

**University of West Florida Department of History and Philosophy**  
**Bylaws for Departmental Governance**

**Article I. Name:**

The name of the unit is the Department of History and Philosophy in the College of Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities of the University of West Florida.

**Article II. Voting Membership:**

**A. Definitions:**

The Department's voting membership shall consist of faculty who hold the rank of professor, clinical professor, associate professor, clinical associate professor, assistant professor, clinical assistant professor, instructor, or lecturer. All other persons affiliated with the Department (adjunct faculty and visiting faculty of any designation) are invited to participate in faculty meetings, but they are not extended voting privileges. The Chair may request volunteers from adjunct and/or visiting faculty to serve on committees because of their particular experience and expertise.

This definition of voting membership applies throughout these bylaws except for matters concerning Tenure and Promotion of faculty. See Article VII.

**B. Faculty Additions:**

When a faculty position becomes open and permission is granted by the University to conduct a search, the Department faculty shall have input regarding the type of applicant to be sought. A faculty search committee shall be formed consisting of members appointed by the Chair.

The committee's duties include following the procedures outlined for faculty hiring by the Office of Academic Affairs. The committee's procedure shall be consistent with the Sunshine Law. The committee drafts search materials, including advertisements and selection of criteria, and submits these to the Chair for approval prior to publication.

The committee reviews applications and forwards to the faculty a pool of top candidates. The faculty will assess the strengths and limitations of the candidates. The faculty may also provide additional input regarding candidate invitations and the selection of finalists by the hiring official(s).

### **Article III. Department Administration**

#### **A. Department Chair**

The Department adopts an “elected” and “short-term” conception of its Chair. “Election” is subject to ratification by the Dean, who appoints the Chair.

An elected Chair can expect to serve a term of three consecutive years. If a Chair takes a sabbatical or other leave, that interlude shall be considered part of the Chair’s elected term.

Under current University policy, Department Chairs are appointed to one-year contracts from August to August, and they are subject to annual performance review by the Dean of the College of Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities.

No later than 5 April in the third year of a term, all full-time voting members anonymously will submit nominations to a faculty member designated by the chair by 30 March. No later than 15 April, the Chair will confirm with each nominee the nominee’s consent to serve if elected. No later than 20 April, all full-time voting members will vote upon the nominees by secret ballot in a Department meeting. An incumbent Chair may be nominated for re-election and should expect to serve no more than two consecutive terms.

A retiring Chair will advise and assist the elected successor at least through the term prior to the commencement of the succeeding Chair’s appointment.

#### **B. Graduate Coordinator**

In consultation with the History Committee, the Chair will appoint a Graduate Coordinator by the first day of the Fall Term. The Graduate Coordinator can expect to serve a term of three consecutive years, though is subject to yearly reappointment at the discretion of the Chair. The duties of the Graduate Coordinator include:

- Serves as the department’s point of contact for current and prospective graduate students and assists with and provides leadership for graduate student recruitment and retention initiatives.
- Advises and mentors graduate students as they plan and execute their academic program, including reviewing the progress-to-degree of all active students during the fall and spring semesters, fostering the development of student cohorts and a cohesive graduate student community, and promoting a culture of professionalism through mentoring and professional development training.
- Serves on the History Committee and in concert with the department chair leads the department’s review of applications; academic progress updates; TA/GA selection, assignment, and evaluation; and nominating and awarding of graduate student awards and scholarships.

### **Article IV. Committee Structure:**

### **A. Ad Hoc Committees**

As circumstances may require, the Department Chair is empowered to constitute and charge ad hoc committees. In memoranda or agenda, the Chair shall propose committee memberships to the faculty as a whole for ratification. The Chair shall, for example, appoint ad hoc “search committees” as positions are budgeted and “tenure mentoring committees” in accordance with the procedures summarized in Article X below.

### **B. Standing Committees:**

#### **1. The standing committees of the Department are:**

##### **a. History Committee:**

Charge: To review the nature, admissions policies, degree requirements, advisement policies, curriculum, and student funding procedures for the history graduate and undergraduate programs. To consult with history faculty and to make recommendations to the Department Chair in developing yearly schedules of and staffing for course offerings. To advise the Chair in awarding financial support to students. To oversee any operation or policy that affects the graduate and/or undergraduate programs, including admissions review, graduate assistantship awards, curriculum revision, evaluation of student progress, and assessment. The committee may not make any significant programmatic changes without the consent of the majority of the Department’s voting membership.

Membership: Graduate Coordinator and two history faculty members.

##### **b. Philosophy Committee**

Charge: To review the nature, admissions policies, degree requirements, advisement policies, curriculum, and student funding procedures for the philosophy undergraduate program. To make recommendations to the Chair regarding the undergraduate philosophy program. To advise Chair in awarding financial support to undergraduate philosophy students. To oversee any operation or policy that affects the undergraduate programs, including admissions review, graduate assistantship awards, curriculum revision, evaluation of student progress, and assessment. The committee may not make any significant programmatic changes without the consent of the majority of the Department’s voting membership.

Membership: At least two philosophy faculty members.

#### **2. Method of Staffing**

The standing committees shall be staffed in accordance with the procedure employed for staffing ad hoc committees. The Department Chair shall announce committee appointments for the next twelve months by the second week of the fall semester. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner.

**C. Procedures**

1. The Department Chair will appoint committee Chairs for committee ratification.
2. Committee Chairs shall convene a meeting at least once every fall and spring semester.
3. Committee meetings shall follow the same procedures for Department meetings as outlined in Article V.
4. Committee Chairs shall report the committee's activity at each Department meeting.

**Article V. Department Meetings:**

- A. The Department Chair shall convene meetings of the voting membership and others as deemed necessary, at least once in each fall and spring semester.
- B. By a signed petition, any three faculty members may direct the Chair to convene a timely Department meeting.
- C. Meetings shall be announced and agendas developed and distributed in a timely fashion by the Chair. In preparing agendas, the Chair shall:
  1. No fewer than four business days prior to a Department meeting, distribute to all faculty a draft agenda, including all relevant items to be introduced, reported, and/or recommended for debate and/or action;
  2. Solicit proposals for additional agenda items from the faculty;
  3. Circulate a final agenda, taking into account faculty proposals, by the end of the business day prior to the scheduled meeting.
- D. The Department Chair shall conduct meetings following accepted procedures for motions, debate, and voting.
- E. Voting shall be by voice or show of hand, although any member present may demand a roll call on any proposition. A majority of those present may demand a vote by secret ballot on any proposition. Elections shall be by secret ballot. Alternatively, voting may be conducted via email.
- F. If a faculty is unable to attend a meeting, that member may grant a written or electronic proxy to another member for the purpose of voting on specified items from the final posted agenda.
- G. A majority of the voting membership shall constitute a quorum.
- H. Where not governed by Florida statutes, the Collective Bargaining Agreement, University policy, or other sections of the History and Philosophy bylaws, the Department will utilize a majority vote of the voting membership to determine Departmental matters related to governance, curriculum, lines, and general Department function and direction.
- I. The Department Chair shall vote only in the event of a tie. The Chair shall, however, vote in the selection of a Chair and on candidacies for faculty appointment.

- J. In the Chair's absence, the Chair will designate a faculty member to preside.
- K. The Chair of the Department, or designee thereof, shall be responsible for the taking of minutes as a permanent record of Department faculty meetings. The office administrator is responsible for keeping and distributing the minutes as required by these bylaws.

## **Article VI. Performance Standards:**

The following categories shall be used in evaluating faculty efforts in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service for the purposes of annual evaluation and Tenure and Promotion:

- Exceeds Expectations: Exceeds Departmental standards for professional performance in quality and/or quantity.
- Meets Expectations: Meets Departmental standards for professional performance.
- Does Not Meet Expectations: Does not meet Departmental standards for professional performance.
- Unsatisfactory: Disregards or fails to address remediation efforts by the university to provide correction or assistance for performance that does not meet expectations, or performance involving incompetence or misconduct as defined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and applicable university regulations and policies.

### **A. Teaching Performance Indicators and Standards:**

Teaching Indicators: The quality of teaching may be demonstrated by evidence bearing on the following considerations:

- Teaching awards and other documented accomplishments related to teaching.
- Student response to course content and presentation.
- Course and work assignment-related mentoring, including student conferences, theses, publications, directed studies, and supervision of interns.
- Course syllabi and other course-related documents and media.
- Intellectual demands made upon students, including the quality of tests and other assignments.
- Students' progress in mastering course content.
- Instructor's estimate of success in fulfilling course objectives.
- Revisions, innovations, maintenance, and development of established and/or new courses.
- Activity undertaken for professional growth that will enhance the instructor's effectiveness as a teacher.
- Design and implementation of University or faculty-led assessment procedures, protocols, and instruments that measure student learning outcomes and program effectiveness.
- Documents reflecting peer reviews and/or classroom observations that comply with the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
- Evidence of teaching initiatives to meet program, Department, or University goals and standards.

The items outlined in this section also constitute additional Departmental “acceptable supplemental exemplars” of teaching quality as defined in Article 11.2 “Sources and Methods of Evaluation” of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

## **B. Scholarly and Creative Activity Indicators and Standards:**

### **1. Scholarly and Creative Activity Indicators for History faculty.**

#### Level 1:

- Peer-reviewed monograph of original research based on primary sources, such as archival material, documents, interviews, oral histories, and material culture, as well as secondary sources including scholarly books, articles, chapters, and reports, that is published with a respected University or trade publisher.<sup>1</sup>
- An equivalent peer-review applied/non-traditional history project.

#### Level 2:

- Book or peer-reviewed volume that is an edited work, such as a documentary or critical edition, a collection of primary sources that contain introductory material or notes that aid the reader in interpreting documents, a translation with introductory material or notes, and/or edited work containing chapters from other academics or professionals. Edited books shall count for TWO (2) Level 2 accomplishments.
- Textbook and/or book-length bibliography.
- A major museum exhibit or digital history publication.
- Article based on original research, using primary and secondary sources, which appears in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal.
- Chapter in a peer-reviewed book that meets the criteria for original research listed above.
- Substantial research reports, policy papers, working papers, commissioned studies, bibliographies, databases, environmental studies, community studies, policy papers, contextual analyses, and/or archival projects, such as, but not limited to, those in the fields of historic preservation and cultural resource management that result from contracts or grants.
- Awarded research grant, sponsored research contract, or fellowship (\$10,000 or more).
- Preparation and submission of a full proposal for a major (more than \$50,000) NEH, NSF or comparable grant program.
- An equivalent peer-review applied/non-traditional history project.

#### Level 3

---

<sup>1</sup> “Published” in these bylaws includes both print and digital formats.

- Published translation of an article or chapter with introductory material and/or notes by the translator to aid the reader in understanding the work.
- Small museum exhibit and/or short film, documentary, and television program.
- Awarded research grant, sponsored research contract, or fellowship (\$5,000-\$9,999).
- Scholarly presentation at regional, state, national, or international conferences that meets the criteria of original research as outlined above.
- Published work that is not subject to a peer review that meets the criteria of original research as outlined above.
- Extensive and documented mentoring activities that reflect the original research of the faculty.

#### Level 4

- Brief publication, book review, essay, classroom material, bibliography, newsletter article, encyclopedia article, and/or contribution to non-academic works, including but not limited to popular books, newspapers, and magazines.
- Special or guest lecture in an academic setting, provided the lecture is based on original research.
- Participation as a commentator on a panel or in a roundtable discussion at a conference, workshop, and special or guest lecture, which is academic but not based on original research.
- Minor research grants or fellowships (less than \$5,000) earned.

2. Scholarly and Creative Activities Indicators for Philosophy faculty are located in Article 9.D.2.

#### 3. Applied/Non-Traditional Research

In areas of nontraditional scholarship it is the responsibility of the faculty member to document and explain the relative value or merit of the project. Evaluations should include peer and/or external reviews. In addition, the faculty member must explain and document the originality, the process, the rigor, and the results of his/her work, and where it fits within the Department's criteria for evaluation.

#### 4. Co-authored Projects

The Department values collaborative and/or interdisciplinary research and scholarly endeavors. As such, a faculty who documents a substantial contribution to the work for a co-edited publication or project will earn full credit for the publication/project.

#### 5. Quality Indicators

In addition to the quantity of a faculty's publications, the following relevant quality indicators for publications can also be considered when evaluating publications/applied/non-traditional research:

- Peer review
- Disciplinary reputation of publisher
- Competitive editorial policy
- University or Local/State/Federal government sponsorship

#### 6. Consideration of Publication Timelines and Schedules

Because the publishing schedules of many academic and university presses and journals often extend over several years, candidates may credit single-author or co-authored monographs, single-author or co-authored books (as appropriate to each candidate's field/discipline), or single-author or co-authored articles or book chapters that are forthcoming or "in-press" from a press or journal but not yet available, as justification for tenure, promotion, and PTR. In such cases, the candidate must provide all relevant documentation of contracts as well as galley proofs and/or publication schedules.

### **C. Service Statement:**

In accordance with the public service mission of the University, consistent performance of service is expected of all members of the Department of History and Philosophy. Such service includes contributions to the discipline, to the University, to the Department, and to the community. In the context of administrative positions, such as Graduate Coordinator, quality of service is demonstrated by program creation, revision, design, and implementation of goals and outcomes. The above-listed examples of administrative service are not intended to be interpreted as exhaustive or prescriptive. Any reviewing body should consult the individual candidate's work assignment for clarification of a candidate's appropriate service exceptions.

### **D. Service Performance Indicators and Standards:**

Service Indicators: The Department defines the items in the following non-exhaustive list as important service-related activities within the Department:

- Substantial service to the Department, such as participation in Departmental governance and/or Department committee(s).
- Membership in one University or college committee such as faculty senate, UPC, CPC, Personnel, or a University hiring committee.
- Service on Special or Ad Hoc Committees within the University community
- Documented substantial service to the profession and/or government entities, including serving on editorial boards, peer-reviewing, professional editing, translating, and/or committee work.



- Leadership role in a professional society.
- Leadership role in the UWF Chapter of the United Faculty of Florida.
- Membership/Active role in University shared governance organizations.
- Implementation, development, and/or maintenance of new programs.
- Service as program director or coordinator.
- Establishment of substantial inter-departmental relationships between one or more UWF programs or entities.
- Substantial, documented mentoring of one or more GTAs.
- Observations of teachers and/or graduate students
- Chairing or membership of a doctoral dissertation committee.
- Faculty advisor for student organization.
- Documented substantial service to the local, state, and/or national community related to one's discipline.

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

## **Article VII. Tenure and Promotion:**

Persons under consideration for tenure in the Department of History and Philosophy must demonstrate significant and consistent accomplishments in teaching, research, and service. The decision to recommend tenure is a vote of confidence in the candidate's demonstrated capacity for scholarly and professional growth. Thus, the Department will not ordinarily recommend an assistant professor for tenure unless the candidate holds the appropriate terminal degree and has accomplishments in teaching and scholarship that warrant a simultaneous recommendation of promotion.

### **A. Tenure and Promotion Criteria for History Faculty**

#### **1. Departmental Criteria for Tenure and Promotion**

- To merit tenure and promotion, a faculty must "Meet Expectations" in teaching, research, and service in accordance with Departmental criteria and performance indicators for the previous three years.
  - Candidate must demonstrate repeated evidence of quality scholarship by achieving ONE of the following:
    - 1 item from Level 1
    - 3 items from Level 2, 1 of which must be a peer-reviewed publication.
    - 2 items from Level 2, which must be a peer-reviewed publication, and 5 items from Level 3
- A strong and continuous record of University, Department, professional, and community service. The Department recognizes service as less significant than scholarship and teaching.

#### **2. Promotion to Full Professor**

- To be promoted to the rank of professor, a faculty member must have at least (3) peer reviewed, scholarly publications, which may include co-

authored and edited works, since promotion to Associate Professor as well as ALL of the following:

- To merit promotion to full professor, an associate professor must meet expectations in all areas and, in three of the five years prior to applying for promotion, exceed expectations, on average, in either teaching, or research and creative activities.
- At a minimum, promotion to full professor requires achieving ONE of the following:
  - 2 items from Level 1 (at least one must be published after promotion to associate professor)
  - 1 item from Level 1 and 3 items from Level 2 (either level 1 item or Level 2 and 3 items must be published/completed after promotion to associate professor.)
  - 1 item from Level 1, 2 items from Level 2, and 5 items from Level three. (Either Level 1 item or Level 2 and 3 items must be published/completed after promotion to associate professor.)
- Service to the University, Department, profession, and/or community should be noteworthy for its impact and intrinsic value.

## **B. Tenure and Promotion Criteria for Philosophy Faculty**

### **1. Departmental Criteria for Tenure and Promotion**

- To be granted tenure and promotion, a faculty member's performance must meet or exceed expectations in all three categories for the preceding three years.
- In addition, a faculty member must have at least (3) peer reviewed, scholarly publications, which may include co-authored and edited works.

### **2. Promotion to Full Professor**

- To be promoted to the rank of Professor, a faculty member must have at least (3) peer reviewed, scholarly publications, which may include co-authored and edited works, since promotion to Associate Professor as well as ALL of the following:
  - To merit promotion to full professor, an associate professor must meet expectations in all areas and, in three of the five years prior to applying for promotion, exceed expectations, on average, in either teaching, or research and creative activities.

## **C. Enhanced Departmental Criteria for Promotion to the Ranks of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer**

- The UWF guidelines for promotion to the ranks of Senior Instructor and Senior Lecturer state that UWF departments should develop enhanced departmental criteria for promotion to the ranks of Senior Lecturer and Senior Instructor in addition to the minimum University criteria for promotion to these positions. The Department of History and Philosophy requires that successful candidates for

promotion to the ranks of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer meet at least one of the following additional enhanced criteria:

- a. The candidate has an established record of annual evaluation ratings where a majority of the ratings (inclusive of all Dean and Chair annual ratings) are at the level of “Exceeds Expectations/Distinguished.” This level of evaluation is an enhancement of the University standard for promotion; or
  - b. The candidate has an established and documented record of incorporating high impact practices into their teaching and service. The University provides examples of the types of practices that qualify as HIPs here: <https://uwf.edu/academic-engagement-and-student-affairs/departments/career-development-and-community-engagement/students-and-alumni/gain-relevant-experience/high-impact-practices/>. This list should not be seen as an exhaustive list of HIPS; however, the scope and spirit of the activities identified by the university should guide an understanding of what constitutes a HIP; or
  - c. The candidate has an established and documented record of service that clearly extends service initiatives and impacts beyond the department and college level to initiatives that impact the university, community, and/or the faculty member’s discipline.
- A candidate for promotion to the ranks of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer in the Department of History and Philosophy should clearly document evidence for these Enhanced Departmental Criteria in the candidate’s application for promotion to the ranks of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer.

#### **D. Mentoring**

1. During the first semester of a faculty member’s appointment to a tenure-earning position, the Chair will assign the candidate an advisory committee of tenured faculty from within the Department and, if requested by the faculty member, one non-Departmental tenured faculty member. The committee will be charged to assist the candidate’s progress toward tenure and to discuss with the candidate and the Chair its specific recommendations for that progress.

The committee will be associated with the nontenured faculty member until the year of the candidate’s review for tenure and will develop its advice in conjunction with the annual evaluation process.

2. Mid-Point Review: For the candidate’s mid-point review, the Chair will ask the candidate’s permission to share with the committee all materials that the candidate has submitted for appraisal. In the Chair’s absence, the committee will discuss with the candidate its assessment of those materials and its recommendations. The committee will then confer with the Chair, who will take its views into account in drafting the mid-point review report. The Chair will discuss that draft with the committee and with the candidate and will then submit to both the mid-point review in final form. If the candidate wishes, they may

submit for inclusion in the mid-point review a written commentary upon and/or rebuttal on the Chair's report.

3. Mentoring Committee Membership: The Chair will appoint two tenured faculty to each mentoring committee. If the nontenured faculty member requests, the committee will be enlarged to include another tenured faculty member of their choice. The committee will designate one member its secretary, to be responsible for circulating materials and convening a yearly meeting.

## **Article VIII. Post-Tenure Review**

The University of West Florida adheres to Florida Board of Governors' Regulation 10.003 as well as Article 11 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement in all matters relating to post-tenure review.

The Department of History and Philosophy endorses the University standard that post-tenure review (PTR) criteria should consider the faculty member's performance holistically over the five-year PTR period of review and not solely over the period of a single annual assignment or evaluation. With this standard in mind, the department endorses the following PTR criteria for teaching, service, and scholarship/creative activity.

### **A. Scholarship and Creative Activity Post-Tenure Review Criteria**

1. PTR Criteria for History Faculty

*Exceeds Expectations* is warranted when a faculty publishes/in-press 1 Level 1 item OR 3 Level 2 items as defined in Article VI.B.

*Meets Expectations* is warranted when a faculty publishes/in-press 2 Level 2 items OR 1 Level 2 AND 3 Level 3 items as defined in Article VI.B.

*Does Not Meet Expectations* is warranted when a faculty does not meet the standards as outlined herein for "Meets Expectations."

*Unsatisfactory* is warranted when a faculty member disregards or fails to address remediation efforts by the university to provide correction or assistance for performance that does not meet expectations or performance involving incompetence or misconduct as defined in the collective bargaining agreement and applicable university regulations and policies.

Simply meeting the minimum post-tenure review publication quantity requirements for the five-year period of review does not guarantee a candidate's successful PTR. In addition to the quantity of a candidate's publication, the

quality indicators for publications defined in Article VI.B.4 should also be considered when evaluating the publications of a candidate for PTR.

## 2. PTR Scholarship Criteria for Philosophy Faculty

*Exceeds Expectations* is warranted when a faculty publishes/in-press three (3) peer-reviewed articles, a monograph with a respected press, or their equivalent.

*Meets Expectations* is warranted when a faculty publishes/in-press two (2) peer-reviewed articles or their equivalent.

*Does Not Meet Expectations* is warranted when a faculty does not meet the standards as outlined herein for “Meets Expectations.”

*Unsatisfactory* is warranted when a faculty member disregards or fails to address remediation efforts by the university to provide correction or assistance for performance that does not meet expectations or performance involving incompetence or misconduct as defined in the collective bargaining agreement and applicable university regulations and policies.

## B. Teaching and Service Activity and Post-Tenure Criteria

The Department of History and Philosophy extends the annual evaluation criteria defined herein for a faculty member’s teaching and service to the evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching and service over the five-year PTR period. A faculty member’s comprehensive post-tenure review rating in service and teaching shall reflect the annual evaluation ratings (inclusive of both the Dean and Chair ratings) received by the faculty member in each category of teaching and service over the five-year PTR window. Over the five-year period of post-tenure review, a faculty member's receiving of consistent “Meets Expectations” annual evaluation ratings in teaching and/or service shall constitute the PTR rating standard of “Meets Expectations” for teaching and/or service for the post-tenure review. Over the five-year period of PTR, a faculty member's receiving of consistent “Exceeds Expectations” annual evaluation ratings in teaching and/or service shall constitute the PTR rating standard of “Exceeds Expectations” for teaching and/or service for the PTR.

## Article IX. Annual Evaluations:

### A. Overview

- a. The annual evaluation process shall follow the annual evaluation procedures established by the University. Faculty shall be ranked in each of the major areas of responsibility (teaching, research and creative activities, and service),

according to the performance standards in Article VI. The Department Chair must then consult with each faculty member before forwarding the evaluation to the Dean and the Provost.

## **B. Teaching Standards for Annual Evaluations:**

In calculating the percentages, the Chair will include the following instruction related SAI items in calculating percentages: Clarity of Communication of Ideas and Information, Respect and Concern for Students, Intellectual Challenge of Course Requirements, Return of Student Work, Facilitation of Learning Environment, Instructor's Command of Subject, Overall Assessment of Instructor, Overall Assessment of Course Organization. The details of the calculation will be provided in the Chair's annual evaluation. The department also recognizes that in some circumstances outside the faculty member's control Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) documents may be unrepresentative of teaching quality for a course or courses. In such circumstances, the faculty member should document these concerns in the faculty member's annual statement and provide sufficient additional materials to accurately represent the quality of teaching.

Because of statistically significant deviations from the mean, lower-division/General Education and online-only courses receive additional adjustments as outlined below:

- Lower-division/General Education, in-person courses receive a +5% adjustment to course percentage of "Excellent" or "Very Good" ratings inclusive of all categories for the individual course.
- Online-only courses and hybrid online/face-to-face graduate or undergraduate courses receive a +10% adjustment to course percentage of "Excellent" or "Very Good" ratings inclusive of all categories for the individual course. Where a hybrid online/face-to-face course contains separate SAIs for the online and face-to-face components, the combined SAIs will be considered together as a single class.
- Courses which are both lower-division/General Education and online-only receive a +15% adjustment to course percentage of "Excellent" or "Very Good" ratings inclusive of all categories for the individual course.
- *Exceeds Expectations* is warranted when a faculty has achieved ONE of the following:
  - 80% or above of all instruction-related SAI scores for all academic courses a faculty member teaches during the academic year marked "Excellent" or "Very Good."
  - 75% or above of all instruction-related SAI scores for all academic courses a faculty member teaches during the academic year marked "Excellent" or "Very Good" PLUS a clear pattern of supportive anonymous student comments.
  - Documentation (through provided additional materials) of teaching practices representative of distinguished teaching.
  - Substantial pedagogical or programmatic implementation/revision/maintenance.

- A University-wide teaching award over the previous three years.
- *Meets Expectations* is warranted when a faculty has achieved ONE of the Following:
  - 75% or above of all instruction-related SAI scores for all academic courses a faculty member teaches during the academic year marked “Excellent” or “Very Good.”
  - 70% or above of all instruction-related SAI scores for all academic courses a faculty member teaches during the academic year marked “Excellent” or “Very Good” PLUS a clear pattern of supportive anonymous student comments.
  - Documentation (through provided additional materials) of teaching practices representative of excellent teaching.
  - Moderate pedagogical or programmatic implementation/revision/maintenance.
- *Does Not Meet Expectations* is warranted when a faculty member’s teaching does not meet the standards outlined herein for “Meets Expectations.”
- *Unsatisfactory* is warranted when a faculty member disregards or fails to address remediation efforts by the university to provide correction or assistance for performance that does not meet expectations, or performance involving incompetence or misconduct as defined in the collective bargaining agreement and applicable university regulations and policies.

#### **B. Service Standards for Annual Evaluations:**

- *Exceeds Expectations* is warranted when a faculty member achieves TWO of the items listed in Article 6.D (Service Performance Indicators and Standards) in a given academic year and fully participates in standard service initiatives related to Department function and the faculty’s work assignment OR a University-wide or significant disciplinary or community service award in the last three years.
- *Meets Expectations* is warranted when a faculty member achieves ONE of the items listed in Article 6.D (Service Performance Indicators and Standards) in a given academic year in an active and constructive role while also fully participating in standard service initiatives related to Department function and the faculty’s work assignment.
- *Does Not Meet Expectations* is warranted when a faculty does not meet the standards as outlined herein for “Meets Expectations.” Demonstrates little initiative to improve service performance and minimally contributes to the department and/or university.
- *Unsatisfactory* is warranted when a faculty member disregards or fails to address remediation efforts by the university to provide correction or assistance for performance that does not meet expectations, or performance involving incompetence or misconduct as defined in the collective bargaining agreement and applicable university regulations and policies.

#### **C. Research and Scholarly Standards for Annual Evaluations**

All tenure-line and tenured professors in the Department of History and Philosophy participate in the tenure/PTR system that has clearly defined scholarship expectations based on university and departmental tenure standards. A faculty member's annual scholarship/creative activity rating is based on the progress a tenure-line or tenured faculty member is making towards his or her tenure evaluation or subsequent PTR.

1. Scholarly and Creative Activity Standards for History faculty Annual Evaluations (History Faculty):

- *Exceeds Expectations* is warranted when a faculty member is clearly exceeding the quality/quantity standards for scholarship and creative activities as defined herein for their tenure and/or promotion evaluation or subsequent PTR.
- *Meets Expectations* is warranted when a faculty member is meeting the quality/quantity standards for scholarship and creative activities as defined herein for their tenure and/or promotion evaluation or subsequent PTR.
- *Does not Meet Expectations* is warranted when a faculty member does not meet the standards as outlined herein for "meets expectations."
- *Unsatisfactory* is warranted when a faculty member disregards or fails to address remediation efforts by the university to provide correction or assistance for performance that does not meet expectations, or performance involving incompetence or misconduct as defined in the collective bargaining agreement and applicable university regulations and policies.

2. Scholarly and Creative Activity Standards for Annual Evaluations (Philosophy Faculty)

- To "Exceed Expectations" for research, a faculty member must present evidence of meeting at least one of the following (or equivalent) criteria:
  - Receipt of a major research award or grant as defined by either dollar amount or prestige.
  - Authorship or editing of a book in the field or related field published by a University or other major press. Note: this would apply to the year of publication or acceptance of final proofs, exclusive. The year following the publication of an authored book will qualify as "meeting expectations" unless additional publications during the subsequent year merit a rating of "exceeds expectations."
  - Publication of at least one article in a peer-reviewed journal recognized in philosophy or a cognate field; publication in an anthology in the field or a cognate field; authored or edited book(s) with scholarly review; or portions of books(s) or monographs (s) with scholarly review.
  - Note: this applies to the year of publication or acceptance of final proofs, exclusive. Time of publication is determined by the date on which the publication appears in print or preliminary appearance



online, exclusive. While multiple book reviews may provide supplementary justification for a rating of “exceeds expectations” they cannot be sufficient for such a rating; they would have to be part of a combination of scholarly activities. A publication receiving an award earns an additional year of “exceeds expectations.”

- Accomplishments that are completed in addition to the minimum requirements for the faculty member’s performance rating in an academic year may be applied to subsequent annual evaluations. Faculty ‘banking’ an accomplishment(s) will document their intent in their annual evaluation.
- To “meet expectations for research, a faculty member must present evidence of meeting at least one of the following (or equivalent) criteria:
  - Preparation or submission for publication of an article in a peer-reviewed journal recognized in philosophy or a cognate field; publication in an anthology in the field or a cognate field; authored or edited book(s) with scholarly/peer review; or portions of books(s) or monographs (s) with scholarly review. Note: “presenting evidence” includes having any of the listed types of publications in preparation, though no single manuscript in preparation can count toward satisfying this criterion for more than two years. Moreover, having multiple manuscripts in preparation is not sufficient for a rating of exceeding expectations. Having a manuscript “in preparation” refers to manuscripts at any stage of preparation prior to publication and after initial writing has begun. Evidence of preparation could include the manuscript at its current state of preparation. Evidence of submission could include a confirmation email from the body to which the manuscript has been submitted. It is the prerogative of the Chair/Program Director to request such evidence in making assessments of progress for manuscripts in preparation, especially if said manuscript is in preparation for a second year and is being claimed warranting a rating of “meeting expectations.”
    - Note: book reviews in preparation do not count as manuscripts in preparation. While multiple book reviews in preparation may provide supplementary justification for “meeting expectations,” they cannot be sufficient for such a rating; they would have to be part of a combination of scholarly activities including original research, or research awards or grants.
  - Publication of one or more book reviews in a scholarly journal. Publication date must coincide with the academic year covered by the annual evaluation. Note also that a book review cannot solely warrant “meeting expectations.” The faculty member must have additional scholarly activities.

- Receipt of a minor research award or grant.
- Presentation of a paper at a scholarly conference
- Invited academic talk based upon original research
- Preparation of a major grant, including grant writing and the period of grant review.
- Reprinting of a peer-reviewed/scholarly publication in an anthology published by an academic press.
- To “Not Meet Expectations,” a faculty member does not meet the standards as outlined herein for “meets expectations.”
- To be “Unsatisfactory,” a faculty member disregards or fails to address remediation efforts by the university to provide correction or assistance for performance that does not meet expectations, or performance involving incompetence or misconduct as defined in the collective bargaining agreement and applicable university regulations and policies.

#### **Article X. Office Hours Guidelines:**

Faculty must post office hours and, if applicable, links to online office hours, in course syllabi and on the Departmental bulletin board.

Faculty teaching nine or more semester hours (excluding internships, directed studies, or thesis hours) will be available to students for a minimum of four office hours per week, reasonably distributed. Faculty teaching six semester hours (excluding internships, directed studies, or thesis hours) will be available to students for a minimum of two hours, reasonably distributed.

Faculty may hold 50% of their office hours online. If all of a faculty’s semester hours are taught online, then 100% of their office hours may be held online. If the University does not provide permanent office space, then a faculty member may hold 100% of their office hours online.

#### **Article XI. Summer Teaching Assignment Prioritization Guidelines:**

Each academic year, the Chair will request summer course teaching preferences from all in-unit time faculty, and courses shall be assigned based on the following guidelines:

- Should the Department in-unit faculty demand for supplemental summer teaching assignments exceed the Departmental supply of available courses in a given summer, the Chair will prioritize allocation of supplemental teaching assignments to the in-unit faculty who have taught the fewest number of summer courses over the previous two summers.
- In-unit faculty members receive priority for supplemental summer teaching assignments.
- Following the initial allocation of supplemental summer teaching assignments, no summer course or courses of an in-unit faculty member will be allocated to another faculty member without the consent of the in-unit faculty member to whom the course or courses were initially assigned.

- The salary amount a faculty member receives for teaching a summer course or courses shall not be a consideration in the prioritization or allocation of supplemental summer teaching assignments.

## **Article XII. Allocation of Department Offices:**

The allocation of faculty offices in the Department of History and Philosophy, whether on an individual faculty office basis or multiple faculty offices basis, shall be prioritized based on the criteria contained herein. The Department of History and Philosophy also recognizes the University's authority to determine what spaces constitute faculty office space, programmatic space, mixed-use space, and any other facilities designation. These allocation guidelines apply only to space designated for individual faculty offices.

Available office space for Department of History and Philosophy faculty will be allocated based first upon faculty rank and second upon longevity, where longevity is defined as the total number of years of the faculty member's career at UWF as a full-time faculty member, irrespective of rank. For determining prioritization order, faculty will first be ordered by rank, and then, within each rank, faculty will be ordered by longevity. The following faculty rank ordering will be used: professor, associate professor, assistant professor, senior instructor, instructor, visiting, emeriti, adjunct/OPS-funded. Because adjunct/OPS-funded faculty are employed under limited-term/non-renewing contracts, office assignments given to adjunct/OPS-funded faculty shall be for the term of their current contract. For adjunct/OPS-funded faculty office allocations, the Chair shall have discretion on assigning available office space in compliance with this allocation language, and the Chair shall consider programmatic need and longevity of service among any other relevant criteria when allocating office space to adjunct/OPS-funded faculty.

Should a tie result in both rank and longevity in the prioritization order, the tied faculty members will then be ordered prioritizing the greater number of years in current rank. If a tie still results between the faculty members following the reordering, the faculty members will be consulted first to see if their preferences are in conflict. If no conflict exists within the faculty preferences of tied faculty, the office allocations will take place simultaneously. If the preferences of tied faculty are in conflict, the conflict will be resolved by a statistically objective and equal measure such as a coin flip.

Full-time Departmental faculty members who have a joint appointment between the Department of History and Philosophy and another UWF Department or administrative position outside of the Department of History and Philosophy will be assigned office space in the Department of History and Philosophy based on the proportion of the faculty member's FTE devoted to the Department of History and Philosophy. If a full-time faculty member's appointment is 0.5 FTE (50%) or higher in the Department of History and Philosophy and the faculty member requests an office in the Department of History and Philosophy, the faculty member will be included in the prioritization allocations based on the faculty member's rank and longevity. If a faculty member's FTE in the Department of History and Philosophy is less than 0.5 FTE (50%) of the faculty member's assignment, the faculty member may still request office space in the

Department, but the faculty member, irrespective of rank or longevity, will not be included in the prioritization allocations.

These allocation guidelines apply only to available office space and do not create a right for an individual faculty member to require the removal of another faculty member from a Department of History and Philosophy office.

### **Article XIII. Merit Pay Criteria:**

Faculty shall be assessed for departmental merit salary increases, when negotiated through collective bargaining and ratified by faculty and the Board, according to criteria based on the faculty member's most recent annual evaluation. Rankings of unsatisfactory or does not meet expectations on the Dean's Overall Ranking shall receive no merit salary increase. Dean's Overall Rankings of meets expectations or exceeds expectations will receive 1.0 or 1.5 units respectively of the total funds available. Funds allocated to the department for merit salary increase distribution shall be pooled on an annual basis corresponding to the ratified language of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, and the pool of funds shall be distributed among eligible faculty based on the Dean's Overall Ranking at the ratios of 1.5 for exceeds expectations, 1 for meets expectations, and 0 for does not meet expectations or unsatisfactory. These procedures constitute "the method for the distribution of any departmental merit salary increase funds" as defined in Article 11 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

### **Article XIV. Relationship to CBA:**

In instances where the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the UWF chapter of United Faculty of Florida and the UWF Board of Trustees authorizes Departments/units to define and/or clarify terms and conditions of employment related specifically to the Department of History and Philosophy, these bylaws constitute the sole and exclusive document wherein those Department-specific terms and conditions reside.

### **Article XV: Severability:**

The provisions of these bylaws are severable, and if any provision shall be held invalid or unenforceable, that invalidity or unenforceability shall attach only to that provision and shall not in any manner affect or render invalid or unenforceable any other provision of these bylaws, and these bylaws shall be carried out as if the invalid or unenforceable provision were not contained herein.

### **Article XVI: Amendments:**

These bylaws may be altered or amended in any fall or spring Department meeting by a two-thirds vote of the members present, provided that the text of the proposed amendment has been submitted to the Department Chair and distributed to the voting membership at least ten days

before the meeting at which the amendment is to be considered. In the event of a bylaw revision, faculty may opt for evaluation under the newly ratified bylaws or those which were current at the time the faculty member signed their annual work assignment letter.

#### **Article XVII: Program Review:**

The department follows the policy and guidelines for Program Review promulgated by the Division of Academic Affairs.

##### *External Reviewers:*

The Program Review process requires that departments hire knowledgeable external reviewers to gauge the overall condition of the department and its academic programs.

After conferring with faculty, the Chair will submit a list of recommended reviewers to the Dean of the College of Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities.

The department will recommend qualified external reviewers from peer/aspirant institutions.

After consultation with the Chair, the Dean will make the final selection of reviewers from the list and make the initial communication.

APPROVED by the faculty of the Department of History and Philosophy on April 28, 2023.

UPDATED by the faculty of the Department of History and Philosophy on April 29, 2025.