Meetings of the committee shall be held only when a majority of the voting members or their faculty proxies are present.
6. The committee shall function as an advisory body in implementing FSUCML policies dealing with the following matters:
 - budgetary policy, except for faculty salaries;
 - academic program;
 - non-elective committee appointments;
 - FSUCML planning and development.

B. The FSUCML Research Faculty Evaluation Committee

1. This committee shall evaluate FSUCML faculty members annually for effectiveness in research, in mentoring, and in service in accord with the percentage of effort stated in the Assignments of Responsibilities for each faculty member. It shall also make recommendations regarding promotion within the FSUCML and requests for graduate faculty status (GFS) of faculty members to be submitted to the Department of Biological Science and/or the Department of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Science, or other appropriate department. General criteria for nomination to, and maintenance of, GFS are listed in the University's Faculty Handbook, and additional criteria specific to these Departments are listed in their separate policy statements. Recommendations shall be made to the faculty when a faculty vote is necessary, or directly to the Director, who shall convey them to appropriate officers and committees outside the FSUCML.
2. This committee shall consist of three members.
 - Two shall be appointed by the Director from the outside.
 - One shall be elected by the FSUCML from the ranks of faculty members entitled to a vote.
 - Members may serve no more than two consecutive one-year terms.
 - The committee shall elect its Chair. Its procedures and criteria for evaluation shall be ratified by a three-fourths vote of the faculty. Current procedures and criteria are available on the FSUCML's web site and attached here as an appendix.
3. The committee shall review annually each faculty member in terms of his or her overall performance of professional responsibilities, according to the standards set forth by Office for Faculty Development and Advancement policies and procedures. The written report is used by the Director in developing the annual evaluation letter. The written report will be made available to the person reviewed upon his or her request. Criteria and procedures must be detailed enough so that any faculty member can understand what performance is required to earn each performance rating.

Faculty performance will be assessed using the following ratings:

- 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
4. The committee shall forward to the Director their written recommendations regarding merit or other salary increases for each faculty member. Merit Evaluations require that all faculty members be reviewed for merit. Merit criteria may not mandate a merit pay award for all members of the department.
 5. When any member of the committee is being evaluated, that member shall be absent from the committee's deliberations and voting.
 6. The committee normally shall consider grievances and counter offers to the faculty.

C. Strategic Planning Committee

1. The Strategic Plan developed in 2018 will be evaluated by a new Strategic Planning Committee in FY19. This committee shall review, on behalf of and in consultation/collaboration with FSUCML and the FSU broader community, the strategic plan for the FSUCML. In doing so, the SPC will review annually the strategic goals and actions to evaluate the metrics by which progress is determined, identify whether the goals have been met, and develop new ideas for how to advance specific initiatives and activities that will allow accomplishing goals.
2. This committee shall consist of 6 members appointed by the Director: 2 members of the FSUCML faculty, the Facilities Director; and three members from faculty in other departments across the FSU campus.

D. Strategic Research Committee

The purpose of the Strategic Research Committee is to enhance research development, promote collaborations within the FSUCML and across the broader FSU community, and synergize efforts around identified research priorities.

1. Members of the committee include all FSUCML research faculty and the Director.
2. Meeting shall occur on a quarterly basis
3. Each faculty member shall provide a list of current, pending, and incubation-stage projects for discussion and exchange of ideas.

Section 2. Other Committees

The Director, with the advice of the Executive Committee, shall establish such additional committees as are needed to conduct the affairs of the FSUCML. The functions and membership of each committee shall be made known to the FSUCML as soon as practicable in the fall term of each year.

ARTICLE V. "SUNSET" PROVISION

These bylaws shall cease to apply after the April 2020 faculty meeting unless they are approved again by a ballot vote of a majority of the voting members of the faculty.

ARTICLE VI. AMENDMENTS TO THE BYLAWS

Any voting member of the FSUCML may propose an amendment to these bylaws. A proposed amendment must be made available to the voting members at or before a FSUCML meeting that occurs at least two weeks prior to the date of the meeting at which a vote on adoption is to be taken. To be adopted, a proposed amendment must receive an affirmative vote by two-thirds of the members present and voting, assuming a quorum. In the event of an emergency, a proposed amendment may be adopted at the same meeting in which it is presented if it receives an affirmative vote by three-fourths of the members present and voting. All voting on proposed amendments shall be conducted by secret ballot.

Appendix I. REVIEW ANNUALLY

Committee Appointments

1. Associate Director of Research:
Sandra Brooke Fall 2018 through Summer 2021
2. Executive Committee – Meets monthly, One year renewable terms
 - a) Director - Dr. Felicia Coleman
 - b) Non-voting staff member, Associate Director, Travis Mohrman (appointed 10/24/2017)
 - c) Faculty Member, Dr. Sandra Brooke (apptd 2/5/2018)
3. Faculty Evaluation Committee – 1-2 consecutive 1-y terms
 - a) Outside faculty members (2) – appointed by Director from other FSU departments
 - i. Dr. Scott Steppan (Department of Biological Science – apptd 2/8/2018)
 - ii. Dr. William Landing (Department of Earth Ocean & Atmospheric Sciences -apptd. 2/6/2018)
 - b) FSUCML Faculty Member Dr. Jeroen Ingels (apptd 2/5/2018)
4. Strategic Planning Committee – appointed by the Director
 - a) FSUCML Faculty (2)
 - b) FSUCML Facilities Director
 - c) Outside faculty members (3) from other FSU departments
5. Strategic Research Committee – All FSUCML faculty members

Appendix II – Procedures for FSUCML Faculty Annual Evaluation

Faculty at the FSUCML are considered Specialized Faculty hired in the Research Faculty I, Research Faculty II, Research Faculty III series. Information about Annual Evaluations can be found on the website for the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement - <https://fda.fsu.edu/faculty-development/annual-evaluation-faculty>. They are expected to develop a CV through FEAS that contains a review of the previous three calendar year's activities in research, instruction, and service. The intent of having several years is to even out stochastic variation in the timing of research products. They also are expected to develop a clearly stated professional development plan (PDP) for the coming year. The PDP forms the cornerstone of the Assignment of Responsibilities (AOR), and together with the CV, elements of use in the annual evaluation and the promotion evaluation processes at FSUCML. It stands as an individualized tool that the faculty member prepares annually and provides the standard against which an individual's progress is measured. Goals listed in the PDP would represent the intentions of the individual across the term of the contract while objectives will present the specific activities that the individual faculty member has planned - in each of the three areas - for the period under review. The PDP and AOR are flexible documents easily amended as necessary by the faculty member and included in the individual's personnel file.

Faculty Evaluation Form -

<http://fda.fsu.edu/sites/g/files/upcbnu636/files/Media/Files/Annual%20Evaluation/facultyevaluationform.pdf>

Assignment of Responsibilities Worksheet:

<http://fda.fsu.edu/sites/g/files/imported/storage/original/application/5d1e5979a7d42f1da2f67e7e479fb8fa.pdf>

Assignment of Responsibilities Form:

<http://fda.fsu.edu/sites/g/files/upcbnu636/files/Media/Files/AOR/NewAORTemplate2016-2017.pdf>

Progress Towards Promotion -

<http://fda.fsu.edu/sites/g/files/upcbnu636/files/Media/Files/Annual%20Evaluation/specializedsample.pdf>

Peer and Merit Evaluation Criteria and Procedures

FSUCML procedures for evaluation of Research Faculty are to be consistent with current policies and procedures of The Office of Research, and the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement to comply with Article 10 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) (<http://uff-fsu.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/BOT-UFF-CBA-2016-19-V2018-04-08-7.5x9.25.pdf>).

Accordingly, the following specifications are required of FSUCML's Research Faculty evaluation procedures:

Duties of the RFEC

- (1) Research Faculty are to be evaluated by the Research Faculty Evaluation Committee (RFEC) with respect to their assignment of responsibilities (weighted scores for each AOR category, Instruction, Research, Service) for the three-year period of review. The RFEC shall have two external members appointed by the Director, and one internal member elected by the FSUCML from the ranks of faculty members entitled to a vote.
- (2) No evaluation process shall require a forced distribution of evaluation ratings.
- (3) Meritorious performance is now defined as performance that meets or exceeds the expectations for

- the position classification and FSUCML expectations
- (4) Merit criteria cannot mandate a pay award for all members of the department.
 - (5) Research Faculty performance shall be assessed using the following ratings (more details on these rankings are mentioned below):
 - 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 (0 points)
 - (6) Merit evaluations require that all Research Faculty members be reviewed for merit, regardless of their years in service. Any Research Faculty member not submitting their materials will be placed at the bottom of the rankings and not be eligible for a merit increase. Research Faculty may petition the director to request a modification of your rating if you have extraordinary circumstances that resulted in your noncompliance (such as illness).
 - (7) If a Research Faculty member receives a rating of "Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations" on two or more of their previous three annual evaluations, then a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) must be initiated by the director.
 - (8) Merit criteria are detailed enough that any reasonable faculty member can understand what performance is required to earn a specific evaluation rating. As such, merit criteria distinguish distinctive levels of defined merit as reflected differences in performance.
 - (9) These criteria and procedures are to be periodically reviewed by the faculty for consistency, revised as appropriate, and subjected to a reaffirmation ballot whenever changes are made. Subsequent revisions may be initiated by a majority vote of at least a quorum of the faculty members subject to evaluation or upon the initiative of the unit administrator.

I. Items Required for the Annual Merit Review

Each faculty member will submit five items for the merit review evaluation:

- (1) Open Response Statements on Instruction, Research, and Service – these statements are allowed in order to explain, elaborate, and place unique performance information into context. Up to one page for each of the three sections (Instruction, Research, Service) is allowed, limited to activities in the 3-year evaluation period.
- (2) Annual evaluations for the previous 3 years (only for years of service at FSU);
- (3) A bulleted list of annual accomplishments for the previous 3 years (only for service at FSU);
- (4) A curriculum vitae generated for all years of service at FSU from The Faculty Expertise and Advancement System (FEAS) website <https://fda.fsu.edu/FEAS>; and
- (5) AOR for the current year.

Research Faculty are encouraged to keep their CV and accomplishment list updated throughout the year. Each faculty member is responsible for the accuracy and completeness of their own data.

II. General Guidelines for Performance Rating

Each year, the RFEC will convene in advance of the evaluation process to review this document, discuss their collective obligations and procedures, and establish the timeline for producing the individual and consensus ratings for each faculty member. Ultimately, each faculty member will receive one of the following five ratings from the RFEC in each of the three categories – research, instruction, and service.

The FSUCML's annual merit review will evaluate Research Faculty using a numerical scale based on the

average annual evaluation to set baseline point values for each category listed below.

- Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations (40-50 points)
- Exceeds FSU's High Expectations (30-39 points)
- Meets FSU's High Expectations (20-29 points)
- Official Concern (10-19 points)
- Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations (0-9 points)

These five nominal rating categories below are ranked from best to worst with the following general descriptions. Note that these do not separate between the three different types of Faculty (I, II, III). More specific criteria and examples follow in Section III:

A. Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations

This describes a Research Faculty member whose accomplishments according to his or her assignment of responsibilities would far exceed performance expectations during the evaluation period. Such Research Faculty are generally recognized as an authority in the field as evidenced by attaining significant professional achievements, awards, or recognitions; and excellence in service to the department, college, university, or discipline. These accomplishments may include the following:

- Highly significant research, instructional, or creative activity above normal expectations of assigned responsibilities
- Demonstrated recognition by peers as an authority in the field of specialty
- Securing external funding
- Presentation at national or international events
- Professional awards, recognition, or achievement
- Proposes and takes on additional responsibility
- Engages in professional development activities and utilizes strategies learned to enhance the Laboratory
- Takes on a leadership role outside the Laboratory.

B. Exceeds FSU's High Expectations

This describes a faculty member whose accomplishments during the evaluation period exceed performance expectations according to his or her assignment of responsibilities. These accomplishments may include the following:

- High level of research, instructional, or creative activity
- Professional recognition(s)
- Willingness to accept additional responsibility
- High level of commitment to serving students
- High level of commitment to serving the overall mission of the laboratory
- Involvement in professional associations or activities outside of the laboratory
- Initiative in solving problems and developing new ideas
- Engages in professional development activities and utilizes strategies learned to enhance the Laboratory.

C. Meets FSU's High Expectations

This describes a faculty member whose accomplishments during the evaluation period meet performance expectations according to his or her assignment of responsibilities. These accomplishments may include the following: research or creative activity; effective instruction; active participation in professional associations; and service to the department, Office of Research, university, or discipline.

D. Official Concern

This describes a Research Faculty member who has difficulty in completing assigned responsibilities during the evaluation period in a manner that is consistent with the high standards of the university.

E. Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations

This describes a Research Faculty member who fails to meet expectations during the evaluation period according to his/her assignment of responsibilities. The Research Faculty Evaluation Committee is charged with submitting the ratings of the faculty to the chairperson.

Research Faculty whose average annual evaluation falls below 20 points will not be eligible for a merit increase. The Faculty Evaluation Committee members will individually score each Research Faculty member excluding themselves, their spouse, or others deemed a conflict of interest, and with regard to their bulleted list using the category descriptions below in section III. Points will be assigned according to the category that best describes their bulleted list (refer to section III for point ranges). The individual scores are discussed among the RFEC for the purpose of reaching a consensus rating in the three areas and an overall total score and ranking for each Research Faculty Member. The RFEC chair will submit the rankings and the scores of the Research Faculty to the Director¹ and individually to each Research Faculty member. The RFEC chair produces a summary letter to be shared with the director and each Research Faculty member regarding their total scores.

Based on the RFEC summary letter and the RFEC scores and rankings, the director will compose an evaluation summary letter to each Research Faculty member, which must specify their numerical scores, achieved ranking, and then a narrative explanation.

In the case that a Research Faculty member fails to earn at least a rating of "Meets FSU's High Expectations", the chair of the RFEC will draft a letter of explanation to the Research Faculty member that will be coordinated through the director. The director will allow the Research Faculty member to submit a rebuttal of the merit review evaluation, if desired, and the rebuttal will be maintained with the department's record of ratings for the relevant year and in the faculty member's official evaluation file. Faculty members dissatisfied with the director's evaluation may request a review by a higher level administrator, as specified in the CBA.

III. Specific Criteria to Earn an Evaluation Rating

It is recognized that our Research Faculty are diverse experts in a variety of fields. Therefore, the suggested

¹ Should the FSUCML ever have researchers that are 100% on C&G funding, then these individuals and the Research Faculty will have separate ranking groups for use in allocating merit resources should they become available.

metrics to earn one of the merit ratings listed below represent criteria that are consistent with performance in that bracket. They serve as concrete examples of expected performance within a rating, but are certainly not exhaustive or exclusive. In order to maintain the high quality of scholarship within the FSUCML, it is necessary to be flexible in a Research Faculty member's chosen creative output but evaluate whether this output is consistent with their defined assignment of responsibilities and professional rank for the period of review.

Three-group evaluations: Research Faculty I, Research Faculty II, and Research Faculty III as groups have different opportunities to achieve comparable performance metrics, and in some cases more or less variable assignments of duties. For these reasons, the RFEC will evaluate separately the three Research Faculty categories (I, II, II), providing a more equitable cohort for comparative performance metrics.

A. Specific Performance metrics for Faculty I

“Meets FSU’s high expectations” (20-29 points)

Research: This describes a faculty member engaged in activities required to successfully start up a laboratory. Minimum performance expectations include, for example, submitting grants at any level (intramural, state, federal); generating data for publication or submitting manuscripts for peer-reviewed articles on research done at FSU; taking steps to achieve visibility for their research programs, or presenting research at local, state, national, or international conferences or seminars. Efforts to recruit and train scientists (undergraduate, graduate, post-doctoral, or technician) should be evident, with emphasis on graduate or post-doctoral training as the most likely human resources to generate the findings required for grants and publications.

Instruction: This describes a faculty member who participates in the FSUCML’s instructional mission. Since the FSUCML only employs research faculty, this section is mainly focused on performance through academic advising and serving on student committees and student supervision and guidance. Course and curriculum development can be taken into account, but will be necessarily limited considering specialized faculty status. RFEC members should take into consideration the type of courses (e.g., 1st year vs. senior, large vs. small, undergraduate vs. graduate), the number of students that are being (co-)supervised and the quality of that supervision, as well as the degree of involvement in other types of academic advising.

Service: This describes a faculty member who contributes to academic service at the FSUCML level or higher by either serving on standing committees, supervisory committees, or meeting other special needs of the FSUCML. Note that junior faculty members are generally encouraged to limit service in lieu of effort expended to start up their research programs.

“Exceeds FSU’s high expectations” (30-39 points)

Research: This describes a faculty member who performs above FSU’s high expectations. Minimum performance expectations include, for example, publishing a peer-reviewed article based on work at FSU; securing an extramural grant or equivalent resource to provide 2 or more years’ support; making multiple presentations as invited talks at national or international conferences or seminars; achieving a high level of professional recognition; and involvement in professional associations or activities outside the laboratory.

Instruction: This describes a faculty member who is mentoring post-docs, students (including DIS) at the undergraduate and graduate levels, serving on M.S. and/or Ph.D. supervisory committees, making use of modern instructional approaches and techniques. Since the FSUCML only employs research faculty, this section is mainly focused on performance through academic advising and serving on student committees and student supervision and guidance. Course and curriculum development can be taken into account, but will be

necessarily limited considering specialized faculty status. RFEC members should take into consideration the type of courses (e.g., 1st year vs. senior, large vs. small, undergraduate vs. graduate), the number of students that are being (co-)supervised and the quality of that supervision, as well as the degree of involvement in other types of academic advising.

Service: Performance for this rating should include multiple activities such as serving on committees at the unit, Office of Research, and/or university level; providing service for journal and/or grant peer-reviews; and possibly serving on extramural committees such as grant panels, educational outreach, policy committees, or other service beyond the university.

“Substantially exceeds FSU’s high expectations” (40-50 points)

Research: This describes a faculty member who is clearly excelling in development of their research program and producing highly significant research, with examples that might include obtaining external multi-year grant funding; publishing multiple peer-reviewed publications; or receiving multiple invitations to present their FSU-based work at conferences or seminars at the national or international level; a demonstrated recognition by peers as an authority in his/her field of specialty, receiving professional awards, recognition or achievement. .

Instruction: This describes a faculty member who is supervising/advising large numbers of students, mentoring post-docs, students (including DIS) at the undergraduate and graduate levels, serving on M.S. and/or Ph.D. supervisory committees, making use of modern instructional approaches and techniques. Since the FSUCML only employs research faculty, this section is mainly focused on performance through academic advising and serving on student committees and student supervision and guidance. Course and curriculum development can be taken into account, but will be necessarily limited considering specialized faculty status. RFEC members should take into consideration the type of courses (e.g., 1st year vs. senior, large vs. small, undergraduate vs. graduate), the number of students that are being (co-)supervised and the quality of that supervision, as well as the degree of involvement in other types of academic advising.

Service: This describes a faculty member whose contribution to academic service far exceeds that of their peers, and may include, for example, participating in multiple, high-visibility, and high-impact activities such as chairing committees at the unit, Office of Research, and/or university level; serving as reviewer for prestigious journals, serving as panel member for granting agencies, or serving on extramural committees such as educational outreach, policy committees; or other service recognized by the wider academic community.

“Official concern” (10-19 points)

This describes a faculty member who has difficulty in completing assigned responsibilities during the evaluation period in a manner that is consistent with the high standards of the university

“Does not meet FSU’s high expectations” (0-9 points)

This describes a faculty member who fails to meet expectations during the evaluation period according to his/ her assignment of responsibilities.

B. Specific Performance metrics for Faculty II

“Meets FSU’s high expectations” (20-29 points)

Research: This describes a faculty member who has secured the resources needed to sustain their research program beyond startup. Minimum performance expectations include, for example, receiving grants or other resources required to advance their research program; successfully recruiting and training scholars (students, post-docs, etc.); presenting or disseminating findings at one or more major conferences; and producing peer-reviewed publications or other scholarly products. Scholarly effort should be of sufficient quality and quantity to indicate the beginning of a national reputation in the candidate’s intellectual discipline and a high probability of continued growth.

Instruction: This describes a faculty member who participates in the FSUCML’s instructional mission. Since the FSUCML only employs research faculty, this section is mainly focused on performance through academic advising and serving on student committees and student supervision and guidance. Course and curriculum development can be taken into account, but will be necessarily limited considering specialized faculty status. RFEC members should take into consideration the type of courses (e.g., 1st year vs. senior, large vs. small, undergraduate vs. graduate).

Service: This describes a faculty member who contributes to academic service at the FSUCML level or higher by either serving on standing committees, supervisory committees, or meeting other special needs of the unit.

“Exceeds FSU’s high expectations” (30-39 points)

Research: This describes a faculty member who has published multiple papers in peer-reviewed journals, who holds one or more external grants, who has built a lab group and is engaged in training students or post-docs who are showing signs of professional progression, as well as achieving a high level of professional recognition; and involvement in professional associations or activities outside the laboratory.

Instruction: This describes a faculty member who is mentoring post-docs, students (including DIS) at the undergraduate and graduate levels, serving on M.S. and/or Ph.D. supervisory committees, making use of modern instructional approaches and techniques. Since the FSUCML only employs research faculty, this section is mainly focused on performance through academic advising and serving on student committees and student supervision and guidance. Course and curriculum development can be taken into account, but will be necessarily limited considering specialized faculty status. RFEC members should take into consideration the type of courses (e.g., 1st year vs. senior, large vs. small, undergraduate vs. graduate), the number of students that are being (co-)supervised and the quality of that supervision, as well as the degree of involvement in other types of academic advising.

Service: Performance for this rating should include multiple activities such as serving on committees at the unit, Office of Research, and/or university level; providing service for journal and/or grant peer-reviews; and possibly serving on extramural committees such as grant panels, educational outreach, policy committees, or other service beyond the university.

“Substantially exceeds FSU’s high expectations” (40-50 points)

Research: This describes a faculty member who is clearly excelling; examples might include publishing three or more peer-reviewed articles in prestigious journals, producing very high impact publications in top tier journals, and holding multiple external grants or other resources required to train multiple scientists who are themselves publishing or presenting at major events such as conferences and meetings. Other examples include receiving multiple invitations to present their FSU-based work at conferences or seminars at the

national or international level; a demonstrated recognition by peers as an authority in his/her field of specialty; and receiving professional awards, recognition or achievement.

Instruction: This describes a faculty member who is supervising/advising large numbers of students, mentoring post-docs, students (including DIS) at the undergraduate and graduate levels, serving on M.S. and/or Ph.D. supervisory committees, making use of modern instructional approaches and techniques. Since the FSUCML only employs research faculty, this section is mainly focused on performance through academic advising and serving on student committees and student supervision and guidance. Course and curriculum development can be taken into account, but will be necessarily limited considering specialized faculty status. RFEC members should take into consideration the type of courses (e.g., 1st year vs. senior, large vs. small, undergraduate vs. graduate), the number of students that are being (co-)supervised and the quality of that supervision, as well as the degree of involvement in other types of academic advising.

Service: This describes a faculty member whose contribution to academic service far exceeds that of their peers, and may include, for example, participating in multiple, high-visibility, and high-impact activities such as chairing committees at the unit, Office of Research, and/or university level; serving as reviewer for prestigious journals, serving as panel member for granting agencies, or serving on extramural committees such as educational outreach, policy committees; or other service recognized by the wider academic community.

“Official concern” (10-19 points)

This describes a faculty member who has difficulty in completing assigned responsibilities during the evaluation period in a manner that is consistent with the high standards of the university

“Does not meet FSU’s high expectations” (0-9 points)

This describes a faculty member who fails to meet expectations during the evaluation period according to his/ her assignment of responsibilities.

C. Specific Performance metrics for Faculty III

“Meets FSU’s high expectations” (20-29 points)

Research: This describes a faculty member who secures the resources needed to sustain their research. Minimum performance expectations include, for example, engaging in the training of scientists (undergraduate, graduate, or post-doctoral); presenting findings or other scholarly output at meetings or seminars; submitting articles for publication in peer-reviewed journals or comparable output. Faculty should be recognized in their intellectual discipline and provide evidence of steps taken to ensure continued productivity.

Instruction: This describes a faculty member who is contributing to the instructional mission of the unit. Since the FSUCML only employs research faculty, this section is mainly focused on performance through academic advising and serving on student committees and student supervision and guidance. Course and curriculum development can be taken into account, but will be necessarily limited considering specialized faculty status. RFEC members should take into consideration the type of courses (e.g., 1st year vs. senior, large vs. small, undergraduate vs. graduate), the number of students that are being (co-)supervised and the quality of that supervision, as well as the degree of involvement in other types of academic advising.

Service: This describes a faculty member who contributes to the academic service of the unit, Office of Research, or university by serving on, for example, student advisory committees, elected or appointed committees, or other academic endeavors.

“Exceeds FSU’s high expectations” (30-39 points)

Research: This describes a faculty member who is engaged in a nationally-recognized scholarly program that includes, for example, high-visibility research; acquiring grant funding; publishing multiple peer-reviewed articles in prestigious journals; presenting FSU-based research at conferences, workshops, or seminars at the national or international level, and training and mentoring future scholars.

Instruction: This describes a faculty member who has outstanding supervision, academic advising, and mentoring accomplishments. Since the FSUCML only employs research faculty, this section is mainly focused on performance through academic advising and serving on student committees and student supervision, mentoring and guidance. Course and curriculum development can be taken into account, but will be necessarily limited considering specialized faculty status. RFEC members should take into consideration the type of courses (e.g., 1st year vs. senior, large vs. small, undergraduate vs. graduate), the number of students that are being (co-)supervised and the quality of that supervision, as well as the degree of involvement in other types of academic advising.

Service: This describes a faculty member who is engaged at a high level in the service of the unit, Office of Research, or university, including, for example, serving on multiple student committees, reviewer or editor for journals or grants, serving on grant panels, serving as officers for professional or scientific societies, hosting workshops, or serving or chairing demanding committees such as faculty search/evaluation/promotion committees, or representing one’s discipline in public forums.

“Substantially exceeds FSU’s high expectations” (40-50 points)

Research: This describes a faculty member who is achieving at the highest level with performance that may include, for example, obtaining international recognition as a leading scholar; demonstrating leadership in the field; publishing ground-breaking articles; publishing multiple peer-reviewed articles; and obtaining substantial grant support above the level of funding typical for their discipline at comparable institutions. Positive indicators also include acquiring federal grant support that brings programmatic resources for graduate or postdoctoral training programs; contributing to professional placement of their laboratory scholars in successful next-career positions, organizing symposia; obtaining international speaking engagements; or acquiring major equipment or other infrastructure to advance the university’s scientific mission.

Instruction: This describes a faculty member who demonstrates the highest level of supervision, advising and mentoring excellence as well as performance in instruction, for instance, through developing and organizing courses. Since the FSUCML only employs research faculty, this section is mainly focused on performance through academic advising and serving on student committees and student supervision, mentoring, and guidance. Course and curriculum development can be taken into account, but will be necessarily limited considering specialized faculty status. RFEC members should take into consideration the type of courses (e.g., 1st year vs. senior, large vs. small, undergraduate vs. graduate), the number of students that are being (co-)supervised and the quality of that supervision, as well as the degree of involvement in other types of academic advising.

Service: This describes a faculty member who is highly accomplished in academic service and has, for example, multiple memberships on committees at the unit, Office of Research, and/or university level; multiple journal and/or grant review assignments year-round; chairing or serving on major federal grant panels; serving as officer for professional or scientific societies; or service for educational or other outreach.

Activities such as providing invited manuscript/grant review or serving through editorial duties, instructing special courses or workshops at external institutes, serving on faculty search/evaluation/promotion committees or doctoral dissertation committees, providing assistance on advisory boards, or offering community/school lectures, would be indicative of this rating.

“Official concern” (10-19 points)

This describes a faculty member who has difficulty in completing assigned responsibilities during the evaluation period in a manner that is consistent with the high standards of the university

“Does not meet FSU’s high expectations” (0-9 points)

This describes a faculty member who fails to meet expectations during the evaluation period according to his/ her assignment of responsibilities.

Appendix III. FSUCML Standards for Recommendation for Promotion

This document sets forth FSUCML standards used to recommend candidates for promotion. It is intended to supplement university-level guidelines (<http://www.fsu.edu/Books/Faculty-Handbook/Ch10/Ch10.4.html>), to help candidates set priorities, and to assure that faculty and administrators fully understand the process, which may vary somewhat among departments and units. Promotion is awarded at the university level by the President, but the action(s) begin(s) within the unit.

The fundamental standard for promotion is significant achievement in advancing knowledge of the marine and coastal realm. This advancement is attained through organization and incorporation of new and established knowledge into educational curricula, through research and discovery, and through contributions to the functioning of the unit, the university, and the profession at large. The traditional three areas of evaluation are therefore instruction, research, and service. The decision to recommend a candidate for promotion is based on the evidence presented in the candidate's binder concerning activities in these three areas. The standards below are those used by the FSUCML in making this judgment.

FSUCML Standards for Promotion to Research Faculty II are:

1. Instruction

Evidence of a commitment to excellence in instruction – specifically mentoring of graduate students at the MSc. and Ph. D. levels -- according to assigned duties, as judged by any peer evaluation. Excellence in instruction includes introduction of students to modern research approaches, to the latest discoveries and techniques as well as debates within the field. Excellence in instruction also includes mentoring post-docs and undergraduates in DIS and Honor's research. Among mentoring activities, greatest weight is given to mentoring of M.S. and Ph.D. students.

2. Research

Evidence of a strong program of independent scholarly research. The scholarly effort should be of sufficient quality and quantity to indicate the beginning of a national reputation in the candidate's intellectual discipline and a high probability of continued growth. Papers based on research performed at FSU and published regularly in prominent, primary refereed journals and/or other scholarly products like software distributed through standard mechanisms for the field, constitute the most important evidence of scholarly excellence. Additional positive indicators include receipt of extramural grants or contracts, receipt of fellowships, invitations to write review chapters and to present seminars and/or symposia at other institutions and at national and international meetings, direction of graduate research, service on editorial boards, and other elements of research accomplishment appropriate to the candidate's area of expertise.

Sub-disciplines of biology may differ in the levels of these indicators considered to reflect excellence in research. The research effort should demonstrate intellectual independence from prior mentors and current collaborators. At the time of promotion, the FSUCML will consider evidence in letters from experts outside the university in the candidate's discipline, taking into account the stature and reputation of the letter writers.

3. Service

Evidence of a level of professional service appropriate for the year by year assignment of responsibilities; such activities should include membership on committees at the unit, college, and/or university level, journal and/or grant peer-reviews, involvement in advising natural resource agencies at all levels, and possibly extramural committees related to scholarly achievement, the administration of scientific societies, and/or educational or other appropriate outreach beyond the university.

FSUCML standards for promotion to Research Faculty III are similar to those for promotion to Research Faculty II, with the following additional considerations:

1. Instruction

Successful mentoring of M. Sc. and Ph.D. students is expected. Mentoring of undergraduates and high school students is encouraged but not required.

2. Research

The primary criterion is an outstanding record of published original research that demonstrates a national and an international reputation in the candidate's specialty. A high probability must be evident of continued progress in the future. Evidence of recognition of this status may come from invitations to present research seminars at other institutions, to participate in symposia at national and international scientific meetings, and to write chapters for books. Letters of recommendation from established researchers at other institutions provide important evidence of the stature of the candidate. The Research Faculty member should be directing a sustained and productive graduate program, with commitment to the professional development of master's and Ph. D. graduate students and/or postdoctoral fellows according to their individual abilities. The candidate should also have a sustained record of extramural support.

3. Service

The candidate should have served on major FSUCML committees and shown evidence of commitment to improvement of the administrative activities of the FSUCML. The candidate also should have served on administrative committees or in professional leadership roles at the university level or at the community, state, or national level.

Appendix IV – FSUCML Faculty Advancement & Promotion

Promotion

The opportunity for promotion from Research Faculty I to Research Faculty II, and from Research Faculty II to Research Faculty III will be evaluated by the Advancement and Promotion Committee (APC) composed of three faculty members appointed by the FSUCML director, one from the FSUCML and one each from the departments of Biological Science and Earth Ocean and Atmospheric Science. The Committee shall select its chair. Promotion will be based on the same criteria as those used to determine contract advancement, with the following additional contribution:

1. Research Faculty I nearing the end of their 4th year in rank will prepare promotion binders following University guidelines. The APC shall meet to discuss and report to the Director on the faculty's progress toward promotion. These reports will be inserted into the promotion binder.
 - a. Reports of the ad hoc committees shall be forwarded to the Director's office early in the Spring semester in time for the Promotion Committee to review.
 - b. Faculty shall prepare their binders, incorporating any guidance from their ad hoc committees, for review by the Promotion Committee.
 - c. The APC shall meet in mid-semester to review the binder and shall prepare a report in time for the Director's annual meeting with the faculty members. Unless other considerations prevail, the format of the APC report may be as follows:

Summary of Meeting

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

2. Committee recommendations regarding promotion.

The Promotion committee shall meet to discuss the progress of candidates towards promotion. Discussion shall be limited to the contents of the binder according to University guidelines. The recommendation of committee members will be communicated by secret ballot and accompanied by a narrative summarizing the meeting of the Committee.

3. Director's letter for the promotion binder
 - a. The Director's letter will be inserted in the binder AFTER the vote of the APC and the Research Faculty III.
 - b. The Director's letter could summarize the spirit of the prior votes, put in context the outside letters and then give his/her opinion. However, we do not wish to prescribe here the elements of the Director's letter; these are suggestions.

- c. The candidate will have the opportunity to review again his/her binder AFTER the Director's letter has been inserted. This provides an opportunity for the candidate to insert a letter to rebut criticisms raised in the Director's letter and to comment on the APC faculty vote.
4. At the beginning of each binder will be a list of the faculty with a place by each name for the faculty to sign indicating that they have read the binder.
5. Procedures for requesting outside letters for promotion
 - a. Requests for outside letters will be sent out no later than 15 May to ensure timely arrival; three letters are required so we suggest that six referees be identified.
 - b. The candidate will submit a list of potential outside referees as well as a list of individuals who should NOT be contacted as potential referees.
 - c. The Director, in consultation with the Executive Committee, will choose a set of external referees independent of the candidate's list.
 - d. The Director will solicit up to six letters of evaluation of the candidate; equally distributed from his/her list and the candidate's list.

Faculty are required to write personal statements that articulate their goals for mentoring graduate students, research and original creative work as well as the strategies they have used to achieve their goals. Content should also include service. Guidelines for developing these statements are on the web here - <http://www.fda.fsu.edu/sites/g/files/imported/storage/original/application/2d95103c2432d9ea44a14fca2d0a5b49.pdf>

The recommendation by the APC will be forwarded to the FSUCML Director for evaluation. The Director shall then forward her/his recommendation for promotion and salary increase to the Vice President for Research and from thence to the Provost for approval. The opportunity for promotion will occur in a minimum of five-year intervals, with the requirement that there be five years between date of hire and the first promotion and also between the first and second promotion. Promotion will follow all other University Policies and Procedures.

Appendix V. Directions for Promotion Binders for Promotion to Research Faculty II or III

Section 1 – General Information

1. Summary Cover Sheet for Promotion

- a. This is the first page in the binder. Do not include any additional title pages from the college/center. Please use only the *Summary Cover Sheet for Promotion* posted to the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement [website](#). 2018/2019 Specialized Faculty Promotion Memo Page 10
- b. When justifying an early promotion prior to the 5th year, include a brief explanation and mark “yes” on the cover sheet.
- c. Be sure to include all numerical votes and signatures. **Please do not use check marks in any box.**

2. Dean’s/Center Director’s Recommendation

- a. If not included in the department chair’s/school director’s/supervisor’s letter, the dean’s/center director’s letter must include justification if the candidate is going up for promotion prior to the 5th year at that level and
- b. discussion of the meritorious performance of assigned duties in the faculty member’s present position.

3. Faculty Response (optional)

The candidate must be provided at least 5 working days to attach a response to the Dean’s/Center Director’s letter.

4. Department Chair/School Director/Supervisor’s Letter

The department chair/school director or supervisor’s letter must include justification if the candidate is going up for promotion prior to the 5th year at that level and discussion of the meritorious performance of assigned duties in the faculty member’s present position.

5. Department or School Committee Narrative

A narrative explanation provided by the departmental/school committee in the promotion process summarizing the meeting and vote.

Example:

Summary of Meeting – Department/School Committee

The FSU Coastal & Marine Laboratory’s research faculty promotion committee met and reviewed _____ for promotion. A majority of the committee members expressed that the candidate’s binder provided evidence that he/she should/should not be granted promotion. Comments were made regarding the candidate’s strength/weakness in the area of ____, as evidenced by _____.

6. College/Center Committee Narrative (optional if there is a department/school narrative)

•A narrative explanation provided by the college/center committee in the promotion process summarizing the meeting and vote.

Example:

Summary of Meeting – College/Center Committee

The College of _____/[Center] promotion committee met and reviewed _____ for promotion. A majority of the committee members expressed that the candidate’s binder provided evidence that he/she should/should not be granted promotion. Comments were made regarding the candidate’s strength/weakness in the area of ____, as evidenced by _____.

7. Outside Letters

Three letters of recommendation from faculty members of higher rank outside the University that attest to the quality of the candidate's research and/or other creative activities and her/his recognition in the field.

8. Written department or school/college/center promotion criteria

•A copy of the department's or school's/college's/center's current approved promotion criteria and procedures (as reviewed by the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement).

9. Curriculum Vita

- a. This vita **must** be generated from the [Faculty Expertise & Advancement System](#) (FEAS).
- b. From the main menu:
 - Click "Generate Specialized Faculty Promotion Documents"
 - Click "Generate a Specialized Faculty Promotion Vita"

10. Assignment of Responsibilities (AOR)

- a. Please include **from most recent to oldest, all fully approved AORs** from the date of hire at FSU or from the date of last promotion. AOR reports **must** be printed using the printer friendly version from myFSU HR (see below).
- b. Example: If the candidate was hired/promoted in August 2013, AORs **must** be from Fall 2013-Summer 2018.

Section 2 – Evidence of Achievement

1. Research Statement (3-pages maximum)

See "Writing Personal Statements for Faculty Evaluations" for guidelines.

<https://fda.fsu.edu/sites/g/files/upcbnu636/files/Media/Files/Specialized%20Faculty/SFStatements.pdf>

2. External Grant Funding

Descriptions of the contracts and grants for which the candidate has served as Principle Investigator (PI) or co-PI since the last promotion or initial appointment, as appropriate, including: the title of the project; the funding agency; the list of PI and co-PIs; any other institutions involved; the FSU share and amount of funding.

3. Other Research-Related Activities

Such as chapters in books, articles in refereed and non-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. **This section is not optional.**

4. Scholarly or Creative Accomplishments

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

5. Annual Evaluation Letters

Please include, **from most recent to oldest**, all annual evaluation **letters** from the date of hire at FSU or from the date of last promotion. **Do not include the annual evaluation form.**

6. Annual Letters of Progress Towards Promotion

- a. Please include **from most recent to oldest**, all annual **letters** of progress towards from date of hire at FSU or from the date of last promotion.
- b. If the annual evaluation letter and the progress towards promotion letter are one in the same, please place a page in this section indicating such.

7. Other Evidence (optional – 5-pages maximum)

- a. If the faculty member has a teaching assignment, please include a list of courses taught since appointment to the level from which being considered for promotion, with the percentage of effort assigned, enrollment, and grade distribution for each course. This will not count towards the 5-page maximum.
- b. This list of courses can be generated from the Faculty Expertise & Advancement System ([FEAS](#)) by using the Teaching Summary.
- c. Grade distribution reports can be obtained from the “Generate a Grade Distribution Summary Report” in the Faculty Expertise & Advancement System ([FEAS](#)).
- d. A summary of the results of the polls of student perceptions of teaching shall also be included for each course, not including free responses of students.

Appendix VI. Faculty Mentoring Program

The Faculty Mentoring Program is intended to be a useful way of helping new faculty members adjust to their new environment. Whether it is academe itself that is new, or simply the Florida State University, assistance from a well-respected mentor can be an invaluable supplement to the guidance and assistance that the Director provides during the early years at a new university. The program's success will depend on the new faculty members, their mentors and their department chairs all taking an active role in the acclimation process. An outline of the responsibilities of each is outlined below.

The Responsibility of the Director

As soon as the appointment is made, the director assigns a mentor. For faculty appointed as Associate or Full Scholar Scientist, assignment of a mentor is less critical, but highly encouraged, to serve as a means of acclimating the new faculty member to FSU. The director is responsible for advising new faculty on matters pertaining to academic reviews, and advancement. As the mentor may also be asked to provide informal advice, it is also the director's responsibility to see that mentors have current information on FSU's academic personnel process.

The Responsibility of the Mentor

The mentor should contact the new faculty member in advance of his/her arrival at the University and then meet with the new faculty member on a regular basis over at least the first two years. The mentor should provide informal advice to the new faculty member on aspects of research, mentoring, and committee work or be able to direct the new faculty member to appropriate other individuals. Often the greatest assistance a mentor can provide is simply the identification of which staff one should approach for which task. Funding opportunities both within and outside of the campus are also worth noting. The mentor should treat all interactions and discussions in confidence. There is no evaluation or assessment of the new faculty member on the part of the mentor, only supportive guidance and constructive feedback.

The Responsibility of the New Faculty Member

The new faculty member should keep his/her mentor informed of any problems or concerns as they arise. When input is desired, new faculty should leave sufficient time in the grant proposal and paper submission process to allow his/her mentor the opportunity to review and critique drafts. It is the new faculty member's responsibility to schedule meetings with his/her mentor, with a suggested frequency of unofficial evaluation twice in the first year and once a year thereafter.

The Mentor

The most important tasks of a good mentor are to help the new faculty member achieve excellence and to acclimate to FSU. Although the role of mentor is an informal one, it poses a challenge and requires dedication and time. A good relationship with a supportive, active mentor can contribute significantly to a new faculty member's career development and satisfaction.

Qualities of a Good Mentor

- Accessibility – the mentor is encouraged to make time to be available to the new faculty member. The mentor might keep in contact by dropping by, calling, sending e-mail, or extending a lunch invitation. It is very helpful for the mentor to make time to read / critique proposals and papers and to provide periodic reviews of progress.
- Networking – the mentor should be able to help the new faculty member establish a professional network.
- Independence – the new faculty member’s intellectual independence from the mentor must be carefully preserved and the mentor must avoid developing a competitive relationship with the new faculty member.

Goals for the Mentor

Short-term goals

- Familiarization with the campus and its environment, including the FSU system of shared governance between the Administration and the Faculty Senate.
- Networking—introduction to colleagues, identification of other possible mentors.
- Developing awareness—help new faculty understand policies and procedures that are relevant to the new faculty member’s work.
- Constructive criticism and encouragement, compliments on achievements.
- Helping to sort out priorities—budgeting time, balancing research, mentoring, and service.

Long-term goals

- Developing visibility and prominence within the profession.
- Achieving career advancement.

Benefits for the mentor

- Satisfaction in assisting in the development of a colleague
- Ideas for and feedback about the mentor’s own mentoring / scholarship
- A network of colleagues who have passed through the program
- Retention of excellent faculty colleagues
- Enhancement of department quality

Changing Mentors

In cases of changing commitments, incompatibility, or where the relationship is not mutually fulfilling, either the new faculty member or mentor should seek confidential advice from his/her Chair. It is important to realize that changes can and should be made without prejudice or fault. The new faculty member, in any case, should be encouraged to seek out additional mentors as the need arises.

Typical Issues

- How does one establish an appropriate balance between mentoring students, research and committee work? How does one say "no?"
- What criteria are used for mentoring excellence, how is mentoring evaluated?

- How does one obtain feedback concerning mentorship? What resources are available for mentoring enhancement?
 - How does one identify and recruit good graduate students? How are graduate students supported? What should one expect from graduate students? What is required in the graduate program?
 - What are the criteria for research excellence, how is research evaluated?
 - How does the merit and promotion process work? Who is involved?
 - What committees should one be on and how much committee work should one expect?
 - What social events occur at the lab?
 - What seminars and workshops does the lab organize?
 - What responsibilities come with appointment in the Office of Research?
-