

Department of Religion

Bylaws

Revalidated, as amended December 11, 2013 by the faculty via secret ballot.

Revalidated, as amended September 2, 2011 (see Appendix III) by the faculty on October 5, 2012 via secret ballot.

Approved by the faculty on November 15, 2006 via secret ballot.

The faculty of the Department of Religion acknowledges adherence to and consistency with University policies found in FSU Constitution, BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement, Faculty Handbook, and annual Promotion and Tenure letter.

I. DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATION

A. Composition: For voting purposes at departmental meetings the department consists of all faculty (assistant, associate and full professors). Visiting and adjunct faculty are not eligible to vote. The department has no tradition of non-tenure-track faculty. Should this situation change, the bylaws will be amended to include provisions applying to non-tenure-track faculty.

B. Meetings: The Chairperson will call for department meetings as necessary, and will consider doing so in response to a request from any faculty member who believes there is a reason for meeting.

C. Chairperson

1. Term and Selection Procedures: The chairperson will, subject to the pleasure of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (the dean), serve a three-year term and is eligible for reappointment to subsequent terms of the same duration. At the beginning of the third year of the chairperson's current term the department elects a chairperson search advisory committee (CSAC) consisting of a minimum of three members, plus an outside member appointed by the Dean. The CSAC is responsible for recommending to the dean either that the current chairperson continue for a subsequent term (should s/he be willing) or that a new chairperson be appointed. In this latter case, the CSAC will make a recommendation to the dean of an appropriate candidate or candidates.

2. Responsibilities: The chairperson is the chief administrative officer of the Department. As such, he/she will, in consultation with the appropriate committees and/or individuals (as specified in subsequent articles):

- a. prepare an annual budget for submission to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences;

- b. supervise the financial affairs of the Department;
- c. submit to the Registrar the schedule of classes for each term;
- d. assign annual faculty responsibilities;
- e. After consultation with the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC), make an annual evaluation of the performance of each faculty member during the previous calendar year (January 1-December 31) and, for those faculty members who are below the rank of Professor, provide a written annual evaluation of progress toward tenure (if untenured) and toward promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor;
- f. appoint appropriate faculty committees;
- g. serve as *ex officio* member of all faculty committees;
- h. represent the Department, personally or through a designated representative, on appropriate divisional, college, and university committees;
- i. confer regularly with each faculty member with respect to professional goals and development;
- j. assume such other responsibilities as may be delegated by the College and/or University administration.

D. Director of Graduate Studies: The Director of Graduate Studies is appointed by the chairperson. S/he is responsible for answering all inquiries concerning the graduate program, counseling and advising graduate students, administering the academic details of graduate registration, examinations, and clearance of graduate students for receiving degrees. The director, in consultation with the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the chairperson, will prepare the schedule of graduate offerings each term; and will serve as the departmental liaison officer for consultations regarding graduate offering in cognate departments and programs. The director serves as chairperson of the Graduate Policy Committee.

D. Director of Undergraduate Studies/Honors Program: The Director of Undergraduate Studies is appointed by the chairperson. S/he is responsible for advising undergraduate majors and minors and, in consultation with the Director of Graduate Studies and the chairperson, for preparing the schedule of classes each term. The director serves as chairperson of the Undergraduate Policy committee and also supervises the Honors Program for undergraduate majors.

F. Committees

1. Executive Committee

- a. The department will have an executive committee consisting of three members elected at large by the department at the first meeting of each academic year. Members will serve a one year term and are eligible for unlimited reelection.
- b. The chairperson of the department will serve as chairperson of the Executive Committee.
- c. The Executive Committee is empowered to act on behalf of the department in all instances where full departmental deliberation is not expeditious, except where responsibility is specifically assigned to another person or committee.

2. Promotion and Tenure Committee

- a. The department will have a promotion and tenure committee consisting of at least three members elected at large by the department at the last meeting of the preceding academic year. Members will serve a one-year term and are eligible for unlimited reelection. Only tenured faculty are eligible for election to this committee.
- b. The department chairperson will serve as chairperson of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- c. The responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall include:
 - (i) annual review of all faculty eligible for promotion and/or tenure, and appropriate recommendations to the tenured faculty of the department regarding those so eligible;
 - (ii) annual review of all non-tenured members of the faculty, and appropriate recommendations to the Dean as to their retention or termination, especially in the third year of progress toward tenure at FSU.
- d. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will select one of its members to serve as the departmental representative on the Humanities divisional Promotion and Tenure Committee. This representative will normally be a full professor.
- e. All deliberations of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will be in accord with the procedures and stipulations in the Faculty Handbook which deal with matters of retention, promotion, and tenure.

3. Undergraduate Policy Committee

- a. The department chairperson, in consultation with the Director of Undergraduate Studies, will appoint an Undergraduate Policy Committee.

- b. This committee will regularly review the undergraduate curriculum and recommend to the department such changes as it deems appropriate.
- 4. Graduate Policy Committee
 - a. The department chairperson, in consultation with the Director of Graduate Studies, will appoint a Graduate Policy Committee.
 - b. This committee will regularly review the graduate curriculum and recommend to the department such changes as it deems appropriate.
- 5. Faculty Evaluation Committee
 - a. This committee will assist the chairperson in the annual review of the faculty.
 - b. The faculty evaluation committee will consist of faculty who have been elected members of the Promotion and Tenure committee.
- 6. Library Liaison
 - a. The department chairperson will appoint a chairperson of the library committee who will appoint other members as may be appropriate.
 - b. The library committee will be responsible for maintaining liaison with the library administration and making appropriate recommendations regarding acquisitions germane to the research and teaching needs of the department.
- 7. Faculty Recruitment and Search Committees: In determining departmental hiring needs, the faculty together with the chairperson will function as a committee of the whole, setting priorities with a view toward meeting the needs of the department. Should the dean authorize the department to hire, the chairperson will constitute a separate committee to oversee each hire. This Search Committee will screen candidates and determine which to interview. The committee will make recommendations to the faculty on which of the finalists to recommend for appointment. The faculty, acting as a committee of the whole, will then vote on the search committee's recommendations. The chairperson will then bring the recommendation to the dean.
- 8. Other: The chairperson may constitute additional *ad hoc* committees as circumstances may demand.

II. Departmental Procedures

A. Assignment of Faculty Responsibilities

- 1. It is the responsibility of the department chairperson to consult annually with each member of the faculty regarding assignment of responsibilities in the areas of teaching, research, and service. After such consultation, each faculty member will

receive a written statement of agreed upon responsibilities. Evaluation of the faculty member will be made on the basis of the assignment of responsibilities (AOR).

2. Changes in the assigned responsibilities may be made if departmental or university needs arise. Such changes will be made only after consultation and such changes will be made a matter of written record for purposes of evaluation.

B. Faculty Evaluation

1. Each member of the faculty will submit in writing to the chairperson an annual report of activities. After consultation with the FEC, the chair will meet with each faculty member. The chairperson will submit to the dean an evaluation of performance for her/his review. Upon its return from the dean, the original will become a part of the faculty member's permanent file, and a copy provided to the faculty member.

2. Faculty evaluation for the purpose of recommending salary increases will be made by the chairperson, and, in the event all or a portion of such increases are tied to meritorious performance, in a manner consistent with the Department of Religion Procedures for Distributing Merit Pay.

3. Each year, the chairperson, in consultation with the FEC, writes letters (which are to be included in the annual evaluation summary) apprising all faculty below the rank of full professor of their progress toward promotion and/or tenure.

C. Teaching Load: Faculty teaching loads are assigned in conformity with the statutory requirements of the Florida Legislature as interpreted in the Faculty Handbook. This is understood to mean that normally the maximum classroom assignment for a faculty member would be four courses per academic year. The chairperson, in consultation with a faculty member, may alter this normal assignment in terms of substantial administrative responsibilities, service assignments or research commitments.

D. Teaching Appointments Outside the Regular Academic Year: The chairperson shall be responsible for making faculty teaching appointments for sessions scheduled by the University which do not fall within the normal academic year. Such appointments will be made on the basis of the following criteria:

- (a) curricular requirements;
- (b) availability of financial resources;
- (c) availability of faculty;
- (d) an equitable rotation of such appointments in accordance with the previously stated criteria.

E. Department Research Leaves: The department recognizes that ongoing programs of research are a necessary part of professional growth and development. Thus, if outside resources are not available, the department may grant to a faculty member a reduction of teaching load or released time for research.

F. Academic Policies: With respect to such matters as grading practices, posting and keeping of office hours, and the University Honor Code, the department follows those procedures as stated in the Faculty Handbook.

G. Faculty Senator: The department will elect its Faculty Senator and official alternate at such times as specified by the constitution of the Faculty Senate.

III. Student Participation

There shall be a Department of Religion Graduate Student Advisory Committee selected by departmental graduate students in a manner to be determined by such students. The Director of Graduate Studies will serve as adviser to the committee. Similarly, there shall be an Undergraduate Student Advisory Committee, with the Director of Undergraduate Studies serving as adviser.

IV. REVISION OF BYLAWS

Any voting member of the Department may propose revisions to these bylaws. Revisions must be approved by a 2/3 majority of the voting members of the Department. With or without revision, the bylaws must be revalidated by 2/3 of the voting members five years from the date on which they were previously adopted by the Department.

Appendix I
FSU Department of Religion Procedures for
Annual Peer Review

In accord with the Faculty Handbook, faculty in the Department of Religion at Florida State University will be evaluated each year, on or about April 1 on the preceding calendar year. Ultimately, evaluation of department faculty is a responsibility of the chairperson, who reports to (and is him/herself evaluated by) the Dean of the College. As a means of assisting the chairperson in the annual evaluation, members of the Department will take an active role (1) by developing and submitting a Professional Activities Report each year; and (2) by evaluating one another's contributions in teaching, research, and service, first as colleagues, then (for those so named) as members of the Religion Faculty Evaluation Committee. Guidelines for (1) and (2) follow.

(1) The Annual Professional Activities Report

Each member of the Department shall submit, in a timely fashion, a report of his/her activities in teaching, research, and service. The purpose of such report will be to provide information to other members of the Department, and ultimately to the chairperson, for use in evaluating performance.

Reports should be crafted with an eye toward the above-stated purpose--providing information. Narrative or explanatory annotations should be kept to a minimum. For convenience, members of the Department are encouraged to make use of the following form.

I. Teaching

A. Awards

(any received, for example, a University Teaching Award)

B. Classes Taught

(list each class by number--4000/5000 classes should be listed separately—and indicate the enrollment in each section, e.g.

Rel 2000 Introduction to Religion	65
Rel 4190 Religion and Culture	10
Rel 5195 Religion and Culture	7

C. Evaluations

(Results from SPOT/SUSSAI should be attached, as should any other instrument developed and/or approved for use by the Department. Any evaluation tool developed by a particular faculty member for his or her own use may be included as information under

“F. Additional comments,” below.)

D. Committees

(Distinguish and list committees on which one has served for Honors in the Major, M.A., and Ph.D. candidates. List only those for which significant effort has been expended in the past year. Examples of “significant effort” include evaluating examinations, reading and commenting upon written portions of thesis or dissertation work, etc.)

E. Thesis and Dissertation Direction

(Distinguish and list Honors, M.A., and Ph.D. work for which you have been director. Same guidelines apply as for D. If work has been directed to completion, indicate date of defense.)

F. Additional comments

(This is the place to indicate which, if any, of the courses taught were newly developed, or in which you made significant alterations. For all courses, include course outlines. DIS courses should not be included as new courses, though they should, of course, be listed under Classes Taught. Any evaluation tools developed for use by a particular faculty member, and the results of same, may be included here.)

II. Research and Creative Activity

A. Awards, Grants, etc.

(Mention any 1. received; 2. applied for—during the year in question.)

B. Publications

(Distinguish and list books, articles in refereed journals or books, articles in non-refereed journals or books, review essays, book reviews, and other publications according to your contribution as author, co-author, editor, or co-editor. In every case, distinguish those published, accepted, or submitted; provide full bibliographic information; when possible, attach copy of work. In every case, also indicate whether the work in question was reported in a previous year, and under what category it was then listed.)

1. Published

(Those published during the year in question. In each case, include a one-sentence description of argument.)

a. Refereed

- i. Books
- ii. Articles and Book chapters

b. Non-refereed

- i. Books

- ii. Articles and Book chapters
 - c. Review Essays
 - d. Shorter reviews and notices
 - e. Newspaper articles
2. Accepted
(Again, during the year in question, indicate expected date of publication.)
3. Submitted
(Again, during the year in question, indicate journal or book, and provide as much information as possible on status, e.g., “title” was submitted to Journal of Religion in January. Editor’s letter indicates it is currently under review.)
4. Work in progress
(Indicate exactly what progress was made during the course of the year in question; those evaluating you will have the right to ask to see a draft of the work, if one exists.)
- C. Presentations
(Scholarly papers or talks presented at professional meetings, e.g., AAR/SBL, as well as invited lectures presenting an aspect of one’s research, particularly to a scholarly audience. A good example would be an invited lecture at another university or college.)
- D. Additional comments
- III. Service
- A. To the discipline
- 1. National
(offices or committees in professional organizations; also editorial boards, consultancies, etc.)
 - 2. International
(same as 1)
- B. To FSU
- 1. Departmental
(committees, special assignments, lectures at Colloquia, etc.)
 - 2. College
(same)

3. University
(same)

C. To the community

(lectures to religious groups, community organizations, etc. N.b.: This assumes a distinction between popular talks of this type and invited talks listed under II.C. N.b.: The service in question should be connected with one's capacity as a university professor.)

D. Additional comments (anything that doesn't fit, etc.)

N.b.: For the sake of convenience, a copy of each member's assignment of responsibilities will be included with his/her activities report.

(2) The Evaluation Process

As noted above, evaluations of department faculty are ultimately a responsibility of the chairperson, who reports to the Dean. The chairperson must indicate at least the following: whether a faculty member has, in the judgment of the chairperson, performed meritoriously, satisfactorily, or unsatisfactorily in each and all of the relevant areas (teaching, research, and service). It will also be the responsibility of the chairperson to report to the Dean the collective sense of members of the Department, and of members of the [evaluation] committee concerning these judgments.

On or about March 1, the chairperson will call upon members of the Department to prepare and submit their annual reports by a date he/she designates. (Unless special conditions arise, the "call" should involve two weeks' notice.) Once reports are submitted, the chairperson will allow ten days to two weeks for members of the Department to read one another's reports. At the end of that time, all members of the faculty are invited to register their views of any/all colleagues' research, teaching, and service by way of a short written report submitted to the chairperson. The chairperson and the Faculty Evaluation Committee — which shall be comprised of faculty elected for that year as members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee — subsequently will meet to discuss each file and any observations made in writing to the chairperson by any members of the department regarding that file, as well as any opinions or questions transmitted orally by any members of the department to the Faculty Evaluation Committee or the chairperson. The chairperson will then meet individually with each member of the department to discuss his/her annual report. Each faculty member may then also request an additional meeting with the Faculty Evaluation Committee together with the chairperson. Following these meetings, the chairperson will report the results of these collective meetings, as well as his/her own judgments, to the Dean.

In the process of evaluating performance, the following criteria shall be utilized.

For teaching: Did the candidate meet his/her obligations, in terms of the assignment of responsibilities negotiated with the chairperson the previous year? What were the

contributions of the candidate, in terms of the Department's performance in the College re: student credit hours? What do student evaluations indicate about the candidate's performance? Did the candidate perform any tasks above and beyond the assignment of responsibilities? In what regard, if any, did the candidate improve the quality of teaching of other members of the Department (e.g., through discussions of teaching, visiting others' classrooms and making comments, contributing ideas concerning the curriculum, etc.)?

For research: Did the candidate meet his/her obligations, in terms of the assignment of responsibilities in the area of research negotiated with the chairperson the previous year? The goal of the Department, overall, is to encourage a steady record of quality published research. With this in mind, emphasis should be placed on the question: What did the candidate publish, this year? The weight of that question should not obscure other considerations, however, Thus, it will be important (in some cases more than others) to consider what progress is being made with respect to particular items of research. To that end, the chairperson will weigh (and will ensure that members of the Department have available to them) PARs for at least two previous years during the course of the annual evaluation.

In either case (published during the preceding calendar year or year or in progress), considerations of quality, as well as quantity, will be important. With respect to the former, emphasis should be placed on the question "What contribution does this make to scholarship?" Such factors as reputation of publisher (or journal), or even the distinction between refereed and non-refereed may help to indicate the answer to this question. But (it goes without saying) nothing should be allowed to substitute for actual reading and evaluation of the piece in question. As indicated above, faculty should feel free to talk with their colleagues about the evaluation of a given piece of research.

For Service: As with teaching and research, the first question will be whether the candidate has met his/her obligations as indicated by the assignment of responsibilities. Further questions will involve contribution to the Department's mission and to its reputation in the College, University, or discipline. Any supererogatory contributions will be considered, as well.

Minimum contributions (for rating of satisfactory or higher): For teaching and service, this will usually mean that one has met his/her obligations under the assignment of responsibilities. In research, it will usually mean that the candidate has something to show as a contribution to scholarship under one of the categories indicated on the form. If there is no written work to show (in the case of presentations, this may sometimes involve extended notes, etc.), the chairperson must consider a rating of unsatisfactory. Further, if there is no published work of the type an academic reviewer would normally rate as a contribution to scholarship over a period of three years, the chairperson must again consider a rating of unsatisfactory. To clarify: Under ordinary circumstances, the writing of reviews and short notices, or of articles in popular journals or newspapers cannot substitute for publication of one's research in academic books and/or journals. The former types of writing will ordinarily be considered an important supplement to a

member's contribution to the Department's mission, but not a substitute for scholarly publication.

Note on evaluation of chairperson:

In order to safeguard the chairperson's role in the evaluation procedure, as well as to recognize the distinctive assignment of responsibilities of the chairperson, s/he will be evaluated through a different process than the one described above. The chairperson will provide members of the Department with his/her PAR during the same time period as the regular evaluation. It will be the task of the Executive Committee to gather information about the sense of department faculty concerning the chairperson's performance in teaching, research, and service, and specifically in his/her role as chairperson. The latter role, in particular, involves discussion of what the chairperson has accomplished in his/her leadership role: For example, has he/she helped to facilitate the teaching, research, and service of members of the Department? The Executive Committee will collect information. Following this gathering of information, members of the Executive Committee will meet and form an initial judgment concerning the chairperson's performance in each and all of the areas of teaching, research, and service: Is the performance meritorious, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory? They will then meet with the chairperson and discuss their initial judgment, prior to submitting a written evaluation (including some report on the information gathered from members of the Department) of the chairperson's performance to the Dean. Should the chairperson wish to express dissent from the Committee's evaluation, his/her proper avenue lies in conversation with the dean.

Appendix II

Promotion and Tenure in the Department of Religion

A. Promotion to associate or full professor, and the granting of tenure is determined through the process outlined in the Faculty Handbook and the annual memorandum on promotion and tenure from the Dean of the Faculties. Department of Religion criteria for promotion and tenure do not vary significantly from those common through the Humanities Area, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the University.

B. Recommendations for promotion and/or tenure will be based on an evaluation of performance in teaching, service, and research.

C. Evidence of a strong performance in teaching and service, as reflected in peer and student evaluations and other sources of evidence, will be considered a prerequisite for promotion and/or tenure.

D. With respect to research:

For promotion to associate professor or associate professor with tenure, candidates will be expected to present evidence demonstrating an ongoing program of scholarly research and publication sufficient to establish or to suggest the promise of a national or international reputation. In most cases, this will involve the publication of a scholarly book with an academic press. In some cases, the publication of a number of articles may substitute for a book, provided the articles are of sufficient quality. If the book or articles are based on a dissertation, candidates must show progress on another project. This will typically be demonstrated by progress on another book or articles so that it is clear the candidate's program of research and publication is ongoing.

For promotion to full professor, candidates will be expected to present evidence demonstrating an ongoing program of scholarly research and publication sufficient to establish a national or international reputation. This will typically involve publication of a book and/or articles beyond those presented by the candidate at the time of promotion to associate professor or associate professor with tenure. Recommendation of promotion to full professor will ordinarily involve simultaneous recommendation that tenure be granted, that is, in cases where a candidate does not already hold tenure at Florida State University.

E. The Promotion and Tenure Committee ordinarily will meet in early fall (or other appropriate time if the schedule requires it) to discuss the binder of a candidate for promotion and tenure. The Committee will vote on whether to recommend. The department subsequently will meet to hear the report of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The department faculty then will vote on whether to recommend. In that process, all department faculty who are tenured are eligible to vote. The vote of the Promotion and Tenure Committee as well as the vote of the tenured department faculty will be recorded in the candidate's binder. (AMENDED 04.15.11)

Appendix III
Department of Religion Procedures for Distribution of Merit Pay

A. In the Spring of each academic year, faculty professional activities reports will be made available in a central location.

B. Each member of the Department will read the reports of his or her colleagues. Based on this reading, each member will submit a written recommendation to the chairperson indicating which of his or her colleagues should be considered meritorious. If possible, this recommendation should list names in rank order. The recommendation may be signed or not, according to the member's preference.

C. The chairperson will consult with the Faculty Evaluation Committee regarding the members' recommendations, and will arrive at a decision regarding the distribution of merit pay allocated for the Department's use. At the appropriate time, this decision will be reported as a recommendation to the Dean of the College.

Amended 4.15.11

AMENDMENT

The department faculty shall have the option of considering merit rankings following a period of a year or years in which no merit money was available. The purpose will be to ensure fairness to those whose performance was evaluated according to departmental process as deserving of merit during a year in which merit money was not available. The faculty in such cases will elect by secret ballot three faculty members to draft a recommended procedure. The chair of the department will also serve on the committee. The full faculty will vote on the recommended procedure after it has been presented by the committee with two-thirds majority required for adoption.

(Amendment to the department bylaws approved by unanimous vote of the faculty in a secret ballot 9/2/2011)

