

Muma College of Business Faculty Charter
Code of Operating Standards for Academic Policy and Administrative Structure

I. PURPOSES

- A. To formally identify organizational structure and procedures for faculty development and supervision of the academic policies of the Muma College of Business.
- B. To provide a structure to facilitate faculty participation in determining administrative policies, practices, and decisions affecting the quality and effectiveness of the educational objectives of the students, faculty, and administration of the Muma College of Business.
- C. To define a collegial system delineating the major academic responsibilities and jurisdictions of the faculty and administrative officers of the Muma College of Business within the framework established by the State University System and the University of South Florida.

II. FACULTY

The COLLEGE FACULTY, as herein used, shall consist of those individuals identified as participating faculty members holding the ranks of Full Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor in the Muma College of Business.

Unless otherwise noted members of the COLLEGE FACULTY comprise the voting members. Voting members of the COLLEGE FACULTY shall exercise general legislative jurisdiction over matters of academic policy within existing University policies and regulations. The COLLEGE FACULTY may delegate a portion of their duties and/or responsibilities to an elected FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, and various standing and/or ad hoc College committees.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

The DEAN, as Chief Executive Officer of the Muma College of Business, is responsible in conjunction with the COLLEGE FACULTY for developing administrative policies and programs. The DEAN, or the DEAN's delegate, is an ex-officio member of all standing Muma College of Business committees and represents the Muma College of Business at the University level.

The DEAN's appointments to the positions of Associate Dean; Assistant Dean; and School, Academic Program, and College Center Directors shall be made with the advice of the

relevant COLLEGE FACULTY members. These individuals and the Campus/School Deans constitute the ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS of the Muma College of Business, and as such constitute the COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION.

Administrative Officers who currently hold faculty rank on continuing appointments are members of the COLLEGE FACULTY. In this capacity, they are eligible to vote on issues brought before the COLLEGE FACULTY at general faculty meetings. Administrative Officers, who are tenured faculty are also eligible voting faculty in the tenure and promotion process. However, no voting faculty member may vote more than once on a tenure and promotion application.

IV. FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The mission of the FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE is to advance the College through active faculty involvement in all aspects of academic programming, governance, and outreach.

The FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE is the representative voice of the COLLEGE FACULTY. It is elected by and responsible to the COLLEGE FACULTY. Its purpose is to represent the faculty in appropriate matters of faculty jurisdiction and concern, and to facilitate communication between the COLLEGE FACULTY and Office of the DEAN.

The FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE shall be composed of three elected members from each multi-campus School.¹ At least one of the three members shall be from a different campus. The single-campus Schools² shall affiliate to elect one member to serve on the committee. The final composition of the committee shall represent all campuses. The terms of the elected members are three years with one member from each multi-campus School being elected each year in April to take office in August. See Appendix A for the election procedure.

The FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE shall by majority elect each year a Chairperson and a Vice Chairperson to serve for a one year term. The responsibility of the Vice Chairperson is to ensure minutes of all meetings are taken and distributed to members. Replacement of either the Chairperson and/or Vice Chairperson shall require a majority vote of FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE members. The Chairperson, Vice Chairperson and Committee members may succeed themselves, but not for more than two (2) consecutive terms. The Chairperson of the FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE shall be an ex-officio member of any principal committee(s) established by the DEAN to

¹ A multi-campus school (known as departments/school prior to consolidation) is one with faculty housed on more than one campus (e.g., Accountancy, Business & Finance, Information Systems & Management, Marketing & Innovation). A faculty member's campus is the geographical location and budget entity responsible for providing the faculty member's support services and payroll.

² A single-campus school is one with faculty all housed on one campus (e.g. Risk Management, Insurance and Security, and Hospitality and Tourism Management).

address college administrative affairs. As requested by the DEAN or the Chairperson of the FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE the Chairperson may attend a meeting of the COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION.

The FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE shall meet as needed. It is expected that the Committee meet at least once each semester during the regular academic year. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairperson, the DEAN, or upon request to the FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE Chairperson, by any member of the Committee.

FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE decisions shall require a quorum consisting of one-half of the members and a simple majority vote of those attending. A written ballot of all FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE members shall be required whenever requested by a Committee member. Attending includes physical, telephonic or electronic presence that ensures full participation by the member.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Prior to the end of the Fall Semester of each year the DEAN shall present a report covering each of the items listed in "A," "B," and "C" below at a general faculty meeting.

- A. A summary and review of the preceding academic year budget with details of allocations and utilization of resources by academic programs, schools, and administrative activities.
- B. A statement of the planned allocation of resources for the year ahead, by program, discipline and/or activity, with relevant breakdowns in terms of faculty lines, operating expenses, "Temporary Personnel" and "Other Capital Outlays" (OCO).
- C. A summary of activities and accomplishments relating to the College's mission, goals, and strategic initiatives.

VI. FACULTY ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEES

There shall be standing UNDERGRADUATE, GRADUATE, and DOCTORAL POLICY COMMITTEES to oversee academic policy, practices, and curriculum. The DEAN'S representative(s) shall serve as an ex officio member on the committees.

- A. The UNDERGRADUATE and GRADUATE POLICY COMMITTEES shall be composed of two members from each multi-campus school who shall serve two-year staggered terms. The single-campus Schools shall affiliate to recommend one member to serve on the committee. Members of these committees shall be appointed by the DEAN based on recommendations from School Directors generated with the advice of the respective school faculty. Committee chairs shall be appointed by the DEAN with recommendations from the School Directors. Through the appointment process the DEAN shall ensure all campuses are represented and at least one-third of the total committee membership is from the Sarasota-Manatee and St. Petersburg campuses.

- B. The DOCTORAL POLICY COMMITTEE shall be composed of the doctoral program coordinators from each School and the Academic Director of the doctor of business administration program.
- C. The UNDERGRADUATE POLICY COMMITTEE, the GRADUATE POLICY COMMITTEE, and the DOCTORAL POLICY COMMITTEE shall advise and make recommendations to the COLLEGE FACULTY, program directors, and the College DEAN, University committees, and University administrative personnel regarding new courses, programs, and academic standards. The policy committees shall recommend approval/disapproval to the entire faculty when there are proposed new courses, programs or academic standards or when there are proposed changes to existing courses, programs or academic standards that are substantive and/or will impact more than one School. Consideration shall be given not only to academic impact but also impact related to the need for additional resources.

These committees shall present to the DEAN and the FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE a written report summarizing their activities at the end of each academic year.

VII. OTHER FACULTY COMMITTEES

- A. In addition to the standing academic policy committees other standing policy committees include TENURE & PROMOTION, RESEARCH & SCHOLARSHIP, STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP & TEACHING AWARDS, DBA, MBA, and DIVERSITY committees to oversee policy and practices related to the academic process. The DEAN'S representative(s) shall serve as an ex officio member on the committees.
- B. The TENURE & PROMOTION COMMITTEE shall have elected representatives and consist of 13 tenured professors distributed as follows. There shall be six representatives from the Tampa campus, four from the St. Petersburg campus, and three from the Sarasota-Manatee campus. There shall be three representatives from each of the multi-campus Schools and one representative from single-campus Schools. At least one of the three representatives from multi-campus Schools shall be a full professor, as shall the single-campus representative. Representatives are elected each year in April to take office in August. A representative may be re-elected to serve a maximum of two consecutive years. Exceptions to re-election are allowed if the area has no other professor qualified to serve. The committee is responsible for reviewing all cases relative to tenure and promotion including the mid-tenure review.
- C. Members of the RESEARCH & SCHOLARSHIP, STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP & TEACHING AWARDS, DBA, MBA, and DIVERSITY committees shall be appointed by the DEAN based on recommendations from Campus Deans and School Directors generated with the advice of the respective School faculty.

Committee chairs shall be appointed by the DEAN with recommendations from the School Directors. Through the appointment process the DEAN shall ensure multi-campus representation on the committees.

With the exception of the SCHOLARSHIP & TEACHING AWARDS committee, these committees shall be composed of five members with at least one member from each multi-campus school; one member may be selected from a single-campus school. The SCHOLARSHIP & TEACHING AWARDS committee shall have at least one representative from each campus. This committee shall be comprised of a minimum of 5 members but not more than 7 members. Members shall serve one year terms, and may be reappointed.

D. AD HOC COMMITTEES

The FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE may appoint Ad Hoc Committees as deemed necessary to consider matters not already assigned to a standing committee. The Committee Chair, with the approval of the Committee members, and in consultation with the DEAN, shall determine the membership and chair of each Ad Hoc Committee.

The DEAN may appoint an Ad Hoc Committee. Membership of the committee shall be determined by the DEAN in consultation with School Directors and faculty members.

VIII. ACADEMIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

- A. Assessment is a responsibility of all Muma College of Business faculty.
- B. The Academic Program Assessment System (Assessment System) of the Muma College of Business shall meet applicable requirements, standards, policies, and procedures set forth by SACSCOC, AACSB, ACPHA, and USF Institutional Research and Effectiveness for program and unit assessment.
- C. The Assessment System shall be coordinated by the DEAN with the support of the School Directors/Deans, and UNDERGRADUATE, GRADUATE, and DOCTORAL POLICY COMMITTEE Chairs.
- D. Faculty shall participate in systematic data gathering, review, and planning for program improvement for their programs and the college.
- E. The Assessment System shall adhere to the policies and procedures compiled by SACSCOC, AACSB, and ACPHA.
- F. The DEAN shall coordinate assessment requirements among the campuses and the Schools for the College; and between the College and external parties such as SACSCOC, AACSB, ACPHA, and USF Institutional Research and Effectiveness.

IX. FACULTY VOTING PROCEDURES

At general meetings of the COLLEGE FACULTY, no formal vote shall be taken unless there is a necessary quorum of COLLEGE FACULTY present. For this purpose, a quorum shall be defined as at least 50 percent of the COLLEGE FACULTY. The DEAN or a member of the COLLEGE FACULTY may request that any vote be done by means of a secret ballot. In order for any measure to pass by a vote of the COLLEGE FACULTY, a majority of the votes shall be in favor of the measure. Attending includes physical, telephonic or electronic presence that ensures full participation by the member.

Email voting may be conducted on questions for which no subsequent vote or dialogue is requested, or discussion will be held, and is in alignment with all other state, University, and College policies. Should e-mail voting occur a faculty member shall cast a “yes vote,” “no vote,” or a vote to “abstain” to count towards the quorum. Faculty not replying to an e-mail vote will not count toward the quorum.

Faculty shall be provided at least a one week notice on issues requiring a faculty vote in general faculty meetings. This notice shall include the time and date of the meeting and relevant information regarding the issue requiring a vote.

X. EVALUATION POLICY

- A. Faculty Evaluations of Administrators. To facilitate and encourage effectiveness in the performance of their duties, the Administrators of the College shall be evaluated and provided feedback by the COLLEGE FACULTY. The FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE shall determine an appropriate evaluation process for College Administrator(s) by the COLLEGE FACULTY and supervise its administration.
- B. Student Evaluations of Faculty. To facilitate and encourage effectiveness in the performance of their teaching assignments, all faculty teaching in the Muma College of Business shall be evaluated and provided feedback by their students.
- C. Administrative Evaluation of COLLEGE FACULTY. The administrative evaluation of COLLEGE FACULTY shall be as set forth in the USF/UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement.
- D. The FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE shall be involved with DEAN and Dean searches for the College and shall meet with potential DEAN and Dean candidates and provide formal input to the concerned search committees.

XI. COMPLIANCE AND SEVERABILITY

The provisions of this Charter shall not be construed in any manner so as to conflict with the Laws of the State of Florida, the policies of the Board of Governors and the USF/UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement. In the event that any provision of this Charter is found to

be invalid or unenforceable, then that provision shall be of no force or effect, but the remainder of the Charter shall continue in full force and effect.

XII. AMENDMENT AND REPEAL

Action to amend and/or repeal this document in whole or in part may be initiated by a petition setting forth the proposed change. Such a petition shall be signed by at least 10 percent of the voting members of the COLLEGE FACULTY or by a majority of the members of the FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. Such petitions shall be presented to the FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, which shall set a date for the convening of a meeting of the COLLEGE FACULTY for the purpose of discussing the proposed change. The FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE shall give at least a one week notice of such meeting to each voting member of the COLLEGE FACULTY. A copy of the proposed change shall accompany such notice.

Action to accept or reject the proposed change shall be by ballot. A majority vote of the members of the COLLEGE FACULTY voting shall be required to adopt the proposed change.

Faculty approve 2-28-20 and USF reviewed 5-1-20

Appendix A
Muma College of Business
Faculty Charter

- A. In order to establish the initial membership of the Faculty Executive Committee, the College Faculty of each multi-campus School shall nominate five (5) College Faculty from his/her multi-campus School to serve on the Faculty Executive Committee. The list of nominees shall contain at least one (1) College Faculty member from each of the three (3) campuses of the multi-campus School. Each College Faculty member from a multi-campus School shall vote for three (3) of the nominees. The three (3) nominees receiving the highest number of votes shall be members of the Faculty Executive Committee from that multi-campus School. If a tie vote occurs, the tie shall be resolved by a re-vote on those tied nominees. If all three (3) of the elected members of the Faculty Council Executive Committee are from the same campus of a multi-campus School, then the elected College Faculty member with the least number of votes, with any ties to be resolved with a flip of a coin, shall be replaced by the non-elected nominee from an unrepresented campus of the multi-campus School with the most votes as compared with the other non-elected nominees from the unrepresented campuses with ties to be resolved by the flip of a coin.
- B. The College Faculty of each single-campus school shall nominate at least one (1) College Faculty member from his/her single-campus School to serve on the Faculty Executive Committee. Each College Faculty member from a single-campus school shall vote for one of the nominees. The nominee receiving the highest number of the votes shall be a member of the College Faculty Executive Committee from the single-campus schools. If a tie vote occurs among the nominees who receive the highest number of votes, the tie shall be resolved by the flip of a coin.
- C. The initial term of a Faculty Executive Committee member from a multi-campus school shall be determined by the number of votes received by the nominee with the one receiving the most votes given a three (3) year term, the one receiving the next highest number of votes be given a two year term and the one receiving the least number of votes given a one year term. If the individual is not able or willing to complete the term, his/her replacement for the remainder of his/her term shall be from the same campus and be elected by a majority vote of the College Faculty from his/her multi-campus or single-campus School.

If after the above election process in A and B is completed on all campuses of the multi-campus and single-campus Schools, none of the thirteen (13) elected College Faculty members are from one (1) of the campuses of the multi-campus Schools, then the elected College Faculty member of the thirteen (13) elected College Faculty members with the least number of votes, with any ties to be resolved by the flip of a coin, which will not result in that campus having all of its elected College Faculty members from the same campus shall be replaced with the non-elected nominated College Faculty member from the unrepresented campus with the most votes, as compared with the total votes received by any other non-elected College Faculty member from that unrepresented campus, with ties to be resolved by the flip of a coin.

Appendix B

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA MUMA COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCEDURE AND CRITERIA

This document presents the procedure and criteria used in the annual evaluation of faculty in the Muma College of Business consistent with provisions of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) related to faculty evaluations. These criteria are applied uniformly in all schools in the Muma College of Business. These criteria, along with the documented and measurable performance outcomes specified, have been developed by the administration in the Muma College of Business with input from faculty. As required by the current CBA, implementation of these procedures and criteria are recommended by a majority vote of Muma College of Business full-time in-unit faculty members.

All full-time faculty members are evaluated annually. The period of the evaluation is for the preceding calendar year from January 1 through December 31. Performance evaluation in each category of teaching, research, and service is based on the faculty member's assigned duties. The evaluation in each category is assigned a numerical value of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5, respectively, which corresponds to the ratings used in the Sustained Performance Evaluations (SPE). Numerical values in the midpoints of the five categories are also used, when appropriate, for example an evaluation of 4.5 when performance is better than 4 but does not rise to the level of a 5.

Faculty Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to provide all the required data and any additional information that should be considered in the evaluation of performance in an annual report, for each of the following three categories: teaching, research, and service. Failure to provide an annual report results in disqualification for merit or other pay consideration that relies on the faculty annual evaluation. In addition, a rating of unacceptable is assigned to any category where no evaluative material was provided, except for the category of teaching, where the state-mandated common student evaluations will be used to determine the evaluation of teaching.

Director Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of the director to evaluate the faculty member using the following guidelines while considering all the information provided by the faculty member. As part of the director's written evaluation the faculty member should be provided with measurable objectives that will be assessed at the next annual evaluation.

Teaching

Student evaluations of teaching in courses with enrollments of more than five students are the starting point for evaluation of teaching using the following criteria:

- (1) *unacceptable* if the average student evaluation of teaching scores for all courses taught was 2.0 or lower on the 5.0 scale (where 5.0 is outstanding) and there is insufficient additional evidence to support a higher rating;
- (2) *weak* if the average student evaluation of teaching scores was greater than 2.0 and less than 3.0 for all courses taught and there is insufficient additional evidence to support a higher rating;

- (3) *satisfactory* if the average student evaluation of teaching scores for all courses taught was equal to or higher than 3.0 and less than or equal to 3.75 and there is insufficient additional evidence to support a higher rating;
- (4) *strong* if the average student evaluation of teaching scores across all courses taught was greater than 3.75 and less than or equal to 4.5 and there is insufficient additional evidence to support a higher rating; and
- (5) *outstanding* if the average student evaluation of teaching scores was consistently above 4.5 across all courses taught and there is insufficient additional evidence to support a rating of *outstanding* (e.g., finalist or winner of a teaching award, new course developed, etc.).

The final assignment of the rating for teaching includes consideration of the level of courses taught (undergraduate, graduate), class sizes, primary delivery mode (mass lecture, online, case-based), the departmental and college average evaluations, written student comments, and if the employee's annual evaluation of teaching in the previous calendar year was less than satisfactory, or if employee agrees to it an observation of classroom teaching performed in accordance with the applicable provisions of the CBA. Consideration is also given to additional evidence provided by the faculty member regarding the quality of teaching, including but not limited to assignments and assessments employed in courses, course syllabi, innovations introduced into courses and co-curricular activities that are aimed at improving student success, and efforts to address creativity and/or analytics in the courses taught and co-curricular activities. The chair will convey in the written evaluation the factors that have been used in the final assignment of the rating.

Research

Research activity of faculty with research assignments should be aimed at making a scholarly contribution (as defined in Section I.A.3.b of the Tenure & Promotion Guidelines for the college) to the faculty member's primary or related academic disciplines. Faculty members who are tenured or tenure-earning with research assignments higher than 40 percent are expected to produce more and better quality research than faculty members with lower research assignments and those in non-tenure-earning positions. For non-tenure-track faculty with research assignments between 10 and 30 percent, the following criteria are modified such that meeting the criteria for a 3 may warrant a rating of 4 and meeting the criteria for 4.0 may warrant a rating of 5.

Because publishing research can be a lengthy process consideration will also be given to the research pipeline in terms of "revise and resubmit" outcomes, highly rated yet unfunded competitive grant applications, presentations at respected academic conferences, and work-in-progress. The rating for research also considers evidence provided of research impact (e.g., citations, h-index, and adoption of research in practice). To avoid counting published research multiple times, each contribution is recognized in the year in which final acceptance of publication is received rather than in the year in which it is actually published (clearly, an article can be accepted and published in the same year). Note that final acceptance of publication (e.g., letter from the editor) should be included as part of the annual report for the year under review.

Securing competitive research grants (e.g., NSF and NIH) may warrant ratings of 4 or 5 depending on the magnitude of funding obtained, the overhead rate, and the degree of competitiveness of the grant. Typically, faculty who serve as a PI/Co-PIs for externally funded, competitive grants can count the grant as a UTD/FT50 journal publication if the grant value represents \$150K or more.

To encourage interdisciplinary research and also research in new and promising areas that have the potential to influence business thinking and practice, due consideration may also be given to research published in interdisciplinary journals that are not included on the UTD/FT50 or the ABDC journal list. However, given the difficulty of assessing the quality of publications in several disparate areas, it will be the responsibility of the

faculty member to provide evidence of the impact and quality of such works.

Scholarly contributions other than journal articles, for example scholarly books, monographs, and chapters in scholarly books may be considered in assigning the research rating, but do not substitute for research in high quality peer-reviewed refereed journals. The faculty member must provide evidence of the impact and quality of the scholarly contribution of such works.

The evaluation score in the area of research is assigned using the following criteria, with consideration given to the above listed factors. If the faculty member has no publication acceptances during the annual evaluation period, higher ratings may be warranted based on tangible evidence from the above listed factors.

- (1) No or very little effort was put into research activities (e.g., no attempt was made to conduct research or to engage in research-related activities, continuing research did not progress to completion and projects were not submitted for publication in discipline-based peer-reviewed journals that conform to the Muma COB Research Publication Policy or accepted for presentation at respected academic meetings).
- (2) A submission to an A* or A journal on the ABDC list or to a journal with a similar impact factor that conforms to the Muma College of Business Research Publication Policy progressed beyond the desk review stage (assigned to a review team), or a paper was accepted for presentation at a respected academic meeting.
- (3) A UTD/FT50 submission progressed beyond the desk review stage (assigned to a review team), or a paper was accepted for publication in an A* or A journal on the ABDC list or a journal with a similar impact factor that conforms to the Muma College of Business Research Publication Policy.
- (4) A UTD/FT50 submission progressed to (a next round of) R&R status, or two papers were accepted for publication in A* or A journals on the ABDC list or journals with a similar impact factor that conform to the Muma College of Business Research Publication Policy.
- (5) A paper was accepted for publication in a UTD/FT50 journal, or two UTD/FT50 submissions progressed to (a next round of) R&R status.

Service

Faculty members with higher service assignments are expected to demonstrate more significant service undertakings in relation to faculty members with lower service assignments.

All service activities should be aimed at advancing one or more of the strategic priorities of the faculty member's school, the Muma College of Business, or the university. In assigning a rating for service, consideration is given to the type of committee(s) assignments, role in the committee(s), the level of the committee (school, college, university, external), and the extent to which external (non-university) service brings visibility and national recognition to the school, college, and/or the university. Evidence of the faculty member's efforts and contributions in both internal and external service may be solicited by the school director.

The evaluation of service is assigned using the following criteria:

- (1) The faculty member refused to fulfill any of the assigned service obligations assigned (e.g., committee work) and was absent for a majority of school and/or committee meetings;
- (2) The faculty member missed several school and/or committee meetings and/or did not fulfill service obligations in a timely manner and to the satisfaction of the school director or the chair(s) of the committee(s) to which the faculty member was assigned;
- (3) The faculty member performed all assigned service obligations at the minimum level of acceptability;

- (4) The faculty member performed all assigned service obligations in a manner that advanced the strategic priorities of the school, college, or university, and/or external service was extensive and noteworthy for the school, college, and/or university; and
- (5) The faculty member performed all assigned service obligations with distinction in a manner that significantly advanced the strategic priorities of the school, college, or university, and/or external service resulted in significant visibility and recognition to the school, and/or the university.

Annual Review Appeals Process

Faculty who are not satisfied with their evaluation can write a response to be included in their personnel file along with the annual review. Faculty can appeal the evaluation by requesting that the school's Committee A (or its equivalent) conduct an independent evaluation of the annual report. The appeal should include the rationale and basis for the appeal and may include clarification to already submitted materials. The appeal cannot include new material that was not included in the original annual report. The results of Committee A's evaluation will be included in the appropriate location in the FIS system and it will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

Conflict of Interest

The evaluator cannot evaluate a Related Person. A related person is one of the following: husband; wife; parent; child; brother; sister; spouse of a child, brother, sister, or parent; or parent, child, brother, or sister of spouse; grandparent; grandchild; aunt, uncle, first cousin, niece or nephew. A "Related" person also includes a person who is engaged to be married to the evaluator or who otherwise holds himself or herself out as or is generally known as the person whom the evaluator intends to marry or with whom the evaluator intends to form a household, or any other person having the same legal residence as the evaluator. (USF Policy 0-027).