BYLAWS
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

Departmental Mission:

The mission of this department is to communicate, interpret, and add to the knowledge of the roles of social and cultural forces in human development, both individually and socially. To these ends, we seek to:

1. Prepare and train our students so that:
   
   A. Those desiring bachelor degrees will be able to apply the insights of these disciplines in their later work lives;
   
   B. Those seeking preparation for graduate degrees will be grounded in the discipline’s basics and will be competitive with students from other colleges and universities.

2. Conduct “pure” and “applied” research in these disciplines and disseminate the results in publications and public presentations.

3. Perform public services to organizations of the disciplines, as well as to public and private organizations, locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally.

To fulfill these responsibilities, the department offers bachelor degrees in sociology and anthropology with several tracks to foster student, university, and public needs.

Departmental Structure:

Voting Rights: Faculty holding the rank of instructor, research assistant, assistant professor, associate professor, scholar-scientist, professor, associate director, and director are eligible to vote on all departmental matters submitted to a vote. The department will observe college, university, and State University System rules and regulations in matters of tenure and promotion. The department may, by majority vote, extend voting privileges to other persons associated with the department. A quorum shall be 50% plus one of the voting faculty. Any faculty person may vote on specific issues in writing with the department chair in advance of a meeting.

Role of the Chair: Recognizing the managerial responsibilities of the chair, the department expects the chair to seek the advice and consent of the faculty and strive to reach decisions by consensus.

Committees: Given the small size of this faculty, the department will generally operate as a committee of the whole. However, disciplinary decisions and recommendations restricted to the fields of sociology and anthropology will lie with the faculty within the discipline concerned.
Ad hoc committees may be elected by the faculty as a whole or appointed by the chair as appropriate. Such appointments will be shared with the entire faculty at the time of appointment.

Meetings of the Faculty: There shall be at least one faculty meeting in each of the Fall and Spring semesters. A minimum of two weeks notice shall be given, except for emergency meetings called by the chair. Faculty may place items on the agenda by notifying the department office assistant at least one week prior to the meeting. A preliminary agenda will be circulated to the faculty one week prior to the meeting. Any two faculty may call a special faculty meeting on their own motion at any time, with said meeting to be scheduled by the chair for optimum faculty attendance. Roberts Rule of Order shall govern.

Departmental Academic Policies:

All proposed changes in academic policies and curricula must be approved by the majority vote of eligible faculty. Such changes shall be included in the circulated agenda prior to the meeting.

Course objectives, grading criteria, and examination policies are left to the professional judgment of the classroom instructor within the bounds of college, university, and system rules and regulations. These policies are expected to be made clear to students at the beginning of the course.

Student concerns about the fairness of grading, the fairness or appropriateness of an examination, or other conduct of a course shall follow the grievance policy of the university.

Personnel Policies and Procedures:

It is the intent 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.

1. Recruitment/Selection of New Faculty: The discipline concerned will operate as a committee of the whole for screening of applicants for new positions, including adjuncts. Final decision on recommendations for hiring shall be by the department faculty as a whole.

2. Annual Evaluation Criteria and Procedures: Annual evaluations are the responsibility of the chair. The chair shall consider an annual vita update, student evaluations, course syllabi, examinations, and other materials, and such other materials as the faculty member shall submit.

The faculty shall promulgate evaluation criteria. The current criteria attached shall be considered part of these bylaws. The established appeals are available; however, evaluations are expected to be developmental rather than punitive in nature.
3. **Merit Pay Criteria and Procedures:** The faculty will make explicit the criteria to be used. In the absence of faculty established criteria, annual evaluations shall govern. No other criteria may be admitted.

4. **Tenure and Promotion Criteria and Review Processes:** Then faculty will make explicit the criteria to be used. No other criteria may be admitted.

   The chair shall be responsible to advise faculty to facilitate their movement toward meeting tenure or promotion criteria and to assist those faculty concerned with meeting the criteria.

5. **Work Assignment Procedures:** While the chair is responsible for making the annual work assignment, input from each faculty member shall be requested and considered prior to its development. A draft work assignment shall be submitted to the faculty persons for review and response prior to the final document. Each faculty member is expected to submit personal goals in teaching, research and creative activities, and service to serve as the initial basis for developing the work assignment.

   Not all faculty will necessarily have comparable assignments across all categories. Some may have a lesser research load in order to accomplish a more demanding teaching or advising assignment, while others may have a reduced teaching load and a greater research or service load. These work assignments will be regarded as the joint product of the chair and the individual faculty member.

6. **Summer Supplemental Contract Opportunities Policy:** All faculty should be given opportunity to teach in the summer, dependent on the availability of such lines to the department. If insufficient lines are available, rotational system will be used, within the demands of enrollment and curricular needs.

7. **Office Hour Policy:** Full-time faculty shall be available to students through a minimum of five hours per week reasonably distributed through several days and time blocks. Part-time faculty will be reasonable available to students depending on their workload. Both part and full-time faculty will be available at other times by appointment.

**Student-Related Policies and Procedures:**

This department recognizes that its primary role is to teach students, to enhance their learning, and to assist them in meeting their educational goals.

The department office assistant, according to the interests of the student and faculty discipline, will assign a faculty adviser to all new students. Students may change an adviser by requesting another faculty person to serve in this role, but the faculty member may decline to advise any particular student for valid reason(s).

The adviser will help the student plan her/his course of study in accordance with the student’s ultimate educational goals. Students and their advisor should meet each semester to
review a degree plan and SASS Audit; at that time both will be explained to the student and signed by both student and faculty or office assistant. The adviser will check the student’s final degree plan and approve the student for graduation.

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

The department shall follow college and university policies regarding student grievance and complaints.
Planning and Budgeting of Resources:

Faculty shall submit to the chair requests for anticipated needed equipment or special resources for the ensuing years in a timely manner fitting the university budgeting process. Each September the faculty shall offer suggestions for changes in the five-year plan for the department. The final plans for future years shall be subject to faculty vote and approval.

The chair shall keep the faculty informed of budgetary information as it becomes available. All budgetary documents will be available to faculty for inspection and review at any time. The chair will report to the faculty periodically on the state of the budget.

Changes in the Bylaws:

These bylaws may be changed by a majority vote of the faculty attending any faculty meeting, provided that at least one week’s notice shall be provided all faculty that such a specific change is contemplated.
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Department of Anthropology
Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

Tenure:
To be granted tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate excellent teaching and at least one excellent and at least one good rating in the other two categories of scholarship and service.

Promotion to Associate Professor:
To be promoted to associate professor, a faculty member must demonstrate excellent performance in all three categories.

Promotion to Professor
To be promoted to professor, a faculty member must demonstrate a distinguished performance record in at least one category and at least excellent in each of the other two categories.

SUGGESTED ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND RUBRICS

1. TEACHING


Teaching effectiveness may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to:

- Department chairperson's annual evaluations and recommendations
- Satisfactory student evaluations
- Organization and planning of courses
- Clear and definitive explanation of assignments
- Engaging students in research projects
- Scholarship in teaching areas
- Updating course material to reflect advancements in the field
- Design of new courses and/or programs
- Conference, workshop, or seminar participation related to specialized area
- Teaching awards and other outstanding accomplishments in teaching
- Participation in teaching development programs
- Teaching specialty topics in seminars, discussion groups, and other student-centric delivery forums
- Directing students in directed studies, honors projects, and internships
- Supervising graduate student research and serving on thesis and/or dissertation committees
- Incorporating QEP goals such as active learning and student engagement.
b. Rubrics for evaluating teaching performance.

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

Indicators:
- Student evaluations document consistent and substantive problems (ratings well below the department average)
- Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations
- 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)
- Goals and course content reflect no continuous improvement efforts; no assistance rendered for department assessment plan
- 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)
- Student support practices are unsound (e.g., late or absent for class, not responding to email, not keeping keep office hours, showing favoritism)
- Consistent and very negative ratings in advising, mentoring, and supervision of students’ scholarly or creative activities
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) avoided or poorly executed
- Chronic academic integrity concerns identified including evidence of disrespect for students and their rights
- Avoids teaching developmental experiences

Implication: Requires major remedial work.

FAIR
Demonstrates some positive teaching outcomes but produces major areas for concern that have a moderately negative impact on students and their learning typically as reflected by a combination of several of the indicators below. In general, teaching performance is moderately below the department norms.

Indicators:
- Student evaluations document areas of moderate concern (ratings below the department average)
- Syllabi need to provide clearer and more appropriate expectations
- Assessment practices show some difficulty in supporting student learning and meeting department needs
- Goals and course content reflect limited continuous improvement effort
- Some pedagogical practices need attention
- Some student support practices need improvement
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices need improvement
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) could be executed with greater competence
- Occasional challenges related to academic integrity, including disrespect for students and their rights
- Does not typically participate in teaching development activity

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

**GOOD**
Demonstrates overall teaching effectiveness but some minor areas for concern, typically reflected by some combination of the indicators listed below. In general, teaching performance is mildly below the norms of excellence for the department.

**Indicators:**
- Student evaluations document adequate impact on learning
- Syllabi provide reasonably clear and appropriate expectations
- Assessment practices support student learning and contribute to department needs
- Goals and course content give evidence of continuous improvement effort
- Majority of pedagogical practices are appropriate and effective
- Majority of student support practices are appropriate and effective
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices are appropriate and effective
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) executed with reasonable skill
- Maintains appropriate standards of academic integrity, including respect for students and their rights
- Participates in teaching development activities when directed to do so

**Implication:** Performance at this level suggests positive potential but does not justify tenure or promotion at this stage of development

**EXCELLENT**
Demonstrates consistent high quality teaching with positive outcomes for student as reflected by the indicators below. In general, performance at this level meets all or almost all department standards of excellence.

**Indicators:**
- Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning as indicated by a minimum of 2.8 yearly average of all reported sections taught on each of item 8 (overall assessment of instructor), item 17 (instructor’s command of the subject), and item 18 (overall course organization) on the Student Assessment of Instruction. If an instructor teaches more than one section of the same course in a semester, the instructor may choose to report only one of those sections
- Syllabi outline comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations
- Assessment practices enhance student learning and contribute to department needs
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- Goals and course content routinely provide evidence of continuous improvement effort
- Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning conditions
- Student support practices facilitate optimal student development
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices receive consistent favorable review
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) executed with expert skill
- Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights
- Participates voluntarily in professional development activities to improve teaching quality and flexibility

**Implication:** Performance at this level justifies favorable tenure and promotion decision.

**DISTINGUISHED**

Demonstrates unusually high degree of quality in teaching as shown by the following indicators that build upon indicators for excellence. In general, performance at this level exceeds department standards for excellence.

**Indicators:**
- Numerical student evaluation data document clear statistical exceptionality as indicated by a minimum of 3.3 yearly average of all reported sections taught on each of item 8 (overall assessment of instructor), item 17 (instructor’s command of the subject), and item 18 (overall course organization) on the Student Assessment of Instruction. If an instructor teaches more than one section of the same course in a semester, the instructor may choose to report only one of those sections
- Narrative statements emphasize powerful impact on learner or transformative learning experiences
- Teaching awards honor high caliber of performance
- Leadership evident in the promotion of high quality teaching and curriculum development in the department

**Implication:** Performance average at this level over the last five years of employment at UWF easily justifies favorable tenure and promotion decision.
2. SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

a. Criteria for assessing scholarly/creative contributions

Scholarly contributions in the field of anthropology include peer-reviewed journal articles; non-peer reviewed journal articles; books; book chapters; book reviews; forensic reports; archaeology technical reports; peer reviewed proceedings chapters; non-peer reviewed proceedings chapters; edited volumes; professional paper/poster presentations; panel or symposium discussant; museum exhibits; online or electronic format writings; videos; grants written; grants received. Each category can be further sub-divided according to criteria such as author's contribution (e.g., sole author, second author); report complexity (Phase I, II, or III archaeology reports); and significance (e.g., international, national, or regional journal). In terms of explicit criteria for weighing relative contributions, we have adopted a “currency” of one peer-reviewed journal article, and have compiled a list of equivalencies, as follows:

- Peer reviewed journal article = 1
- Non- Peer reviewed journal article = .5
- Book Review = .25
- Letter Report = .1
- Forensic Report = .25
- Archaeology Technical Report
  - Phase I = .25
  - Phase II = .5
  - Phase III = 1
- Book = 3 – 5
- Book Chapter = 1
- Peer reviewed Proceedings Chapter = 1
- Non-Peer reviewed Proceedings chapter = .5
- Co-Authored Book = .5 – 1 of value of equivalent single author book
- Editor of Edited Volume = 2
- Paper Presentation / Poster Presentation / Presentation on Organized Panel or Symposium / Discussant = .1
- Exhibit = up to 1, depending on venue and complexity
- Online or electronic format writing / video/ CD-Rom = up to 1 depending on venue and complexity

Grant Writing:
- Internal proposed = .25
- Internal proposed and received = .5
- External proposed = .75
- External proposed and received = 1
- External grants administered = variable
b. **Rubrics for evaluating scholarly/creative contributions.**

**POOR**
Demonstrates serious problems in developing scholarship and creative projects as reflected by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative production is well below the department standard of excellence.

*Indicators*: Summary score for scholarly/creative contributions **less than or equal to 2**
*Implication*: Major remedial work is required. Scholarship and creative projects mentor should be considered.

**FAIR**
Demonstrates only minor tangible progress toward executing a scholarly and creative agenda as shown by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative projects are moderately below the department standards of excellence.

*Indicators*: Summary score for scholarly/creative contributions **between 2 and 3**.
*Implication*: No support for tenure/promotion but shows promise of future productivity.

**GOOD**
Demonstrates moderate tangible progress in scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the indicators below but work falls mildly below department standards of excellence.

*Indicators*: Summary score for scholarly/creative contributions **between 3 and 4**.
*Implication*: May qualify for tenure if other effort areas are at least excellent, but does not qualify for promotion.

**EXCELLENT**
Demonstrates satisfactory execution of scholarship or creative activity agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university context, as shown by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative projects meet department standards of excellence in both quality and quantity.

*Indicators*: Summary score for scholarly/creative contributions **between 4 and 5**.
*Implication*: Performance at this level facilitates favorable promotion/tenure decisions.

**DISTINGUISHED**
Demonstrates unusually high degree of skill in design and execution of scholarly and creativity projects as shown by the indicators below that build upon the indicators for excellence. In general, this performance exceeds department standards for excellence in both quality and quantity.

*Indicators*: Summary score for scholarly/creative contributions **greater than 5**
*Implication*: Easily qualifies for favorable promotion and tenure decisions.

3. **SERVICE**

a. **Criteria for assessing service contributions**
Service is broadly defined and includes a wide range of activities including, but not limited to:

- Service on university, college, and department governance
- Service as Department Chair, Program Director, or Program Coordinator
b. Rubrics for evaluating service contributions.

POOR

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

Indicators:
• Service activity nonexistent or very poor in quality, producing a potentially adverse impact on the goals of the relevant organization
• Significance of the obligation of service in the faculty role in a regional comprehensive university not apparent (e.g., faculty seems resistant or oblivious to service needs)
• Community service, if any, does not in any way provide synergy between the faculty member’s area of expertise and the service functions, for example, serving as the director of a local church choir.

Implication: Remedial work is required; May include recommendation to find a context that is a better match to the individual's service values than the substantial service needs relevant to the regional comprehensive context. No support for tenure or promotion.

FAIR

Demonstrates only minor tangible progress in service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is moderately below department standards for excellence.
Indicators:
- Minimal contributions made in service role (e.g., "sits" on committees as compared to active participation)
- Over-commitment to service spreads faculty time and energy too thinly to facilitate effectiveness
- Community service, if applicable, provides limited, tangential synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and service functions.

Implication: No support for tenure/promotion

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

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

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

EXCELLENT
Demonstrates satisfactory execution of service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service contributions meet the department standards of excellence.

Indicators:
- Participates effectively in at least six of the service activities listed above
- Scope and effort level meet department standards
- Colleagues view contributions to department as effective
- Service agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university mission
- Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, department, campus, and community
- Community service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions.

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

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

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

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