Department of Communication Bylaws

I. Department Policy

1. Voting Rights
All full-time faculty members who are tenured, tenure-earning or non-tenure earning are eligible to vote on matters pertaining to the department other than promotion and tenure. A 2/3 vote is required. Proxies will be accepted in all matters, except for personnel decisions.

Please refer to Section 1.3 under "II. Tenure, Promotion and Annual Evaluation Guidelines" for tenure and promotion voting procedures.

2. Department Meetings
The Department meets at least once a semester during the academic year. Meeting dates and times are set at least two weeks in advance of the meeting. Requests for agenda items are announced the week before the meeting. Minutes will either be recorded or extensive notes taken and filed.

3. Office Hours
Full-time teaching faculty shall be available to students during posted office hours as specified in the university faculty handbook. Part-time faculty will be reasonably available to students depending on their workload. Both part and full-time faculty will be available at other times by appointment.

4. Departmental Committee Duties
Committees may be formed at the request and discretion of the Chair to study the feasibility of certain projects, to review curriculum, to plan recruitment efforts, or to attend to similar departmental needs. Committees may be project-specific or standing. Committee members will be informed about the nature and length of their membership before agreeing to serve. These duties will count under service for the purposes of annual evaluations.

5. Bylaw Review
All full-time faculty members will vote annually to either: 1) reaffirm the existing bylaws of the department, or 2) undertake review and revision of Department bylaws during that year. If review is recommended, the Chair will appoint a Bylaw Committee to undertake such duties. The bylaw vote will take place during the first faculty meeting of the Fall semester, each year.

II. Tenure, Promotion and Annual Evaluation Guidelines

This section provides guidelines for promotion, tenure and annual evaluation for all full-time faculty members in the Department of Communication.

TENURE-LINE FACULTY: Teaching, Service, and Scholarship sections apply for promotion, tenure, sustained performance evaluations, and annual evaluations.

NON-TENURE EARNING FACULTY: For faculty members who do not have scholarship requirements, only the Teaching and Service sections apply.

UWF has adopted a set of criteria and standards for the assessment of a faculty member's performance of assigned duties and responsibilities. There are three performance categories: teaching; scholarship and creative projects; and service. These assessment criteria form the basis for promotion and tenure decisions.

The following criteria categories will be used in evaluating faculty quality of performance:

- **Poor:** Unacceptable level of performance. Major areas of weakness require remediation.
- **Fair:** Overall performance includes some strengths, but one or more major weaknesses exist.
- **Good:** Moderate progress toward long-term professional goals, but one or more minor weaknesses exist.
- **Excellent:** Meets department standards for professional performance. No areas of weakness exist.
- **Distinguished:** Exceeds department standards for professional performance. Exceeds the standards for excellence in quality, quantity or both.

The minimum standards are:

- **Tenure:** To be granted tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate excellent teaching and at least one excellent and at least one good rating in the other two categories.
- **Promotion to Associate Professor:** To be promoted to associate professor, a faculty member must demonstrate an excellent performance in all three categories.
- **Promotion to Professor:** To be promoted to professor, a faculty member must demonstrate a distinguished performance record in at least one category and at least excellent in each of the other two categories.

The performance levels are expected as an average with sustained effort throughout the decision period.

Table 1. University Criteria for Tenure and Promotion Decisions

Personnel Decision	For a favorable personnel decision the weight of evidence must show sustained performance at these levels		
	Teaching	Scholarship and Creative Projects	Service
Tenure	**Excellent**	At least **Excellent** in one category and at least **Good** in the other category	
Promotion to associate	**Excellent**	**Excellent**	**Excellent**
Promotion to professor	**Distinguished** in at least one category and at least excellent in the other two categories		

1. The Department's Role in Preparation of Tenure-Track Faculty

1.1 Mentoring Committee

The department chair is responsible for assigning a mentoring committee of three members, at least one of which should be tenured communication faculty member. The Mentoring Committee is expected to review progress toward tenure and promotion annually and add their report to the Chairperson's annual evaluation of progress toward tenure.

1.2 Mid-point Review

1.21 Purpose

UWF Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion Policy, 2018-2019 states:

"It is also the responsibility of the department to conduct a review during the midpoint of the probationary period. The Dean must identify the approximate date of the mid-point review in the initial appointment letter. The Chair shall take responsibility for ensuring that the department completes the review, whether the Chair provides the evaluation or delegates the responsibility (e.g., mentoring committee). The procedure for the review shall be described in departmental by-laws.

The mid-point review is intended to provide formative feedback to optimize faculty success in the tenure decision. The review should corroborate success and encourage faculty who are making solid progress toward tenure, inform faculty who may need to improve in selected areas of performance, and warn faculty where lack of progress could jeopardize a favorable outcome. Faculty members may elect to include a copy of the mid-point review in the tenure portfolio; however, inclusion is not required. All mid-point reviews should address the performance of annual assignments including teaching, scholarly and creative projects, and service occurring during the preceding tenure-earning years of employment. In addition, all reviews

should assess overall performance and contributions critically in light of mid-point expectations.

The mid-point review will not be as extensive as the formal tenure review that occurs toward the end of the probation period, but should be based on a set of documents, including a current vita; annual evaluations; student/peer evaluation of teaching; selected examples of teaching materials and scholarship; and a self-evaluation by the faculty member. The Dean will review the department's written mid-point review and respond to the department and the faculty member in writing. Further use of these materials is at the discretion of the faculty member."

1.22 Content

In addition to the preceding information, the mid-point review should include a
a. Statement of Contributions (self-evaluation).
b. Current CV.
c. Annual Evaluations.
d. Student/Peer Evaluation of Teaching.
e. Select Examples of Teaching Materials.
f. Select Examples of Scholarship.
g. Select Examples of Service.
h. Letter of Initial Appointment.
i. Letter of Evaluation by the Chair.

1.23 Preparation

a. It is the responsibility of the faculty member's mentors to guide the faculty member in preparing the mid-point review.
b. All tenured faculty will be required to review the dossier and provide feedback directly to the Chair.
c. The mentors will provide feedback to the faculty member, which will include a performance improvement plan, if necessary.
d. The Chair will prepare a written summary of the evaluation that will go in the faculty member's personnel file and for the Dean's review.
e. The Dean will review the Department's written mid-point review and respond to the Department and the faculty member in writing.
f. Faculty members may elect to include a copy of the mid-point review in their tenure portfolio; however, inclusion is not required.

1.24 Timeline

a. The faculty member will submit the mid-point review at the beginning of the spring semester during the third year, unless otherwise indicated in the faculty's appointment letter.
b. Faculty will review the dossier during Spring semester and provide feedback within a set of time.
c. The mentors will have a meeting with the faculty member before the end of the spring semester and provide feedback to the faculty member as well as the Chair.
d. The Chair will submit a written evaluation, along with the annual evaluation, to be submitted to the College Dean.

1.3 Voting

The Chair will request all tenured full-time faculty members to submit a formal evaluation on tenure for each eligible faculty member within the appropriate unit. The evaluation form should be completed and signed by each faculty member and submitted to the Chair. Other full-time faculty (excluding visiting faculty) may provide the Chair with opinions of the candidate's dossier. On a separate document, all tenured faculty in the department or unit shall vote regarding the acceptability of tenure for the candidate. The unsigned votes will be included in the tenure dossier in an envelope without disclosure of how individual faculty voted in the decision.

2. Teaching

2.1 General Guidelines

2.11. In this performance area, the ratings in the first three performance categories (Poor, Fair, Good) do not facilitate favorable tenure and promotion decisions.

2.12. SAI's with a response rate of less than 60% should be interpreted with caution as they may not be reflective of a professor's performance in the classroom.

2.13. In calculating Student Teaching Evaluation averages, faculty may either provide an average of student responses on all evaluation categories, or a calculated average of the two items: "Overall, assessment of instructor" and "Overall, I would rate the course organization". Depending on the design of the SAI questionnaire, these two items may be at different locations within the questionnaire from semester to semester.

2.14. All Student Teaching Evaluations for a given semester must be calculated the same way (i.e. a faculty member may not select to calculate all items for one course and only "Overall, assessment of instructor" and "Overall, I would rate the course organization" for another course in the same semester).

2.15. The SAI evaluation scores for each course will be calculated on a 5-point scale where a ranking of excellent = 5.0, very good = 4.0, good = 3.0, fair = 2.0 and poor = 1.0. The overall SAI evaluation score for an academic year will be calculated by averaging all of a faculty member's courses for that year. For example, a faculty member teaching three fall courses with SAI scores of 4.3, 4.5 and 4.7 and three spring courses with SAI scores of 4.6, 4.8, and 3.9 would have a total SAI evaluation score of 4.46 for that academic year.

2.16. Course teaching evaluation averages may also be weighted at the discretion of the Department Chair in consideration of variables such as courses noted for their difficulty, graduate courses, major courses with an unusually high number of non-majors, etc.

2.2 Poor

This performance level demonstrates serious problems in attaining success in the teaching role as reflected either by (1) teaching evaluations averaging below 3.5, (2) a combination of many negative indicators, or (3) fewer but more extreme behaviors that produce substantial negative outcomes on students and their learning.

Additional Indicators:

- Student evaluations document consistent and substantive problems.
- Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations.
- Course fails to meet objectives established in syllabi.
- Assessment practices are inadequate to support student learning and department needs (e.g., learning outcomes are inadequate, inappropriate or missing; testing strategies are ineffective or unfair).
- Goals, course content, and/or performance reflect a lack of consistent improvement efforts.
- Pedagogical practices are unsound (e.g. consistent lack of preparation or organization, frequent absences or tardiness, unhelpful feedback, weak standards, chaotic or hostile classroom environment).
- Student support practices are unsound (e.g. not responding to student inquiries, not keeping office hours, documented incidents of favoritism).
- Consistent and very negative ratings in advising, mentoring, and/or supervision of students' scholarly or creative activities.
- Special teaching assignments (e.g. honors, capstone, practicums, field experiences) avoided or poorly executed.
- Ample evidence of disrespect for students and their rights.

Implication: Requires major remedial work

2.3 Fair

Demonstrates some positive teaching outcomes but includes major areas for concern that have a moderately negative impact on students and their learning typically as reflected by several of the indicators below. In general, teaching performance is moderately below the department standards of excellence and teaching evaluations average below 3.75.

Additional Indicators:

- Student evaluations document consistent and substantive problems.
- Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations.
- Course fails to meet objectives established in syllabi.
- Assessment practices are inadequate to support student learning and department needs (e.g., learning outcomes are inadequate, inappropriate or missing; testing strategies are ineffective or unfair).
- Goals, course content, and/or performance reflect a lack of consistent improvement efforts.
- Pedagogical practices are unsound (e.g. consistent lack of preparation or organization, frequent absences or tardiness, unhelpful feedback, weak standards, chaotic or hostile classroom environment).
- Student support practices are unsound (e.g. not responding to student inquiries, not keeping office hours, documented incidents of favoritism).
- Consistent and very negative ratings in advising, mentoring, and/or supervision of students' scholarly or creative activities.
- Special teaching assignments (e.g. honors, capstone, practicums, field experiences) avoided or poorly executed.
- Ample evidence of disrespect for students and their rights.

Implication: Remediation is necessary. Change will need to be substantial to qualify for tenure and promotion.

2.4 Good
Demonstrates overall teaching effectiveness including teaching evaluations average above 3.75 but includes some minor areas for concern, typically reflected by some combination of the indicators listed below. In general, teaching performance is slightly below the department standards of excellence.
Additional Indicators:
- Student evaluation narratives document adequate impact on learning.
- Syllabi provide reasonably clear and appropriate expectations.
- Assessment practices support student learning and contribute to department needs.
- Goals, course content and/or performance give evidence of continuous improvement efforts.
- Majority of pedagogical practices are appropriate and effective.
- Majority of student support practices are appropriate and effective.
- Special teaching assignments (e.g. honors, capstone, practicums, field experiences) are executed with reasonable skill.
- Maintains appropriate standards of academic integrity, including respect for students and their rights.
- Participates in teaching development activities.

Implication: Performance at this level suggests positive potential but some change is needed to qualify for tenure and promotion.

2.5 Excellent
Demonstrates consistent high-quality teaching with positive outcomes for students as reflected by the indicators below. In general, performance at this level meets department standards of excellence.

To receive an Excellent teaching evaluation, a faculty member must have an overall SAI evaluation score of 4.0 or greater and one additional performance indicator from the list below, or an overall SAI evaluation score of 3.75 or greater and three or more additional performance indicators listed below:

Additional Indicators:
- Syllabi, course assignments, testing procedures, attendance requirements, grading standards, and record-keeping that adhere to rigorous academic standards and university requirements and ensure the equitable treatment of students.
- A majority of student evaluation narrative statements emphasize powerful impact on learner or transformative learning experiences.
- Voluntary participation in professional development activities focused on improving teaching quality.
- Participant in a conference presentation focused on pedagogical issues.
- Development of a new course or evidence of significant revision of an existing course
- Leadership evident in the promotion of high-quality teaching and curriculum development in the department.
- Recognition by the University or a professional communication association of excellence in teaching
- Consistent usage and evidence of High Impact Practices in assigned coursework

- Consistent and very high ratings in advising, mentoring, and/or supervision of students' scholarly or creative activities or special teaching assignments (e.g. honors, capstone, practicums, field experiences).
- Peer teaching evaluations assessed at the Distinguished or Excellent level.
- Other evidence of advanced pedagogical practices and/or student impact as identified by the department chair.

Implication: Performance average at this level during the three-year period of employment prior to application for tenure and/or promotion at UWF merits a favorable tenure and/or promotion decision.

2.6 Distinguished

Demonstrates the highest degree of quality in teaching as shown by the following indicators below. In general, performance at this level exceeds department standards of excellence and is viewed as a significant departmental factor for tenure and promotion.

To receive a Distinguished teaching evaluation, a faculty member must have an overall SAI evaluation score of 4.25 and one additional performance indicator from the list below, or an overall SAI evaluation score of 4.00 and five or more additional performance indicators listed below:

Additional Indicators:
- Syllabi, course assignments, testing procedures, attendance requirements, grading standards, and record-keeping that adhere to rigorous academic standards and university requirements and ensure the equitable treatment of students.
- A majority of student evaluation narrative statements emphasize powerful impact on learner or transformative learning experiences.
- Voluntary participation in professional development activities focused on improving teaching quality.
- Participant in a conference presentation focused on pedagogical issues.
- Development of a new course or evidence of significant revision of an existing course
- Leadership evident in the promotion of high-quality teaching and curriculum development in the department.
- Recognition by the University or a professional communication association of excellence in teaching
- Consistent usage and evidence of High Impact Practices in assigned coursework
- Consistent and very high ratings in advising, mentoring, and/or supervision of students' scholarly or creative activities or special teaching assignments (e.g. honors, capstone, practicums, field experiences).
- Peer teaching evaluations assessed at the Distinguished or Excellent level.
- Other evidence of advanced pedagogical practices and/or student impact as identified by the department chair.

Implication: A performance average of Distinguished during the three-year period of employment prior to application for tenure and/or promotion at UWF easily justifies a favorable tenure and promotion decision.

3. Scholarship and Creative Projects

3.1 General Guidelines

3.11. In this performance area, the ratings in the first two performance categories (Poor, Fair) do not facilitate favorable tenure decisions, and the ratings in the first three performance categories (Poor, Fair, Good) do not facilitate favorable promotion decisions.

3.12. In assigning a scholarship rating in annual evaluation, the chair should use the trajectory of the faculty member's scholarship activities, up to two years prior to the evaluation period. This is to capture the trajectory of longer-term projects such as books, archival scholarship, revise-and-resubmit processes, and transitioning from completed projects to new scholarship production.

3.13. In assessing scholarly and creative work, the greatest emphasis will be given to the following:

- A. (order as value criteria) Single-authored work, followed by
    - a. First-authored work
    - b. Multiple-authored work
- B. Peer reviewed work
- C. Citation of work by other scholars
- D. Awards or recipient of published critical acclaim

3.14. Scholarly achievement is divided into three tiers, with descending importance from Tier 1 to Tier 3. Faculty members will be evaluated based on the total points they earn and the distribution of the points among the three tiers.

Tier 1:
- a. Books published with an academic press of which the faculty member is the first or single author (3-5 points depending on the prestige of the press and impact, such as winning an award and book reviews published by an academic journal.)
- b. Books published with an academic press of which the faculty member is not the first or single author (1-2 points depending on the prestige of the press and impact, such as winning an award and book reviews published by an academic journal.)
- c. First or solo authored peer-refereed journal articles (1.5-2 points depending on the prestige[1] of the journal)
- d. Second or third authored peer-refereed journal articles (1 point)
- e. Published textbooks (2-3 points depending on the contribution of the faculty member[2] and the book's impact, demonstrated by factors such as the number of adoptions, prestige of the press, support letters from the publisher, winning an award and so on.)

Tier 2:
- a. Peer-Refereed Conference Presentation of original research which has been blind reviewed (.5-1 point depending on the prestige of the conference and requirement of a fully-developed paper vs abstract)
- b. Proposal writer of peer-reviewed conference panel presentation when accepted (.5 point)
- c. Invited (non-refereed) or editorial reviewed journal articles & book chapter in a scholarly book (1 point)
- d. Grants and research contracts (.5-1.5 points depending on the prestigious of the granting organization and amount; more points should be assigned if the faculty member is the principal or co-investigator)
- e. Public-facing scholarship projects, such as digital editions of primary source collections with editorial/scholarly notes to aid the reader in interpreting the materials (.5-1 point depending on the scope and impact of the work; more points should be assigned if the faculty is a principal investigator, editor, or director)
- f. Invited scholarly presentation at an academic setting (.5-1 point depending on the prestige of the event,)
- g. Third author and beyond journal articles (.5 point)
- h. Book chapter in a scholarly book (1 point)
- i. Academic books published with a respected trade press, of which the faculty member is the first or single author (1-2 points depending on the prestige of the press and impact, such a winning an award, book reviews published by an academic journal.)

---

[1] Indicators of journal prestige include, but not limited to the following: 1. The journal is indexed in SSCI (Social Sciences Citation Index) and H-index; 2. Number of citations; 3. International, national or regional journal; 4. Award-winning. The exact points awarded to a journal publication can be determined by members of the mentoring committee who are experts in the specific research field.

[2] The order of authors for a textbook may not reflect the actual contribution of the individual author. For example, one may have written the majority of chapters in a textbook but is listed as the third author because he/she joined writing the textbook long after the textbook was established.

j. Editor of a book volume with an academic press (.5-2 points depending on the prestige of the press and impact, such as winning an award, book reviews published by an academic journal)

k. Invited (non-refereed) journal articles and articles in conference proceedings (including proceedings journal, i.e., the paper is competitively selected and editorially reviewed after it is presented at an academic conference (2.5-1 point), depending on the prestige of the journal, authorship order, online only (vs. print publication) and whether it is competitively selected and editorially reviewed.

Tier 3:

a. Contribution to a textbook, such as excerpt or an exercise/case study in a textbook (.5 point)

b. Encyclopedia Entries (.5 point)

c. Published book review (.25 point)

d. Invited scholarly presentation and speaking engagements at venues other than an academic setting (.25-.5 point depending on the prestige of the event)

e. Non-refereed conference presentations (.25 point)

f. Member of peer-reviewed conference panel presentation (.25 point)

g. External grants and research contracts applied for (.25-.5 points depending on the prestige of the granting organization and amount requested; more points assigned if the faculty is principal or co-investigator

3.2 Poor
A faculty earned 2 or fewer points.

3.3 Fair
A faculty earned more than 2-3 points.

3.4 Good.
A faculty member must earn 4 or more points with at least 2 points from Tier 1.

3.5 Excellent
A faculty member must earn 5 or more points with at least 3 points from tier 1, with at least one journal article or book being first or solo-authored with the exception of a textbook.

For textbooks, the faculty member does not have to be the first or solo-author. Please refer to 3.14 Tier 1 e and Footnote 2 on Page 6.

3.6 Distinguished
A faculty member must earn 6 or more, with at least 4 points from tier 1.

4. Service

4.1 General Guidelines

4.11. Along with teaching and scholarship, service is an important part of one's responsibility as a university faculty member. At the outset of their employment, the department chair will advise new faculty members about how this activity can be incorporated strategically into their work assignments. Although service may be somewhat lighter for new faculty members in the process of establishing themselves as teachers and scholars/artists than for experienced faculty members, new faculty should be encouraged to render high-quality service.

As is the case with scholarship, some service activities are more meritorious than others. Most meritorious are those that involve major time commitments and contribute to the well-being of the department, college, university or profession. Service activities will be assessed annually.

4.12 Service is broadly defined and includes a wide range of activities including, but not limited to (all service activities must be linked to the discipline in order to contribute to tenure and promotion):

- Service on university, college, and department governance.
- Service as Program Director or Coordinator.
- Community service related to one's discipline.
- Service to the university in the form of delivering courses to remote locations.
- Advising student organizations.
- Service to student organizations.
- Services related to recruitment and retention of students.
- Service on editorial review boards.
- Service on conference committees.
- Articulation efforts at various levels.
- Outreach activities that promote the department, college and/or university.
- Participation with the local professional organizations.
- Textbook, manuscript and grant reviewing activity.
- Mentoring and assisting new faculty.
- Student mentoring (including sustained graduate capstone or assistantship).
- Regional or national consultancy related to a faculty member's area of expertise.
- Service to professional/academic organizations.
- Active leadership in regional or national professional/academic organizations.
- Director of multi-section course (unless position is attached to release time).
- Involvement in speaking engagements.
- Commentary for civic groups and media outlets.
- Securing funding that directly support ongoing activities of the department or university.

4.13. In general, more weight should be given to services where a faculty member holds a leadership role and services that require significant time involvement.

4.14. In this performance area, the ratings in the first two performance categories (Poor, Fair) do not facilitate favorable tenure decisions. The ratings in the first two performance categories (Poor, Fair) do not facilitate favorable promotion decisions to Associate Professor, and the ratings in the first three performance categories (Poor, Fair, Good) do not facilitate favorable promotion decisions to Professor.

4.2 Poor

Demonstrates serious problems in fulfilling appropriate service role for faculty as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is well below the department standards for excellence.

Indicators:

- Service activity nonexistent or very poor in quality, producing a potentially adverse impact on the goals of the relevant organization.
- Faculty seems resistant or oblivious to service needs.
- Community service, if any, does not in any way provide synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service function(s).

Implication: Remedial work is required; May include recommendation to find a context that is a better match to

the individual's service values than the substantial service needs relevant to the regional comprehensive context. No support for tenure or promotion.

4.3 Fair

Demonstrates only minor tangible progress in service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is moderately below department standards for excellence.

Indicators:

- Minimal contributions made in service role (e.g., "sits" on committees as compared to active participation).
- Spreads faculty time and energy too thinly to facilitate effectiveness.
- Community service, if applicable, provides limited, tangential synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and service functions.

Implication: No support for tenure/promotion.

4.4 Good

Demonstrates major tangible progress in relevant service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is somewhat below department standards for excellence.

Indicators:
- Selection of service activity expresses understanding of faculty service role in regional comprehensive university.
- Usually participates actively and constructively in service activity.
- Usually effective in service as citizen of department.
- Balance across service obligations may be a struggle.
- Community service, if applicable, provides reasonable synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions.

Implication: Acceptable performance early in career is demonstrated but expectation is that service excellence is the standard that produces positive personnel decisions.

4.5 Excellent

Demonstrates satisfactory execution of service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service contributions meet the department standards for excellence. Demonstrates *consistent* involvement in service activities.

Indicators:
- Scope and effort level are substantive with demonstrated impact.
- Colleagues view contributions to department as effective.
- Service agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university mission.
- Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, department, campus, and community.
- Community service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions. For example, serving as a judge in a science competition.

Implication: Performance at this level qualifies for favorable promotion/tenure decisions.

4.6 Distinguished

Demonstrates high degree of skill in service contributions as shown by the indicators below that build upon indicators for excellence. In general, service contributions exceed the department standards for excellence.

Indicators:
- Leadership demonstrated in targeted arenas of service (e.g., holds elected office; collaborates skillfully and innovatively).
- Problems solved proactively through vigorous contributions.
- Wide external recognition (local, national or international audiences) or awards achieved for quality of service contributions.
- Community service provided significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions.

Implication: Performance easily qualifies for favorable tenure and promotion decisions.

Appendix 1: Revision and Ratification History

2010 – Bylaws ratified

2016-2017 – Teaching section of bylaws was revised and approved at the department level only

2020 – Service, scholarship, and teaching sections revised and approved; mid-point review and mentoring responsibilities added; clarity on voting rights added. All changes voted and approved by department

2021 – Redlined version reaffirmed, minor changes made to bring bylaws into compliance with new UWF bylaw review process. Department members voted to approve [12-10-21]

2022 – Revised bylaws [redline changes and clean copy] submitted to CASSH Dean's Office and CASSH Council [Jan. 27, 2022]

2022 – Bylaws approved by Provost and filed [July 26, 2022]