

1
2 **Guide to Faculty Expectations, Annual Evaluation, and Promotion and**
3 **Tenure in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning**

4
5 **Approved: November 30, 2000**

6 **Revised: July 17, 2001; August 23, 2001; December 8, 2006; November 2, 2007**
7
8
9

10 **Part I: Tenured and Tenure-Earning Faculty**

11
12 **Purpose**

13
14 The purpose of this part of the Guide is to inform tenured and tenure-earning faculty in the
15 Department of Urban and Regional Planning about the Department's expectations for their
16 performance in teaching, research, and service. Its purpose is to help each faculty
17 member, regardless of rank and tenure, to better understand what the Department expects
18 of them in these areas. Please note that the Department's criteria are guided and governed
19 by the standards for promotion and tenure and evaluations articulated in the *Faculty*
20 *Handbook* and *the Collective Bargaining Agreement*. In addition, it provides information on
21 the procedures that are followed for annual evaluation and promotion and tenure.
22

23 **Annual Evaluation Procedures**

24
25 During the spring semester of each year, faculty members in the Department of Urban and
26 Regional Planning participate in the Peer Review Process. Each faculty member is required
27 to prepare an Evidence of Performance binder covering his teaching, research, and service
28 activities for the previous calendar year. Items in the binder include an updated c.v., an
29 activity report for the previous year; copies of publications, articles accepted for publication,
30 and works in progress; teaching materials, including syllabi, class assignments and exams,
31 SUSAI/SPOT scores, classroom observation reports; as well as any evidence on service.
32 The annual activity report form details the information requested on teaching, research, and
33 service.
34

35 The Evaluation Subcommittee of the Academic Personnel Committee shall evaluate every
36 tenured and tenure-earning faculty member. The subcommittee shall collectively discuss the
37 file of each faculty member to agree on its contents and its meaning. Each subcommittee
38 member then shall evaluate each file secretly (not in the meeting). Every faculty member is
39 scored on a 1 to 5 (5 being the highest) scale for teaching, research, and service and each
40 evaluator is also required to prepare a brief statement explaining his or her evaluation of
41 the subject faculty member's teaching, research, and service performance. Anonymous
42 forms are completed for each faculty member and scores and statements are recorded by
43 the Office Manager, who takes care to report scores in a way that does not reveal who has
44 what score. Evaluation is based on the faculty member's performance during the prior year
45 and the progress the faculty member is making towards promotion and/or tenure.
46

47 Each faculty member receives a one-page report showing her scores on teaching, research,
48 and service, the anonymous scores received by every other faculty member on these
49 variables, and the anonymous statements that the Evaluation Subcommittee members

1 made about the subject faculty member. This information, along with the faculty member's
2 binder is used by the department chairperson to prepare each faculty member's annual
3 evaluation. Also, the numeric scores on teaching, research, and service, over a three year
4 period of time, are used to allocate merit pay increases.
5

6 In addition, in specified years, the evaluation process includes a meeting of the Promotion
7 and Tenure Committee in the Department to discuss a faculty member's progress towards
8 tenure and promotion. This is done in the first year, third year (the third year review
9 required by the university), the fifth year (just prior to the sixth year when faculty normally
10 go up for promotion and tenure), and the 11th year (representing the fifth year after
11 receiving tenure as a point to determine the progress the faculty member is making towards
12 promotion to full professor and whether s/he will be ready for promotion to full professor in
13 the 12th year).
14

15 In the third year review, if the faculty member is considered by his/her peers not to be
16 making satisfactory progress towards obtaining promotion and tenure, then the Department
17 chair will have a notice of termination prepared, effective after the end of the faculty
18 member's fourth year.
19

20 The culmination of the annual review process is an annual evaluation letter written by the
21 chair to each faculty member. The chair shall annually apprise in writing each faculty
22 member eligible for tenure and/or promotion of their progress toward tenure and/or
23 promotion.
24
25

26 **Promotion and Tenure Procedures**

27

28 The Department is guided by the promotion and tenure procedures and criteria identified in
29 the *Faculty Handbook*, the *Collective Bargaining Agreement*, and in the annual Promotion
30 and Tenure memo published each April by the Dean of Faculties.
31

32 **Criteria for Assessing Teaching, Research, and Service**

33

34 In general, the following criteria are employed in assessing a faculty member's teaching,
35 research, and service:
36

37 **Research.** Research activity in urban and regional planning is expected to lead to
38 publication, generally in the form of journal articles or scholarly books. Evaluation of a
39 faculty member's research is based on publications, as well as upon articles and books
40 accepted for publication.
41

42 Refereed journal articles are considered to be the *sine qua non* of research publications as
43 the blind peer review process is seen as the primary mechanism by which research quality
44 is assured. In evaluating refereed articles, attention is paid to the quality of the journal, as
45 well as the quality of the article. In evaluating progress towards tenure and promotion,
46 significant attention is paid to the quality and quantity of refereed journal articles.
47

48 In determining whether a piece of research has been published in a top quality location,
49 some consideration will be given to the nature of the work and to the publication outlet that
50 would be appropriate for it. Such an approach guides the Department's evaluation of both

1 articles and book chapters. Although book chapters are generally non-refereed, the
2 Department values them as an important outlet especially in specialty areas that are less
3 likely to command a journal of their own or a place in a mainstream journal such as *JAPA* or
4 *JPER*. Moreover, the Department, as well as the planning academy, values research outlets
5 that are likely to be read by practicing planners and interested publics and policy makers.
6 Such groups are as likely to read books as they are to read refereed journals. As with
7 journal articles, attention is paid to the quality of the book chapter.

8
9 Scholarly books are also considered very important indices of research output. Books
10 written or co-written by the candidate are given more weight than edited books. Attention
11 is also paid to the prestige of the publisher, the rigor of the peer review process, and, of
12 course, the quality of the book. In terms of evaluating a book for promotion and tenure,
13 the book should be published and if not published, the faculty member should provide
14 strong evidence, such as galleys, that the book will be published soon.

15
16 When evaluating a faculty member's progress towards tenure or promotion, consideration is
17 given towards the mix of single and multi-authored articles. Specifically, the Department
18 looks to the degree to which the faculty member has established an **independent** line of
19 research at Florida State University.

20
21 Although they are not substitutes for refereed journal articles and books, book reviews,
22 book review essays, and encyclopedia entries are frequently published by faculty. The
23 value of such publications is variable. More weight is given when such items reflect
24 positively on a faculty member's status in the field. If someone is invited to prepare an
25 encyclopedia entry or book review because of their status in the field, then this is viewed
26 more favorably than if the faculty member is selected merely because s/he is willing to write
27 a review or entry. Reviews, essays, and entries are also evaluated by the impact they have
28 on the field. In general, the Department values works that have an impact on our field,
29 regardless of their form, and rewards faculty for publishing such material.

30
31 Because planning is a practice-based field, faculty normally should be engaged in some way
32 with the practice of planning, either through empirical research, service on a planning body,
33 or through actual professional practice. The last is a form of outreach that differs from
34 traditional service that is performed by faculty for their university and their professional
35 societies. As a part of professional practice, the publication of plans or planning analysis
36 reports can be treated as a form of research if it is evaluated in the same fashion as
37 refereed journal articles or other publications: Are these planning products innovative? Do
38 they make an original contribution to the field? Have they obtained wide recognition or
39 impact?

40
41 Planning faculty members have a significant opportunity to contribute to the development of
42 the planning field through the editing of journals, leadership in our professional research
43 associations, and similar exceptional efforts. While such work may not result in the direct
44 production of knowledge, by contributing to the development of the planning field's research
45 capacity and outlets, such work has a research component that the Department values.

46
47 A part of the faculty member's research activity is considered to be work in progress.
48 Indicators of work in progress include draft manuscripts, working papers, papers presented
49 at professional meetings, seminar presentations at FSU and other universities, grant
50 proposals, and funded research.

1
2 Outside funding for research and practice, as well as for other Department functions such as
3 financial aid, public service, and teaching, is an important activity that the Department
4 encourages. While funding cannot substitute for publication of research, it is an important
5 indicator of faculty performance. Quite simply, state funding resources are inadequate to
6 meeting the needs of the Department and therefore the pursuit of outside funding is critical
7 to meeting our needs and improving our effectiveness in teaching, research, and service.
8 Faculty members who bring in outside funds that are likely to result in publication of
9 refereed journal articles, chapters, and books should be recognized for their achievement in
10 the annual evaluation. Particular value is placed on faculty obtaining outside funding that
11 not only provides stipends and tuition funding for doctoral and masters students, but also
12 aids those students in furthering their research skills, perhaps even to the point where their
13 names appear as co-authors on resulting referred journal articles, chapters, or books.
14 Faculty members who win peer reviewed grants, such as NSF or other federal grants that
15 are likely to result in the publication of findings in peer reviewed journals and which are
16 likely to further the academic careers of research assistants, should be rewarded similar to
17 other peer reviewed outputs. Funded practice that supports masters' students' also is
18 important to the department and is to be valued in the evaluation process.

19
20 Although the submission of a research proposal is a work in progress, the Department does
21 recognize the value of submitting research for peer review by funding agencies. Peer
22 review, regardless of whether it is done for journal submissions or research proposals is a
23 fundamentally important way in which both the faculty member and the Department receive
24 valuable feedback on how well we are doing as scholars and how we can improve our
25 scholarship. Consequently, the submission of peer review research proposals is especially
26 encouraged. Of course, the actual funding of peer reviewed research proposals is significant
27 recognition of the value of a faculty member's research and is therefore highly desired.

28
29 To recap, the Department values works that have an impact on our field and rewards faculty
30 for publishing such material. The full value of our research is measured by the degree to
31 which it has had an impact on the field of planning and how people think about it. It is not
32 the publication of articles *per se*, therefore, that is sought, but impact on the field of
33 planning through our research. Impact can be measured in a variety of ways and faculty
34 are encouraged to demonstrate impact through the use of appropriate measures. For books
35 and articles, impact can be demonstrated in a variety of ways, including book reviews,
36 prizes, and citation counts.

37
38 **Teaching.** Quality of teaching is based both on classroom performance and performance in
39 outside-the-classroom meetings with students, including directing graduate students, sitting
40 on masters and doctoral committees, and reading doctoral preliminary examinations.
41 Classroom teaching performance is evaluated on the basis of Department teaching
42 evaluation scores, classroom observation evaluations, the quality of the syllabi and course
43 materials employed by the faculty member, and SUSSAI scores. Recognition is made of the
44 fact that in evaluating teaching we evaluate a) the course and the course materials and b)
45 the actual instruction in that class. Classroom observations must be done in compliance
46 with the requirements laid out by the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

47
48 In evaluating instruction and course materials, the Department is guided by the following
49 criteria: instructor skill, course structure, accessibility and rapport, feedback, interaction,
50 currency and appropriateness of content, and level of expectation for student achievement.

1
2 In evaluating teaching, consideration will also be given to the numbers of students taught.
3 Faculty who are making a major contribution to increasing the number of student FTEs in
4 the Department, at both the graduate and undergraduate level, should be rewarded for
5 their contribution. Although we may regret an emphasis on quantity of teaching, the simple
6 fact is that the Department's performance is evaluated in part on the number of students
7 we teach.
8

9 Also, in evaluating teaching, we recognize an obligation to distinguish between factors over
10 which an instructor has control and factors over which she doesn't have control, such place
11 of the course in the curriculum, whether the course is required or not, and the quality of
12 educational infrastructure.
13

14 **Service.** Quality of service is based in great part on the expectations that derive from a
15 faculty member's rank. Assistant professors are expected and in fact encouraged to play a
16 minor service role in the Department. Their attention should be focused on developing their
17 research and teaching agendas. Nevertheless, in a small department such as ours, all
18 faculty are expected to perform some service role in the Department.
19

20 Senior faculty, at both the associate and full professor levels, are expected to play more
21 significant roles in Department service, such as chairing committees and performing special
22 administrative duties such as Department Chair, MSP Program Director, Ph.D. Program
23 Director, and Undergraduate Program Director. In annual evaluations, attention should be
24 paid to how well these senior faculty do in performing these roles. Because of the
25 Department's small size, it cannot afford senior faculty who do not play significant
26 leadership roles.
27

28 Service to the profession is also an important activity. In addition to service to ACSP and
29 other academic and professional associations, significant professional service also includes
30 serving as a journal referee, service on the editorial review board for a journal, testimony
31 before a legislative or other public body, and significant public speaking or media
32 appearances of a professional nature.
33

34 Finally, because planning takes place in the community, evaluation of service activity also
35 reflects a faculty member's service to the community, particularly as that service relates to
36 planning. Hence, service on planning bodies or authorities, for example, is considered to be
37 an important service activity. This type of service is especially important because it informs
38 both our teaching and our research. Our ability, for example, to educate planning
39 practitioners is contingent in part on our ability to relate our courses to the practice of
40 planning. Moreover, service to the community also helps the Department, College, and
41 University obtain recognition by the community for its public service.
42
43

44 **Differential Assignments**

45

46 1. The standard AY teaching load of two courses per semester (2/2) (unless elsewhere
47 specified) constitutes a 50% assignment. Research constitutes approximately 48%, and
48 service 2%, though percentages can change in individual situations. The Department of
49 Urban and Regional Planning endorses the principle of differential faculty assignment for

1 faculty members whose performance suggests that the standard assignment is not
2 productive.

3
4 2. The new policy will take effect for the Spring 2008 peer review of performance in CY
5 2007.

6
7 3. A tenured faculty member who is evaluated by the Chair in the area of research with a
8 "U" for two years in a row shall have his or her assignment adjusted to teach 3 courses per
9 semester. This adjustment would be reflected in a teaching assignment of 75%.

10
11 4. A tenured faculty member evaluated by the Chair with a "U" for three consecutive years
12 shall have his or her research assignment further modified to teach 4 courses each
13 semester. This assignment would be reflected with a 98% teaching assignment.

14
15 5. Alternatively, the Chair may increase the tenured faculty member's service and/or
16 advising assignment in conjunction with increased teaching, such that the total assignment
17 is 100%.

18
19 6. A tenured faculty member who has a 4-course assignment but evinces the productivity
20 of a 50% research assignment two years running may return to a normal teaching and
21 research assignment upon the judgment of the Chair.

22
23 7. This policy does not apply to untenured faculty members working toward tenure, in
24 order to give such faculty members the fullest opportunity to earn tenure.

25 26 **Part II: Non-tenure-track Faculty**

27 28 **Purpose**

29
30 The purpose of this part of the Guide is to inform non-tenure-track faculty in the
31 Department of Urban and Regional Planning about the Department's expectations for their
32 performance in teaching, research and other creative activity, and service. Its purpose is to
33 help each faculty member, regardless of rank, to better understand what the Department
34 expects of them in these areas. Please note that the Department's criteria are guided and
35 governed by the standards for promotion and evaluations articulated in the *Faculty*
36 *Handbook* and *the Collective Bargaining Agreement*. In addition, it provides information on
37 the procedures that are followed for annual evaluation and promotion.

38 39 40 **Annual Evaluation Procedures**

41
42 For non-tenure-track faculty members, the Department chair will prepare an annual
43 evaluation in accordance with the guidelines set out in the Faculty Handbook and Bargaining
44 Agreement, including a solicitation of assessments from the tenured, tenure-earning, and
45 full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in the Department. The chair shall score every non-
46 tenure-track faculty member on a 1 to 5 (5 being the highest) scale for teaching, research
47 and other creative activities, and/or service, as assigned in the individual's Assignment of
48 Responsibilities. Numeric scores over a three year period of time are used to allocate merit
49 pay increases.

1 Supra-annual evaluations shall be conducted in the first year and third year in rank for
2 individuals in the Assistant In and Assistant Scholar/Scientist ranks to advise the faculty
3 member being evaluated about his/her progress towards promotion. A supra-annual
4 evaluation shall be conducted in the third year in rank for individuals in the Associate In and
5 Associate Scholar/Scientist ranks to advise the faculty member being evaluated about
6 his/her progress towards promotion. A supra-annual evaluation shall be conducted in the
7 fifth year in rank, and every five years thereafter, for individuals in the Research Associate
8 and Scholar/Scientist ranks to assess sustained performance. The supra-annual evaluations
9 will be conducted by the Department chair with the advice of all tenured, tenure-earning,
10 and full-time, non-tenure-track faculty.

11
12 **Promotion Criteria and Process for Non-Tenure Track-Faculty**
13

14 In the Department of Urban and Regional Planning non-tenure-track faculty members
15 conduct research and other creative activity including specialized services to local, state,
16 and federal governments, communities, non-governmental organizations and others
17 engaged in or affected by the planning process. They also may contribute to the teaching
18 functions of the Department. These positions have titles that include, but are not limited to,
19 the Assistant In/Associate In/Research Associate series and
20 Assistant/Associate/Scholar/Scientist series.

21
22 Criteria for non-tenure-track faculty promotions are based on the individual's degree, time-
23 in-service, and performance. Overall performance is reviewed in the annual evaluation
24 process; decisions to recommend promotion are based on these reviews.
25

26 The following elements will be considered when recommending a non-tenure-track faculty
27 member for promotion. These elements are in no particular order, and will be applied as
28 appropriate based on the duties, responsibilities, and expectations of the position. These
29 elements include, but are not limited to:

30 **PROFESSIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT:**

- 31 Effectiveness in the performance of teaching duties
- 32 Relevant years of experience
- 33 Submission of contract and grant proposals for external funding
- 34 Timely completion of contractual and grant obligations
- 35 Publication of books, brochures, chapters in books, articles in refereed and un-refereed
36 journals and/or professional publications
- 37 Features and/or citations in professional magazines, newsletters, or on professional
38 websites
- 39 Demonstrated expertise in the area of research, creative activity, or field of specialty
- 40 Presentations at meetings, workshops, or conferences of professional societies
- 41 Other professional accomplishments as appropriate

42 **PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION:**

- 43 Recognition as an authority in the area of research, creative activity, or field of specialty
- 44 Invited talks at meetings, workshops, conferences or within the University community
- 45 Organization of workshops, seminars, professional conferences, and meetings
- 46 Membership and/or positions of responsibility in professional organizations
- 47 Professional honors, awards, competition placements, and other recognitions
- 48 Contract and grant funding awarded from external sources including federal, state, local,
49 and private

- 1 Invited exhibitions of work
- 2 Testimony before public legislative or executive bodies
- 3 Other professional recognition as appropriate

4 **PROFESSIONAL SERVICE:**

5 Service to DURP and the University directing/supervising undergraduate and graduate
6 research as well as committee and sub-committee activity related to instruction, research,
7 creative activity, etc. Service in providing professional services to the public and private
8 sectors of the community, state, and nation as well as communities in other nations. Other
9 service, including administrative assignments, as appropriate

10

11 **ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA:**

12 **Assistant In/Associate In/Research Associate:**

13 Promotional ladder is Assistant in, Associate in, and then Research Associate. An Assistant
14 In becomes eligible for promotion from Assistant In to Associate In after 5 years in service
15 with Bachelor's degree or after 3 years in service with Master's degree. A Research
16 Associate must have a Ph.D. OR 10 years of training and experience at the Assistant in
17 and/or Associate in level(s), or their equivalents, per FSU criteria.

18

19 **Assistant/Associate/Scholar/Scientist:**

20 For the Assistant/Associate/Scholar/Scientist series, promotional ladder is Assistant
21 Scholar/Scientist, Associate Scholar/Scientist, and then Scholar Scientist. An Assistant
22 Scholar/Scientist is eligible for promotion to Associate Scholar/Scientist when holding a
23 Ph.D. or the highest degree in an appropriate field of specialization and after 5 years of
24 service. Promotion to Scholar/Scientist requires a Ph.D. or the highest degree in an
25 appropriate field of specialization and 5 years of service at the Associate Scholar/Scientist
26 level.

27

28 For promotion to Associate Scholar/Scientist, the expectation is that the candidate clearly is
29 becoming recognized nationally in urban and regional planning. Promotion to Associate
30 Scholar/Scientist shall be based on recognition of demonstrated effectiveness in teaching,
31 service, definite scholarly or creative accomplishments, and recognized standing in the
32 profession.

33

34 For promotion to Scholar/Scientist, the expectation is that the candidate has become
35 recognized nationally in urban and regional planning. Promotion to the rank of
36 Scholar/Scientist shall be based on recognition of superior teaching, service, scholarly or
37 creative accomplishments of high quality and recognized standing in the profession.

38

39 Although the period of time in a given rank is normally five years, demonstrated merit, not
40 years of service, shall be the guiding factor. Promotion is not automatic, nor is it regarded
41 as guaranteed upon completion of a given term of service. Early promotion is possible
42 where there is sufficient justification.

43

44 In all cases, the Department of Urban and Regional Planning will adhere to Florida State
45 University policy. A copy of the criteria must be on file in the Office of the Dean of the
46 Faculties.

47

1 **PROMOTION PROCESS:**

2 The recommendation for promotion originates with the non-tenure-track faculty member's
3 immediate supervisor at the appropriate time determined by the Dean of Faculties.

4 Documentation should be organized in a binder or folder as follows:

- 5 • Letter/memo of recommendation
- 6 • Vita
- 7 • Faculty member's annual assignments and annual evaluations including faculty
8 member's written promotion appraisal(s) for the required time of service
- 9 • Any additional supporting documentation that would enhance and/or justify request
- 10 • Letters of assessment provided by external reviewers

11
12 The DURP Chair with the advice of all tenured, tenure-earning, and full-time non-tenure-
13 track faculty will review all documentation and forward his or her recommendation as well
14 as the recommendation of the faculty to the President via the Office of the Dean of the
15 Faculties and the Dean of the College of Social Sciences. Promotion recommendations to
16 the Associate in and/or Research Associate level(s) must also be reviewed by the Vice
17 President for Research prior to forwarding to the Office of the Dean of the Faculties.

18 The Dean of the Faculties' Office will review files to ensure that the University and DURP
19 criteria are satisfied, as well as any additional criteria of the specific unit, and will forward
20 the advice to the President for final action. The DURP Chair will be notified of the
21 President's action(s) and will subsequently notify the applicable supervisor(s) and faculty
22 member(s). The promotional increase and title change shall become effective the first day
23 of the next academic year. Faculty members on contracts and grants or auxiliary funding
24 will receive salary increases equivalent to faculty members on E&G funding, provided that
25 such salary increases are permitted by the terms of the contract or grant and adequate
26 funds are available.