

Reubin O'D. Askew Department of Government  
Bylaws

Adopted: May 6, 2022

**REUBIN O'D ASKEW Department OF GOVERNMENT  
AND WORLD LANGUAGES**

**Bylaws**

**Table of Contents**

| Article and Section                             | Page |
|---|------|
| I. Name and Programs                            | 3    |
| II. Mission of the Department                   | 3    |
| III. Structure of the Department                | 3    |
| Voting Rights                                   | 3    |
| Role of the Chair                               | 3    |
| Committees                                      | 6    |
| IV. Meeting of the Department                   | 8    |
| V. Academic Policies of the Department          | 8    |
| VI. Personnel Policies/Procedures               | 9    |
| VII. Student Related Policies and Procedures    | 10   |
| VIII. Resources: Planning and Budgeting         | 11   |
| IX. Planning and Reviewing Processes            | 11   |
| X. Adoption                                     | 12   |
| Appendix 1 – Political Science Program          |      |
| Guidelines for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion | 13   |
| Annual Evaluation Criteria for Ratings          | 18   |
| Appendix 2 – World Language Program             | 28   |
| Guidelines for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion |      |
| Annual Evaluation Criteria for Ratings          |      |



**REUBIN O'D ASKEW DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT  
AND WORLD LANGUAGES**

**BYLAWS**

**I. Name and Programs:**

A. The name of this unit is the Reubin O'D Askew Department of Government (herein referred to as the "Department"), in the College of Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities (CASSH) at the University of West Florida (UWF).

B. The Department consists of two sets of programs: Political Science, Pre-Law, and International Studies, on the one hand, and on the other, World Languages.

**II. Mission of the Department:**

The primary goal of the Department is to educate students in our fields of study in the expectation that beyond graduation they will exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship as productive members of the communities in which they will live and work.

A. Mission of the Political Science/Pre-Law/International Studies Program.

The mission of these inter-related programs consists in the conservation, transmission, and development of a body of philosophical, theoretical, empirical, and practical knowledge about politics, international relations, and constitutional law. Preparing students for either further education in an academic discipline or the law, or for careers in the public and private sectors, domestic or international, as well as responsibly to exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship are the primary goals of these programs. The study of any of these fields gives students a better understanding of the opportunities and challenges that they will encounter upon graduation. Another important purpose is to conduct pure and applied research together with the dissemination of the results of this research in publications and public presentations. Not to be overlooked is the public service to the campus community, the profession, and the city and region in which UWF is located. In pursuit of this mission, our faculty strives to foster the spirit of rational inquiry, civil discussion and debate, and the love of truth which constitute the intellectual heritage of a liberal education.

B. Mission of the World Languages Program.

The World Languages program in the Department fosters the study of languages and cultures providing students with a program focused on communication and cultural awareness while understanding and respecting other cultures as well as their own. The program prepares students to successfully engage with a diverse, multicultural, and multilingual world, within their communities and places of employment.

## **II. Structure of the Department:**

A. Voting Rights: Full-time (non-visiting) faculty holding the rank of Instructor, Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor shall vote on all Department matters that cut across the programs that are submitted for a vote. The faculty may, by absolute majority vote, extend voting rights to other persons associated with the Department. A quorum is defined as 50% + one of the voting faculty, including the Chair. In case of a tie, the Chair prevails. Faculty members may register their vote on specified issues in writing with the Chair in advance of the meeting.

B. Role of the Chair: The Chair is a key administrative officer in maintaining the quality of the University and a sense of belonging to the University and support for its purposes among the faculty members. Not only is the Chair responsible to the formal administrative structure, but he/she is also responsible to faculty colleagues, students, and faculty governance units.

The Chair's responsibilities and authority include the following:<sup>1</sup>

The Chair is responsible to the College Dean:

1. Carrying out the policies of the University and the College and the specific directions of the Dean.
2. Assisting in the formulation of College and/or University goals and policies.
3. Representing the view of the Dean to members of his/her faculty.
4. Submitting five-year and annual planning documents which are consistent with the University and College missions and strategic goals as well as the aspirations of the Department.
5. Enhancing the achievement of University and College goals through evaluations, disciplinary actions, and recommendations for merit raises, appointments, promotions, and tenure.
6. Formulation of budgetary requirements and the careful and effective management of activities of the unit within funds allocated.
7. Handling of faculty grievances in accordance with established procedure.

---

<sup>1</sup> We appreciate the social contract language utilized in the Department of History and adopt many of their standards with little modification here.

8. Fostering and encouraging cooperation between and among faculty units to enhance the efficiency and/or effectiveness of the College and University as a whole.
9. Ensuring that all hiring is consistent with national, state, and University EEO/AA policies and procedures.
10. Ensuring that all employment actions and all student program and activity actions are consistent with national, state, and University policies and procedures related to individuals with disabilities; ensuring that interactions between and among faculty and students are free from sexual, racial, and other forms of bias and harassment.
11. Actively participating in the process of recruitment of students.

The Chair is responsible to members of the faculty unit:

1. Fostering consensus-building in Departmental discussions and decision-making
2. Communicating regularly throughout the academic year with the faculty on all matters of importance.
3. Managing all Departmental budget accounts, including Foundation Accounts, transparently and according to purposes agreed upon by the faculty.
4. Acting as the spokesperson for the unit to persons and organizations outside the unit, both within and without the University.
5. Stimulating innovative programs and activities within the University.
6. Stimulating innovative programs and activities within the faculty unit which are in harmony with the overall goals of the College and the University.
7. Creating an environment for and fostering opportunities for scholarship and professional growth of members of the faculty unit, especially in terms of teaching, advisement, and service.
8. Engaging in teaching and research activities in a manner which does not detract from his/her responsibilities as a Chair.
9. Supporting continued faculty development.
10. Mentoring faculty on tenure-track requirements and evaluate all faculty
11. Administer the Collective Bargaining Agreement at the Departmental level

The Chair is responsible to students:

1. Ensuring that the needs and aspirations of students, while enrolled at UWF and subsequent to graduation, are reflected in the curriculum, course schedules, course content and quality, teaching quality, facilities, and attitudes of faculty members of the unit.
2. Representing the needs and aspirations of majors and other students to members of other disciplines and gaining interdisciplinary cooperation of faculty and administrators in meeting those needs and aspirations.
3. Providing an interface between students and professional groups outside the University.

4. Handling student suspensions, readmissions, probationary decisions, and graduate admissions in a manner which enhances the overall quality of the University.
5. Handling student grievances and complaints in keeping with policies and procedures identified in the Student Handbook.

The Chair is responsible to staff:

1. Assigning work and defining work expectations that are reasonable and equitable.
2. Ensuring that an appropriate work environment is provided.
3. Ensuring that support personnel are treated with dignity and respect by faculty and students.
4. Encouraging participation in professional development activities and assigning duties to prepare for promotional and other advancement opportunities.

The Chair is responsible to governing bodies:

1. Participating actively on committees and councils as appropriate.
2. Recommending membership on committees and ensuring active and dedicated participation of members of the faculty unit in various committees and councils of the University.
3. Cooperating with and carrying out the decisions and policies established through various governing bodies.

The Chair has authority within the faculty unit to do the following:

1. Approve academic programs and priorities within the faculty unit for presentation to various approving bodies, the Dean and the Provost/Academic Vice President.
2. Assign academic counseling, coordinating, and teaching responsibilities.
3. Cancel classes if they do not meet the Department's enrollment management plan and reassign teaching responsibilities to meet contract obligations.
4. Approve budget proposals for submission to higher authority.
5. Allocate resources in support of teaching and research functions within the unit.
6. Initiate recruitment actions and provide recommendations to final hiring authority consistent with EEO/AA policies, goals, and procedures.
7. Evaluate faculty and make recommendations for promotion, tenure, and disciplinary action.
8. Recommend initial salaries at the time of hire and annual salary increases within guidelines established by the BOT, Provost, and the College Dean.
9. Exercise direct supervision over staff assigned to the unit, including hiring and performance evaluation.

10. Where there are conflicts between or among the above duties, such conflicts shall be resolved, subject to federal and state laws and regulations, in priority of:
  - a. the professional standards of the American Political Science Association
  - b. the obligations to students
  - c. the obligations to faculty
  - d. the obligations to higher administrators

Faculty Responsibilities to the Chair and Department:

1. Support the Department and its initiatives
2. Contribute actively to the development of students within the Department at all levels
3. Provide ideas and feedback to the Chair regarding Departmental priorities
4. Participate in Departmental planning
5. Provide service upon request and within reason
6. Keep the Chair regularly informed regarding needs related to work performance
7. Keep the Chair regularly informed regarding work progress across the areas of teaching, research and service
8. Communicate plans to the Chair in advance of undertaking individual initiatives that will impact the Department, its students, its programs and curriculum, and / or the Chair
9. Support the Department and its initiatives
10. Foster a climate of collegiality and mutual support within the Department

Eligibility and Chair's schedule of evaluation and term of service.

Given the mutual responsibilities of Chair and Faculty to each other, and acknowledging the Dean of the College's prerogative on appointments, it is the wish of the faculty of the Department that:

1. Only tenured Associate Professors or Professors are eligible to serve as Chair.
2. The term of the Chair is three years, at the end of which the Dean of the College shall consult with the faculty on the incumbent's performance according to the set of criteria specified in section II.B. before reappointing the incumbent for a second consecutive term.
3. Any year served as interim shall count toward the three-year term.
4. There is a presumption against anyone serving more than two consecutive three-year terms unless all other eligible members decline to serve in this position. Ideally, at least two of the eligible faculty will wish to be considered, at which time the Dean will consult with the faculty before making a choice.
5. If only one other member of the faculty wishes to be considered, the Dean shall consult with the faculty before making a new appointment or, if the

recommendation of the Faculty on the aspirant is not favorable, reappoint the incumbent.

C. Committees: The faculty shall sit as a committee of the whole for Department business cutting across programs. Matters of curriculum, hiring and other academic major-specific concerns that pertain only to one or the other program housed in the Department shall be handled by committees of their respective members, except that members from the other program may be invited to participate as needed. This may include such thing as faculty hiring<sup>2</sup>, curriculum development and planning, assessment, events -programming -and outreach, and other matters. Additionally, the Chair may appoint ad hoc committees for special purposes as needed.

Mentoring committees shall be formed by the Chair for new tenure-track faculty when they join the Department. These committees will consist of faculty holding associate professor or higher rank and generally will include at least two members of this Department. The committee will meet at least once a year with the faculty member toward the end of the spring semester. The committee will provide evaluation of present performance and offer guidance on strategies for achieving tenure and promotion to both the candidate and Department Chair. More frequent meetings of the whole or individuals on the committee with the faculty member are encouraged but not required. Mentoring committees will be Chaired by faculty within the Department. An effort will be made to include at least one member who shares some of the same scholarly interests of the candidate.

A Third Year Review committee will be appointed by the Chair by the end of September in the academic year in which a tenure-track faculty member comes up for the third year review. The committee will consist of three faculty holding associate professor or higher rank and generally will include at least two members of this Department. Normally, the Third Year Review committee will include members of the Mentoring Committee. The committee will meet at least once toward the end of spring semester. It will provide written evaluation to the candidate and Department Chair summarizing strengths and areas of improvement identified in the three areas of responsibility including teaching, scholarly activity, and service by the end of April. The Department Chair may draw from and or refer to insight from the third year review in annual evaluation recommendation that year. The committee will be responsible for reviewing materials provided to it no later than March 30 of the academic year of the third year review by the Department Chair. Candidates must provide materials for review to the Department Chair by March 25. Materials provided should include

---

<sup>2</sup> The Chair will nominate members of faculty search committees, which may contain a subset of the full Departmental membership. The full faculty will vote to approve search committee composition and any member may provide feedback to the search committee on candidates observed during the campus visit.

a 2-3 page Statement of Contributions, CV, Letter of Initial Appointment, evidence of teaching effectiveness, evidence of scholarly activity output (note: see Appendix 1 section for each program for a description of what constitutes scholarly activity, and evidence of service effectiveness).

A Departmental Personnel Committee serves to evaluate candidates for promotion decisions. They shall consist of all tenured faculty of rank about or above that to which the individual being evaluated has applied as a candidate. The committee will provide to the Department Chair their recommendation in the form mandated by the University Tenure and Promotion Guidelines no later than middle of September typically or within 2 weeks of the candidate submitting their dossier materials to the Department.

### **III. Meetings of the Department:**

There shall be at least one faculty meeting in each of the fall and spring semesters. Notice will be given at least one week prior to a Departmental meeting, with the exception of emergency meetings called by the Chair. Typically, meetings will be scheduled during times broadly convenient for all faculty, such as a midday common hour when classes are not scheduled. Faculty may place items on the agenda by giving notice to the Department Chair at least 48 hours in advance of the called meeting, unless exigent last minute items arise and warrant late addition. Any three faculty may call a meeting on their own motion at any time. It is the intent of this section that the Department meetings shall be arranged timely and efficiently to serve Department needs. Roberts' Rules of Order shall prevail when appropriate. All full-time faculty (1.0 FTE) are expected to attend these meetings. Remote attendance via telephone or video conference may be possible under particular circumstances, but this should be the exception and not the norm.

At each Departmental meeting, on a rotating basis, a voting member will be responsible for taking meeting minutes, which will include a summary of the main points discussed and all decisions. (The Chair may opt to assume this responsibility.) The meeting minutes will be provided to the Chair who will distribute to all attendees within a reasonable time for review and corrections and then again the corrected minutes a week before the next meeting. The first item on the agenda at the next Department meeting shall open with a vote on accepting, rejecting, or amending the meeting minutes.

### **IV. Academic Policies of the Department:**

A. All proposed changes in structure, academic policy and curricula must be approved by the majority vote of eligible faculty. By "eligible faculty" we mean those who oversee and/or regularly teach courses within a given academic major program.

B. Grading and examination policies are left to the professional judgment of the classroom instructor. These policies should be made clear to students at the beginning of classes. The type of examination, including its scope, must be determined by the instructor in accordance with class objectives.

C. Student concerns about the fairness of a faculty member's grading or the fairness or appropriateness of an examination shall follow the grievance process outlined by the University.

## **V. Personnel Policies/Procedures:**

A. It is the intent of the faculty that all personnel policies and procedures contribute to the collegial well-being of the Department. The BOR-UFF collective bargaining agreement shall be implemented in the spirit of collegial relationships.

B. Recruitment/selection of new faculty: Search committees for full-time faculty will be formed by the Chair according to guidelines from Human Resources and the College Dean. All eligible Departmental faculty may request in writing to the Chair to be included on a faculty search committee as the Department values the committee of the whole approach to hiring. The Chair will present a list of nominated members of faculty search committees to the whole faculty for majority approval unless the search committee is a committee of the whole.

C. Annual evaluation criteria and procedures: Annual evaluations are the responsibility of the Chair. The Chair shall consider all materials and evidence submitted by the faculty member according to Departmental tenure and promotion criteria in accordance with College procedures for the submission of the annual self-evaluation by faculty.

D. Faculty on tenure track shall be evaluated by a third year review committee near the completion of their third academic year. The committee shall evaluate all candidates for promotion and/or tenure. The results of all evaluations shall be communicated to the Chair and insights from the third year review may inform the annual review by the Chair upon conclusion of the third year (see Section X for more on third year review committees).

E. Subject to the provisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, in the event that awarding merit pay were to be vested in the Chair, eligible faculty within each program shall make explicit the criteria to be used. No other criteria may be admitted.

F. Tenure/promotion criteria and review procedures: The faculty shall make explicit the criteria to be used [see Appendix sections for program-specific guidelines on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion]. No other criteria may be admitted.

G. Procedures for making annual work assignments: This document shall be considered by the Chair and by the faculty as the single most crucial document for both the faculty member and the Department. The document shall set forth the teaching assignment for the following academic year in as much detail as possible. Also, the document shall address research and service responsibilities for the coming year. Since the annual work assignment is to be viewed as a developmental tool, the faculty member and the Chair jointly shall establish goals that are demanding, feasible, and equitable relative to other faculty. It is expected that faculty activity reporting will correspond directly with the faculty work assignment.

H. Policy for overload teaching opportunities: No faculty member shall be required to engage in overload teaching, but all faculty members who desire to do overload teaching shall have an opportunity to do so in their fields of expertise and where there is sufficient enrollment demand according to the verdict of the Chair and / or College Dean. Faculty members shall be encouraged to work through the Chair to promote their overload courses in order to secure appropriate numbers of students. In those areas where more than one faculty member has expertise, the overload teaching shall be assigned on a rotational basis.

I. Policy for summer supplemental contract opportunities: All faculty shall be given the opportunity to teach in the summer, depending on availability of resources. If there are not enough lines for at least half lines for everyone, a rotational system shall be employed.

J. Office hour policies: Full-time faculty shall be available to students through a minimum of two hours per assigned course, per week, reasonably distributed through several days and time blocks; part-time faculty shall be available to students through a minimum of two office hours per week. Faculty may substitute virtual availability to students by means of scheduled phone or online conferencing appointments.

## **VI. Student Related Policies and Procedures:**

Faculty are expected to make themselves available to students for the purpose of student professional development. Faculty are encouraged to support or create events related to student professional development. Faculty are also encouraged to guide students interested in careers or advanced academic study in

pursuit of these endeavors. Faculty are expected to maintain professional interaction with students at all times.

The faculty shall nominate the outstanding student awardees on the basis of academic merit and extracurricular achievement.

The Department shall follow the policies of the College Academic Standards Committee and / or Student Affairs regarding the procedure for student grievances and complaints. The grievance procedure is outlined in the UWF Student Handbook.

### **VII. Resources: Planning and Budgeting:**

The Department Office Manager shall maintain an up-to-date budget report, showing encumbrances and allowances on all departmental accounts, including Foundation accounts. A budget status update on all accounts will typically be provided at all departmental meetings and any other time upon request by any member of the faculty. Requests to review the budget should be directed to the Department Chair and must allow for periods of budget updating that are ongoing culminating in the annual academic budget cycle of July 1 to June 30. Faculty may discuss the budget with the Chair at any time upon request.

### **VIII. Planning and Reviewing Processes:**

Planning shall be conducted on an annual cycle corresponding to the University call for Departmental end of year reporting completion. The Department Chair will notify faculty of the year-in-review summary points and discuss goals and planning, typically through first and / or last of the year Departmental meetings. The process shall be the same as for annual budget planning and generally shall be concurrent with the formulation of the budget.

Program review of accredited programs shall be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the accrediting body. All Department faculty have the right to be informed of and to participate in the final review and decision-making process of the program review. The Chair shall propose and the faculty shall approve both the program reviewer and the itinerary. The itinerary shall provide both for a group meeting of the Department or the Program being reviewed, as well as individual meetings with the respective faculty.

Department programs shall be reviewed periodically at the call of the Department Chair, the faculty, or coincident with the official program review process. The five-year planning process shall provide an annual review of the basic program; the periodic review should focus upon broader questions of program direction. Faculty participation is expected.

**IX. Adoption:**

This document shall go into effect upon adoption by an absolute majority vote of the voting faculty. Revisions may be made by following the provisions under 'Meetings of the Department' and upon approval by absolute majority vote. [The original bylaws were adopted in 1989. See Addendum, History of the Bylaws.]

## APPENDIX 1

### DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT THE UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATIONS

Tenured and tenure-earning faculty shall be evaluated on the basis of performance in teaching, scholarship and service. Full-time non tenure-earning faculty shall be evaluated on the basis of teaching and service only according to the same criteria.

#### **I. General**

The Faculty of the Department expects all its members to perform competently in teaching and academic advising, research and creative activities, and service. A faculty member's specific responsibilities in each evaluation period shall be identified by the Department Chair in the annual work assignment and its modifications, subject to the provisions of the BOR-UFF agreement.

#### **II. Assessment of Competence**

Judgments of competence shall be made by the Chair, who may solicit the advice of other faculty members. To a substantial degree, the competence of each faculty member shall be judged in terms of the specific tasks assigned and goals established in the annual work assignment. It is recognized that all criteria cannot be stated quantitatively and that the evaluation of a faculty member is dependent necessarily upon the professional judgments of peers. In other words, quantitative measures of teaching, research or scholarship, and service, inform but are no substitute for professional judgment. The evaluation of colleagues shall be conducted with the strongest regard both for academic standards and fairness. All judgments will be explicitly justified in writing.

#### **Retention**

Non-tenure track faculty members shall be rehired from year to year so long as they perform their assigned tasks satisfactorily. The Chair's evaluation shall state clearly whether or not the faculty member's performance is judged unsatisfactory in any area of responsibility. If the evaluation so states, the Chair shall offer positive assistance to the faculty member, and may call upon tenured faculty members to assist. If performance in one or more of the areas has been judged unsatisfactory, the faculty member normally shall be given one additional academic year of employment. If the faculty member's performance is not raised

to satisfactory levels in that evaluation period, the faculty member shall not be given a contract for the next academic year.

### **III. Tenure and Promotion**

Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or Professor are significant milestones in a faculty member's career. Admittance to each stage is not attained based on the mere sum of annual ratings or years on the faculty, but rather on a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's career to date and promise for the future. Normally, for freshly minted Ph. D.'s, promotion to Associate Professor and tenure shall be applied for and awarded simultaneously no earlier than in their sixth year on the Faculty.

Awarding of tenure represents full admittance to the community of teacher-scholars at UWF. It involves establishment of a research agenda and a record of excellence in teaching and strong contributions to the university. It indicates that the candidate merits confidence that he or she will exercise academic freedom for its intended purpose, specifically to practice his or her discipline or art without being constrained by a reigning orthodoxy or party line. This freedom is particularly cherished in the discipline of political science, for our members are expected to inquire into all matters concerning politics and government, letting the chips fall where they may and, at the same time, to respect the freedom of others to do the same, colleagues and students alike.

Promotion to Associate Professor indicates that the faculty member is making promising contributions to the published body of work in our discipline, to the education of our students, and to the community. Promotion to Professor attests that the faculty member has fulfilled or exceeded the promise of the first promotion, and is making contributions in scholarship, teaching, and service that merit recognition at the highest rank. It involves a qualitative leap, especially in scholarship. This means publishing items of recognizably higher quality than those that came earlier in the candidate's career, and attaining recognition from the discipline at a national or international level as evidenced by references to his or her work in scholarly publications, invitations to present papers or contribute book chapters, awards, grants, etc.

What follows are the specific *minimum* requirements to receive a favorable recommendation for tenure or promotion to associate professor or professor in the Department. All scholarship is subject to evaluation for quality as well as quantity, and this necessarily involves a degree of professional judgment on the part of colleagues, external reviewers, and the Department Chair.

**Tenure.** The Department of Government expects all candidates for tenure to have been rated in all three years prior to candidacy as excellent in teaching, and good or excellent in scholarship and service. Establishing a clear research agenda is a key criterion for tenure in the area of scholarly activity. Materials considered as part of a scholarly research agenda must be submitted in annual review.

Evidence of an active research agenda should include at least three of any of the following: publications in peer reviewed scholarly journals, books or book chapters in an academic-caliber press. Edited books or journal special issues are included. So are published textbooks and scholarship on teaching and learning. Evidence may take the form of conference papers of 6000 words or more presented at state, regional and national political science conferences, book reviews of at least 2000 words published in scholarly journals, peer reviews by invitation from editors of scholarly journal articles or books / book chapters of at least 1500 words, published encyclopedic entries of at least 1000 words. Additionally, as political science has an applied component, political scientists may provide forecasting, empirical analysis, and other types of work that leads to report writing and guidance for those in both the public and private sector where our field applies. Such scholarly activity may take the form of an analysis of empirical evidence that leads to a report of at least 3000 words (such as election or policy analysis), or oral / written briefings given to a specific group including public sector, private sector, or community interest groups that include a written report component of at least 3000 words (such as on the state of national security). Additionally, the Department recognizes that work on grant-writing or contract-seeking can be time consuming and it recognizes this as scholarly activity where a written proposal of at least 3000 words results.

**Promotion to Associate Professor.** As with tenure, candidates for promotion to Associate Professor must obtain excellent ratings in teaching, scholarship, and service in the three years prior to candidacy. The aspirant to promotion to this level must demonstrate that a research agenda beyond the dissertation has been launched effectively. The candidate is expected to meet this requirement in one of the following three ways:

(1) publication of at least three peer-reviewed scholarly journal articles that did not serve as the equivalent of a dissertation in the candidate's Ph.D. program

Or

(2) publication of one scholarly book (presumably based on the dissertation) plus two more items- either scholarly journal articles or book chapters in a substantive area of political science research

Or

- (3) one scholarly book beyond the dissertation project, by which we mean one that is not a revised version of the dissertation, but one that addresses subject matter way beyond it, even if it builds or significantly extends a line of inquiry begun in the former.

**Promotion to Professor:** A candidate for promotion to the highest rank of full Professor must spend at least five years in rank as Associate Professor although, again, time in rank is no qualification for promotion. The candidate is expected to demonstrate a consistent, year to year record of excellent to distinguished performance in all areas of evaluations since the last promotion. In each of the three years immediately prior to candidacy, the candidate must have earned a “distinguished” rating each year in scholarship and have earned at least excellent ratings in the other two areas of evaluation. Also, the candidate must demonstrate having performed increasingly important service to the institution and a professed commitment to continue doing the same. Establishment of scholarship can be attained in one of the following ways, counting items added since the last promotion. Again, judgment may be brought to bear in significant ways. For example, an article in the APSR may count double or triple. Also, sole or first author of an article may be weighed more heavily than multi-author publications. Any such judgment calls shall be justified.

- (1) publication of at least five peer-reviewed scholarly journal articles in publications of the discipline or subdiscipline of the candidate’s specialty

Or

- (2) publication of one scholarly book (beyond the dissertation) plus three more items- either scholarly articles or book chapters in publications of the discipline or subdiscipline of the candidate’s specialty

Or

- (3) publication of two scholarly books (beyond the dissertation)

AND

(5) Evidence that the candidate’s scholarship is valued by members of the discipline, such as citations to the candidate’s work in books and peer-reviewed journal articles as demonstrated in google scholar or some other citations index.

Notes regarding scholarly activity:

\*All scholarly activity counted for tenure and promotion decisions must be in a substantive area of scholarship in political science.

\*The level of recognition of work (local/regional for Associate Professor) / (national/international for full Professor) form part of the calculus in promotion decisions as discussed in the paragraphs above in this section.

\*Evidence of rigorous peer review is important in assessing the quality of work and may be evidenced in many ways, including journal standards for peer review on the journal website. For other types of published work this may come in other forms, such as in blind reviewer comments returned to the author or invitations to submit in one's area of expertise based on one's reputation for strong scholarship in a particular area as opposed to invitation based on acquaintance. The nature of peer review will be addressed in annual review as well as in promotion letter Chair comments in order to clarify the nature of peer review associated with publications, as needed. Faculty have an option to submit materials substantiating the nature of peer review and any other indications of quality of a publication outlet with their annual review.

\*Editing a scholarly book does not count as a book for the purpose of promotion to higher rank. With edited volumes, if one substantive chapter is authored, the work is treated as a book chapter. If, besides a substantive chapter, the candidate serving as editor contributed an introductory and a concluding chapter, then the work is treated as a peer-reviewed article.

\*One textbook may be counted as a scholarly book for promotion above the rank of Associate Professor but is excluded from consideration in promotion decisions to the rank of Associate Professor.

\*A scholarly book typically has a page count of 150 or more printed pages. Shorter books or monographs in political science typically range from 60 to 100 pages. Work of an in-between length will be weighed in terms of quality by the Department Chair letter and justified in the candidate's statement of scholarly activity.

\*For emphasis, it is repeated here what was stated earlier: quantitative measures of scholarship are no substitute for the exercise of professional judgment. They inform but do not trump judgment rendered by Department peers and the Chair. Reasons shall be adduced for all judgments.

**Note on Teaching**

The following factors are recognized to be significant elements of teaching performance. The Department Chair and colleagues shall judge a faculty member's teaching performances in light of such factors. The faculty member shall:

1. Be available for academic consultation and professional mentoring on a regular basis.
2. Treat all students fairly and courteously--in a word, professionally.
3. Regularly update course materials according to ongoing developments in the field.
4. Come to class well-prepared so that class time is used effectively and appropriately.
5. Course requirements and grading practices shall uphold challenging academic standards.

### **Note on Service**

The Department of Government expects and encourages its members to make service contributions to the University, , to the profession, and to the community at large.

Service starts at the level of the Department. Collegiality is an essential aspect of that. . Therefore, a faculty member is expected to treat colleagues with respect, deal with disagreements in a professional manner, and bring unresolved conflicts/disagreements to the attention of the Chair, who shall attempt to resolve the conflict with the parties involved. As well as respectful and courteous treatment of our peers and active participation in departmental decision-making, collegiality may, as time permits, extend to sharing our expertise by reading and commenting on others' papers, helping peers with statistical, methodological, or computer related challenges, and otherwise lending support and encouragement to our fellows.

Outside the Department, service activities include, but are not limited to, the following: active membership in college and university committees; advising or sponsoring student organizations; active membership and election or appointment to local, regional, or national office in a professional association; active membership and election or appointment to an advisory or policy making body in the community; staffing governmental bodies and other public sector or non-profit organizations; lecturing to high school students and giving speeches to community organizations; appearing on television and radio programs; and writing guest editorials on issues of public interest.

### **ANNUAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR RATINGS**

The Chair of the Department annually evaluates the professional performance and collegial conduct of the tenure-track and tenured faculty of the Department in all three areas of responsibility: teaching, scholarship, and service. All faculty members are expected to perform at the level of excellence in teaching and at least one other area (scholarship or service), especially after the third year of employment. An untenured faculty member is assessed in terms of potential as well as actual performance as indicated in an annual “progress toward tenure” statement. In assessing the performance of untenured faculty the Department Chair may consult senior faculty (tenured associate or full professor).

The Chair of the Department annually evaluates the professional performance and collegial conduct of full-time non-tenure faculty of the Department in the Teaching category.

All evaluative rankings shown below shall be justified by evidence submitted by the faculty member, whose responsibility it is to provide it. The evidence may consist of copies of award letters, acceptance or publication of articles or books, conference papers, third year review or mentoring committee letter, etc. In other cases, evidence may take the form of written affirmation and accompanying paper- or e-work (e.g., syllabi). Unassigned means a voluntarily assumed extra responsibility not included in the annual work assignment. Also, again we affirm that these guidelines, as comprehensive as attempted, are meant to inform but not substitute for the judgment of personnel committees and Department Chair. .

What follows are the criteria for evaluating performance in each of the areas of a faculty member’s responsibilities. Be it noted that a *Distinguished* rating recognizes exceptional accomplishments that substantially exceed expectations. A singular achievement warrants this rating for more than one year. If within any area of responsibility there is more than one such achievement, the years in which the rating takes effect is negotiated between the Chair and the faculty member.

Normally, the overall rating will reflect approximately a weighted average of the three area ratings. However, the Department Chair may consider that a truly extraordinary performance in any one area warrants a rating of *Distinguished* rating overall as well. The same may result at the opposite extreme: unprofessional or unethical conduct in any one area may be so egregious that the Department Chair may assign an *Unsatisfactory* rating to the overall evaluation.

## **I. Scholarly Activity**

Faculty members are expected to be actively engaged in scholarship. This requirement is fulfilled by some combination of conference papers, journal

articles, books or book chapters, contributions to teaching and learning in the discipline, and applied analytical reports. Unless otherwise noted, the rating is for the one year in which the assignment is completed. Again, in case of two or more multi-year accomplishments obtained in one year, the years when credit is assigned is to be negotiated between faculty and Department Chair but will typically add some portion of rating “credit” to the rating beyond the given year.

### **A. Distinguished (evidence of active dissemination of completed scholarship)**

The following achievements warrant this rating for two or more consecutive years starting with the year in which the award is made or the book or article is accepted for publication:

1. UWF Distinguished University Professor (DUP) award (three years credit)
2. A scholarly book in political science beyond the dissertation (three years credit)
3. An award or grant by a recognizably prestigious external source, including but not limited to such agencies or institutions as the NSF, NEH, APSA, Fulbright Program, a highly regarded “think tank” (e.g., Brookings) (two years of credit-1<sup>st</sup> year credit is the year of the grant award, second year credit is the year of grant completion with tangible results.)
4. UWF Distinguished Research and Creative Activities Award or equivalent award (two years credit)
5. Publication of a scholarly book based upon the dissertation within the first three years at UWF (two years credit)
6. Publication of an edited scholarly book or peer-reviewed journal special issue (two years credit)
7. Publication of a peer-reviewed article in a political science journal above the state level (two years credit)

The following attainments warrant this rating for one year:

8. Publication of a textbook in political science (first edition)
9. A scholarly book based on the dissertation that is published within the first five years at UWF (Note: no double-counting with A.1.5)
10. The first year of editing a scholarly journal
11. Publication of one or more articles in a political science journal where the editor or editorial board makes the decision to accept or reject without sending the submission out for peer review
12. Publication of a chapter in a book that was peer-reviewed (not invited and selected solely by the book editor and not a reproduction of another publication)

13. Publication of two or more articles in journals in academic publications outside of political science or in a journal of a state-level political science association.

### **B. Excellent (evidence of an active research agenda)**

1. One article published in a peer-reviewed journal with content on political science education or pedagogy or in a state-level journal of political science
2. One article or book chapter published in an academic publication (book or journal) outside of political science or in a non-peer-reviewed journal in political science or in an interdisciplinary outlet
3. Updated edition of a textbook in political science (two years credit)
4. A funded award, grant or contract to perform research or conduct scholarly activity by an internal or external source
5. A comprehensive book proposal in political science of at least 3000 words including an introduction and at least two substantive chapters submitted for review to a publisher (academic or commercial)
6. Two recognizably different articles submitted for review at peer-reviewed political science journals of 6000 words or more.
7. A solicited inclusion in an anthology of an article published previously of 6000 words or more.
8. An applied work, such as an applied research report providing forecasting, empirical analysis, and other types of work that leads to report writing and guidance for those in both the public and private sectors. Such scholarly activity may take the form of any analysis of empirical evidence that leads to a report of at least 3000 words (such as election or policy analysis), or oral / written briefings given to a specific group including public sector, private sector, or community interest groups that include a written report component of at least 3000 words (such as on the state of national security). These projects typically will involve ongoing meetings and collaboration beyond what is written.
9. Three or more peer reviews by invitation from editors of scholarly journal articles or books / book chapters of at least 1500 words each.
10. One published book review essay of at least 1,000 words published in an APSA journal or one of the four regional political science association journals, or two book reviews of at least 1,000 words each published in any scholarly journal in the discipline, or one book review of at least 2000 words published in any scholarly journal in the discipline.
11. One or more conference papers of 6000 words or more presented at national or regional associational meetings or submitted to a journal

### **C. Good (evidence of scholarly activity beyond the dissertation)**

1. One or more conference papers of 5000 words or their equivalent (if of a quantitative nature) presented and posted to the conference website at local or state level meetings
2. One or more internal or external grant or contract proposals submitted for research support but not-funded where a written proposal of at least 3000 words (or their equivalent if of a quantitative nature) .
3. A report submitted to the Department Chair documenting ongoing data collection/analysis, e.g., surveys, experiments, field research such as interviews, archival research, projects involving student research
4. One or two peer reviews by invitation from editors of scholarly journal articles or books / book chapters of at least 1500 words
5. Published encyclopedic entries of at least 1000 words

**D. Fair--satisfactory (evidence of some scholarly activity)**

1. Report submitted to the Chair documenting research activity or progress toward dissertation completion.

**E. Poor--unsatisfactory (no evidence of scholarly activity)**

1. No evidence of scholarly activity
2. Failure to adhere to standards of professional scholarly ethics
3. Failure to submit a report on research to the Chair

## **II. Teaching**

As noted above, on teaching all faculty are expected to perform at the level of excellence or higher. Teaching involves classroom instruction as well as advising and tutoring beyond the classroom. Teaching imparts and demonstrates how to acquire substantive knowledge and analytical skills, sets challenging goals for students to achieve in the course of a semester, and fairly assesses their performance, making careful distinctions among levels of attainment, as reflected in grading practices (superior, average, and unsatisfactory). To perform effectively, faculty are required to keep up with developments in their discipline (political science or world languages ). In evaluating teaching performance, the Chair shall take into account the annual “student course evaluations”; these constitute an important although by no means the most important source of information. Faculty may submit exemplary student work as evidence of teaching quality. Criteria such as updated materials, innovation in teaching techniques, and student engagement will be considered. Additionally, classroom visits by

peers or Chair may be included, especially for beginning faculty. Faculty may elect to submit a report from a visit by a peer of their choice.

Criteria that may be used in the evaluation of teaching:<sup>3</sup>

- teaching awards and other accomplishments related to teaching
- student evaluations of teaching
- peer evaluations of teaching, such as those of Department Chair and (optional) a peer observer or Department mentor
- quality of student work
- quality of work / mentoring with students, e.g.:
  - product of student work shows advanced competence / skills
  - guidance in student research, conference papers, and other research presentations
  - guidance in career or educational goals (graduate school, law school, job applications, study abroad programs, etc.)
  - guidance in preparation for student competitions, or in other forms of student development
  - letters of recommendation for advanced-educational / career / professional purposes
  - unsolicited communication from alumni attesting to the long-term impact of the teaching on their career or education choices beyond UWF.
  
- Master's level comprehensive exam committee service, supervision of graduate theses, supervision of research seminar papers, supervision of honors' theses.
- Participation in Department's assessment plan: General Education and / or Major Programs and / or Graduate Programs.
- Participation in teaching development programs, including conference, workshop, or seminars related to subject areas taught.
- Design of new courses and programs.
- Organization and planning of courses.
- Punctuality in classroom attendance, grading assignments, etc.
- Clear and effective communication in the classroom or online environment.
- 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.
- Maintenance of adequate office hours virtually or in person (see above)

---

<sup>3</sup> We appreciate the criteria utilized in the Department of History and adopt many of these with little modification above.

- Evidence of scholarship and currency in subject area in selection of topics, resource materials, and content of lectures.
- Unsolicited student comments/feedback.

### **A. Distinguished (Evidence of superlative work with students)**

Distinguished performance demonstrates that the weight of evidence supports exceptionally high quality in teaching, as shown by the following indicators that build upon performance indicators for excellence. Performance indicators that may be used to support distinguished ratings:

1. Teaching awards that honor high caliber performance
2. Numerical student evaluation data documenting clear statistical exceptionality
3. Narrative statements emphasize powerful impact on learner or transformative learning experiences
4. Leadership evident in the promotion of high quality teaching and curriculum development in the Department.
5. Assessment practices that obviously enhance student learning and further Departmental efforts

### **B. Excellent**

Excellent performance represents consistent high quality teaching with positive outcomes for students as reflected by the performance indicators below. Performance indicators that may be used to support excellent ratings:

1. Student statements that document a consistently positive impact on learning.
2. Syllabi outline comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations.
3. Assessment practices in place.
4. Goals and course content routinely provide evidence of successful continuous improvement effort.
5. Pedagogical practices that facilitate optimal learning conditions.
6. Student support practices that facilitate optimal student development.
7. Mentoring, and student supervision practices receive consistent favorable review.
8. Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies) executed with expert skill.
9. Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights.

10. Participates voluntarily in professional development activities to improve teaching quality and flexibility.

### **C. Good**

Good performance demonstrates overall teaching effectiveness, but some minor areas for concern. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that teaching performance is below what is required for tenure and promotion decisions, which is outlined above as “Excellent” indicators. Performance indicators that may be used to support good ratings:

1. Student evaluations data document adequate impact on learning.
2. Teaching philosophy expressed in course planning and activities.
3. Syllabi provide reasonably clear and appropriate expectations.
4. Assessment practices support student learning and contribute to Department needs.
5. Goals and course content give evidence of continuous improvement effort.
6. Majority of pedagogical practices are appropriate and effective.
7. Majority of student support practices are appropriate and effective.
8. Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices are appropriate and effective.
9. Special teaching assignments executed with reasonable skill.
10. Maintains appropriate standards of academic integrity, including respect for students and their rights.
11. Participates in teaching development activities when directed to do so.

### **D. Fair (satisfactory)**

Fair performance demonstrates some positive teaching outcomes, but produces major areas for concern for the Department. The weight of evidence suggests that teaching performance in this performance category is well below what is required for tenure and promotion decisions. Performance indicators that may be used to support fair ratings:

1. Some student complaints flag areas of real concern. By “real” we mean complaints about frequently arriving late for class, long delays in grading assignments, lackadaisical lecturing, favoritism in grading, and so on.
2. Teaching philosophy may not be clearly expressed in course planning and activities.
3. Syllabi need to provide clearer and more appropriate expectations.

4. Assessment practices show some difficulty in supporting student learning and meeting Department needs.
5. Goals and course content reflect limited continuous improvement effort.
6. Some pedagogical practices need attention.
7. Some student support practices need improvement.
8. Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices need improvement.
9. Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) could be executed with greater competence.
10. Some indications of disrespect for students and their rights.

### **E. Poor (unsatisfactory)**

Poor performance demonstrates very serious problems in attaining success in fulfilling teaching responsibilities as reflected either by (1) a combination of many negative indications, or (2) fewer but more extreme behaviors that produce substantial negative outcomes on students and their learning. In general, the weight of evidence suggests teaching performance is well below the Department norms. Performance indicators that may be used to support poor ratings:

1. Student evaluations data document consistent and substantive problems, such as frequently missing class, unclear expectations, biased grading, and so on.
2. Teaching philosophy missing, poorly articulated or poorly expressed in course activities and planning.
3. Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations.
4. Assessment practices are inadequate to support student learning and Department needs (e.g., learning outcomes are inadequate, inappropriate, or missing; testing strategies are not effective or fair).
5. Goals and course content reflect no continuous improvement efforts.
6. No assistance rendered for Department assessment plan.
7. Pedagogical practices are unsound (e.g., disorganization; late, missing, unhelpful feedback; standards too lax or too challenging; routinely poor preparation; disengaging, chaotic, or hostile classroom environment).
8. Student support practices are unsound (e.g., late or absent for class, not responding to email, not keeping office hours, showing favoritism).
9. Consistent and very negative feedback in mentoring, and supervision of students' scholarly or creative activities.
10. Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies) avoided or poorly executed.
11. Chronic academic integrity concerns identified including evidence of disrespect for students and their rights.

### III. Service

All faculty are expected to contribute to the well-being of the university, the discipline, and the community. This requires, *inter alia*, membership in or leadership of a professional association, and university or college committee, as well as performing some community service. The latter can take many forms, provided it is related to one's subject area of expertise. Examples include giving a lecture to a community group (e.g. Daughters of the American Revolution, League of Women Voters, Leisure and Learning Society, etc.), being interviewed by the local newspaper or radio or television station, serving on a community board, etc. It goes without saying that attendance at Departmental meetings called by the Department Chair is required, as is attendance at one commencement ceremony (fall or spring); exemptions for any reason other than illness or family emergency require approval of the Department Chair.

#### **A. Distinguished (Evidence of extraordinary contributions): Any one of the following:**

In addition to the expectations for excellent, one of the following merits the distinguished rating:

1. President of a political science or a language association for World Languages faculty, (three years credit for regional or national, two for state-level)
2. Member, executive committee or council of a political science association or a language association for WL faculty.
3. Conference section Chair
4. President of Faculty Senate (includes one additional year beyond tenure in the office)
5. Committee Chair of Faculty Senate
6. Chair of CASSH Council or University or College Personnel Committee or another committee charged with significant responsibilities, e.g., Institutional Review Board, Scholarly and Creative Activities Committee,
7. Editor of a journal or book series (annually and for two years beyond expiration of assignment) if not counted as scholarly activity.
8. UWF Marion Vickers or equivalent award- campus (two years credit)
9. A combination of several items included under "excellent" may with proper justification merit the rating of distinguished.

#### **B. Excellent: Any one of the following**

1. Chair or discussant role on a panel for a disciplinary conference
2. Service on two or more committees at the College, or University level
3. Service on a faculty search committee
4. Review of a tenure or promotion file external to the Department

5. Contributions to the development of interdisciplinary language and culture programs.
6. Designated responsibility at commencement (e.g. marshal, hooder, platform party, etc.)
7. Giving a campus or community talk pertaining to one's subject area of expertise e.g. classroom guest lectures, a talk to student organizations, panel discussion
8. Organizing a panel discussion or special event
9. Media interviews or newspaper column or article pertaining to one's subject area of expertise
10. Other contributions to the university community in various roles, e.g. Student Scholar Symposium, Office of Undergraduate Research, scholarship competitions, etc.
11. Departmental service, e.g., faculty sponsor of a student organization or special event, sub-committee leadership, etc.
12. Solicited service as political science or language program reviewer at another institution

**C. Good**

1. Some service to the Department, college, university or community

**D. Fair (satisfactory)**

1. Some service to the Department

**E. Poor (unsatisfactory)**

1. No service performed at any level

**Or**

2. Un-collegial conduct in the performance of service responsibilities at any level within the university

**Or**

3. Unprofessional or unethical conduct in performance of service responsibilities in the community

## APPENDIX 2

### THE UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA WORLD LANGUAGES PROGRAM

The World Languages program came to the Department of Government from its former location in the English Department in August 2015. The Department of Government wants the World Language Program to flourish at UWF and values its contributions to a liberal education, the cultivation of global engagement, and the acquisition of practical communication skills.

#### ADDENDUM

##### History of the Bylaws of the Department of Government

1. The original document was adopted by the faculty of the Department of Government (then Department of Political Science) on September 15<sup>th</sup>, 1989.
2. The faculty voted to call themselves the Department of Government on April 1<sup>st</sup>, 1994.
3. Appendix 1, "Statement on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion," was adopted on May 20<sup>th</sup>, 1994.
4. Article II, Section C as revised on September 16<sup>th</sup>, 1994.
5. Statement on Retention, Promotion and Tenure revised on March 25, 2011.
6. Bylaws reviewed and revised in entirety for updating and also to address and delineate criteria for annual ratings pursuant to UWF changes with 2010 University Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion on August 5, 2016.
7. Appendix 2 will be added during the 2016-2017 year to specifically address discipline-specific annual review, promotion and tenure criteria of the World Languages program
8. Bylaws reviewed, revised, and adopted on May 6, 2022.