

**DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT
BYLAWS**

Current Version Adopted: August 5, 2016

Department of Government

Bylaws

Table of Contents

Article and Section	Page
I. Mission of the Department	3
II. Structure of the Department	3
Voting Rights	3
Role of the chair	3
Committees	6
III. Meeting of the Department	8
IV. Academic Policies of the Department	8
V. Personnel Policies/Procedures	9
VI. Student Related Policies and Procedures	10
VII. Resources: Planning and Budgeting	11
VIII. Planning and Reviewing Processes	11
IX. 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	
Addendum – History of the Bylaws	29

DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT BYLAWS

I. Mission of the Department:

The Department of Government consists of teacher-scholars dedicated to the conservation, transmission and development of the body of theoretical and practical knowledge about government and politics. Educating men and women in politics, as well as preparing them for law school, graduate studies, and careers in government and related fields, as well as responsibly to exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship are the primary goals of the Department. An education in political science education gives students a better understanding of the opportunities and challenges confronting the United States in an increasingly interdependent world. 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 these three goals, the department offers integrated programs of teaching, research, and service in political science, pre-law, and international studies. In its programs and activities, the department strives to foster the spirit of rational inquiry and the love of truth which constitute the intellectual heritage of political science and a liberal education.

II. Structure of the Department:

A. Voting Rights: Full-time faculty holding the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor shall vote on all department matters 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:¹

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.
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. Acting as the spokesperson for the unit to persons and organizations outside the unit, both within and without the University.
3. Stimulating innovative programs and activities within the University.
4. Stimulating innovative programs and activities within the faculty unit which are in harmony with the overall goals of the College and the University.
5. 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.

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

6. Engaging in teaching and research activities in a manner which does not detract from his/her responsibilities as a chair.
7. Supporting continued faculty development.
8. Mentor faculty on tenure-track requirements and evaluate all faculty
9. 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 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

C. Committees: The faculty shall sit as a committee of the whole for departmental business pertaining to adoption of curriculum modification and departmental governance changes or bylaw revision. Matters such as faculty

hiring², curriculum development and planning, assessment, events - programming -and outreach, and other matters that do not require a committee of the whole may be handled by sub-committees with leadership from the most related sub-fields when possible. Additionally, the chair may appoint ad hoc committees for special purposes as needed.

Mentoring committees will be formed by the department chair for new 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 faculty member comes up for 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 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

² 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.

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, a junior faculty member will be responsible for taking meeting minutes, which will include a summary of the main points discussed and all decisions. The meeting minutes will be provided to the chair who will distribute to all attendees no later than 1 week after the 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.

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 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. Merit pay criteria and procedures: The Faculty 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, but feasible.

It is recognized that all faculty members will have comparable assignments across all categories; thus, some will have a lesser research load in order to accomplish a more demanding teaching and service assignment, while others will have a reduced teaching load and a greater research and/or service responsibilities. These work assignments will be regarded as the joint product of the chair and the individual faculty member, keeping in mind that departmental objectives and needs along with capacity in which faculty were hired into the department play a definitive role in structuring the work assignment letter. Faculty should utilize their work assignment for a given academic year in order to plan and allocate their time and effort. 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.

K. Procedures for submitting and considering annual salary increment recommendations are determined by College Policy.

L. Procedures for selecting the chair are determined by College Policy.

M. Criteria, policies, and procedures for periodic review of chair are determined by College Policy.

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. A budget status update will typically be provided both at the final faculty meeting of each academic year and at the initial meeting of the fall semester but at least once per year. 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 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.

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 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

THE UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA POLITICAL SCIENCE PROGRAM

A. GUIDELINES ON RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

I. General

The Faculty of the Department of Government 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. That said, 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. At UWF, 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.

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 follow are the specific *minimum* requirements to receive a favorable recommendation for tenure or promotion to associate professor or professor in the Department of Government. 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 with 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. 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 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 plus one more item –either scholarly article or book chapter in a substantive area of political science research. By a book beyond the dissertation, we mean a book that is not a revised version of the dissertation, but one that

addresses subject matter way beyond it, even if it builds or 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. In each of the three years immediately prior to candidacy, the candidate must have earned a “distinguished” rating each year in either scholarship or teaching 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. Establishment of scholarship can be attained in one of the following ways, counting items added since the last promotion:

(1) publication of at least five peer-reviewed scholarly journal articles

Or

(2) publication of one scholarly book (beyond the dissertation) plus three more items- either scholarly articles or book chapters in a substantive area of political science research

Or

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

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.

*Scholarly books classification does not include edited books. 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 qualified for weight 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 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 take service contributions to the University of West Florida, to the profession, and to the community at large.

Service starts at the level of the department. Collegiality, i.e., the sharing of authority and expertise, takes many forms, including but not limited to active participations in departmental decision-making, reading and commenting on colleagues' papers, helping peers with statistical, methodological, or computer related challenges, and other support and encouragement of fellow faculty.

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 of Government annually evaluates the professional performance and collegial conduct of the 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).

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, dean, and provost.

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-1st 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 inter-disciplinary 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 6000 words or more 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 results.
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 department 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 department 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 political science. 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. Classroom visits considering criteria such as updated materials, innovation in teaching techniques, and student engagement will be considered. Additionally, classroom visit evaluation will be included. To accomplish this, the chair will make at least one classroom visit and write an evaluation of teaching for each full time faculty member each year. Faculty may elect annually to submit a second teaching evaluation based on a classroom visit by a peer of their choice.

Criteria that may be used in the evaluation of teaching:³

- 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 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.

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

- 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 (2 hours per 3 s.h. of teaching)
- 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 evaluations document 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. Student evaluations data that flag areas of concern.
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 serious problems in attaining success in teaching role 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.
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)

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

1. Member, executive committee of Florida or other state political science association
2. Member of regional or national political science association committee
3. Conference section chair
4. President or Executive Committee Member of Faculty Senate
5. Subcommittee chair of Faculty Senate
6. President 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

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

C. Good

1. Some service to the department and community

D. Fair (satisfactory)

1. Some service to the department

E. Poor (unsatisfactory)

1. No service performed at any level

Or

2. Uncollegial 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

History of program relocation to the Department of Government

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. We want to support the development of this program toward eventually becoming its own department or unit under the direct supervision of the Dean of the College. To that end, it expects the program to be self-governing under the direction and supervision of the chair of the Department of Government within a framework that mimics those detailed in Articles I through VIII of the Bylaws of the Department of Government. It is to be understood that faculty in World Languages vote on matters internal to that program only. While the program is provisionally located in the Department of Government, the Language Coordinator will attend DOG meetings as Language Coordinator for the purpose of facilitation, routine communication and coordination between the two programs, although, again, without a vote on any matter pertaining to political science or its faculty and, again, the Language Coordinator does not vote on matters pertaining to the Political Science program.

A. GUIDELINES ON RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION**

B. ANNUAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR RATINGS**

***Forthcoming during the 2016-2017 academic year*

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 15th, 1989.
2. The faculty voted to call themselves the Department of Government on April 1st, 1994.
3. Appendix 1, “Statement on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion,” was adopted on May 20th, 1994.
4. Article II, Section C as revised on September 16th, 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