

Bylaws for the Department of Religion

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Bylaws	3
II. Membership and Voting Rights	3
III. Department Organization and Governance	3
IV. Curriculum	8
V. Annual Evaluation of Faculty on Performance and Merit	8
VI. Promotion and Tenure	9
Appendix I	11
Appendix II	17
Appendix III	19
Appendix IV	20
Appendix V	24

RECORD OF SUBSTANTIVE REVISIONS AND AMENDMENTS TO THESE BYLAWS

Revalidated, as amended, on February 18, 2022 by the faculty via secret ballot.

Revalidated, as amended, on April 24, 2019 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.

SUNSET/RENEWAL PROVISION

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.

These are the bylaws for the Department of Religion in the College of Arts and Sciences at Florida State University. These bylaws were last approved on February 18, 2022, by a majority of the applicable voting members of the department and on February 22, 2022 by the College and the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement.

I. Bylaws

A. Adherence with Other Governing Documents. At all times, department policy shall adhere to and be consistent with all university policies found in the FSU Constitution, the BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement (if applicable to the college), the Faculty Handbook, and the Annual Memorandum on the Promotion and Tenure Process issued by the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement.

B. Bylaws Revision. 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.

C. Substantive Change Statement. Faculty and staff members are expected to be familiar with and follow the Florida State University Substantive Change Policy as found on the university web site <https://sacs.fsu.edu/substantive-change-policy/>

II. Membership and Voting Rights

A. Faculty Membership. The faculty of the Department of Religion shall consist of those persons holding tenure-track appointments at the ranks of assistant, associate, and full professors, and specialized faculty at the ranks of I, II, and III.

B. Department Membership. In addition to the faculty members defined in II.A above, the following are members of the Department of Religion: postdoctoral fellows, visiting teaching faculty, adjuncts, and staff.

C. Faculty Voting Rights. When voting on general departmental matters, the department consists of faculty members defined in II.A.

D. Non-faculty Voting Rights. Visiting and adjunct faculty, as well as postdoctoral fellows, are not eligible to vote on any matters.

III. Department Organization and Governance

A. Faculty Meetings. The chair 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.

B. Department Chair Selection. The chair 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 chair's current term, the department elects a chair 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 chair continue for a subsequent term (should they be willing) or that a new chair be appointed. In this latter case, the CSAC will make a recommendation to the Dean of an appropriate candidate or candidates.

C. Department Leadership and Committees

Department Leadership

1. **Chair.** The chair is the chief administrative officer of the Department. As such, they 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; the membership being identical with that of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, as per below at III.C.5 ["Promotion and Tenure Committee"] and III.C.8 ["Faculty Evaluation Committee"]; also cf. Appendix I), 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 or Specialized Teaching Faculty III in the case of specialized faculty, provide a written annual evaluation of progress toward tenure (if untenured) and toward promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, or of Specialized Teaching Faculty II or III;
 - 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.
- 2. **Director of Graduate Studies.** The Director of Graduate Studies is appointed by the chair. They are 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 will also convene the admissions committee in early January of each year to make decisions regarding applications to the graduate program. The director, in consultation with the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the chair, 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 chair of the Graduate Policy Committee.
- 3. **Director of Undergraduate Studies/Honors Program.** The Director of Undergraduate Studies is appointed by the chair. They are responsible for supervising the advising of undergraduate majors and minors and, in consultation with the Director of Graduate Studies and the chair, for supervising the preparation of the schedule of classes each term. The director serves as chair of the Undergraduate Policy Committee and also supervises the Honors Program for undergraduate majors.

Committees

4. **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 chair of the department will serve as chair 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.

5. **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 chair will serve as chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- c. When a specialized faculty member is being considered for promotion, the committee will seek input from a specialized faculty member peer. If one is not available in the Department of Religion, the committee will invite a specialized faculty from another Humanities Area unit to perform this function.
- d. 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 tenure-track and specialized members of the faculty, and appropriate recommendations to the Dean as to their retention or termination, especially in the third year of tenure-earning faculty members' progress toward tenure at FSU;
 - iii. annual review of the performance of full professors, and appropriate recommendations to the Dean regarding performance
- e. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will select one of its members to serve as the departmental representative on the Humanities Area Promotion and Tenure Committee. This representative will normally be a full professor.
- f. 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, with the Annual University P&T Committee Memorandum submitted by the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement, and with the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

6. Undergraduate Policy Committee

- a. The department chair, 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.

- c. This committee will be responsible for organizing events for undergraduate majors, such as the Undergraduate Research Symposium, the reception to recruit majors, and the end-of-year graduation event.

7. Graduate Policy Committee

- a. The department chair, 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.
- c. This committee will each year review the applications for admission to the graduate program in Religion and will determine whom to accept.
- d. This committee shall consist of at least one member of each of the four tracks (American Religious History; History and Ethnography of Religion; Religion, Ethics, and Philosophy; Religions of Western Antiquity).

8. Faculty Evaluation Committee

- a. This committee will assist the chair in the annual review of the faculty.
- b. This committee, after reviewing faculty peer evaluations, shall generate a recommendation for the distribution of merit monies independently of the department chair. If its recommendations differ from the chair's, they shall both be submitted to the Dean of the College and the Provost.
- c. The faculty evaluation committee will consist of faculty who have been elected members of the Promotion and Tenure committee.

9. Library Liaison

- a. The department chair will appoint a chair 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.

- 10. Faculty Recruitment and Search Committees.** In determining departmental hiring needs, the faculty (excepting specialized faculty) together with the chair 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 chair 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 eligible faculty (tenure-track and tenured), acting as a committee of the whole, will then vote on the search committee's recommendations. The chair will then bring the recommendation to the Dean.

11. **Other.** The chair may constitute additional ad hoc committees as circumstances may demand.

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

E. Faculty Recruitment. See III.C.10 ("Faculty Recruitment and Search Committees")

F. Unit Reorganization. Unit reorganization would be addressed through a bylaws revision (see section I.B. above).

IV. Curriculum

A. Undergraduate Curriculum. See III.C.6 ("Undergraduate Policy Committee")

B. Graduate Curriculum. See III.C.7 ("Graduate Policy Committee")

V. Annual Evaluation of Faculty on Performance and Merit

A. Peer Involvement in Annual Performance and Merit Evaluation. Each faculty member's performance will be evaluated relative to their assigned duties. Each faculty member's performance will be rated annually using the following university rating scale:

Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations

Exceeds FSU's High Expectations

Meets FSU's High Expectations

Official Concern

Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations

1. Faculty Evaluation.

- a. Each member of the faculty will submit in writing to the chair an annual report of activities. The format of this report should follow the outline

presented in Appendix I.1 (“The Annual Professional Activities Report [PAR]”). After consultation with the FEC, the chair will meet with each faculty member. The chair will submit to the Dean for review the Annual Evaluation Summary Form, along with the accompanying evaluation narrative and performance improvement plan if required. 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.

- b. Faculty evaluation for the purpose of recommending salary increases will be made by the chair—and by the FEC, if the FEC’s evaluation differs from that of the chair—and, in the event all or a portion of such increases are tied to meritorious performance, in a manner consistent with Appendix III: Department of Religion Procedures for Distributing Merit Pay.
 - c. Each year, the chair, 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, and all specialized faculty below the rank of Teaching Faculty III, of their progress toward promotion and/or tenure. As well, the chair comments on the performance of all faculty, including full professors, in the Annual Evaluation Summary mentioned above.
- 2. **Annual Review for Tenure-Track Faculty.** See Appendix I.1 (“FSU Department of Religion Procedures for Annual Peer Review for Tenure-Track Faculty”)
 - 3. **Annual Review for Specialized Faculty.** See Appendix IV.1 (“Annual Evaluations”)

B. Criteria for Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty. See Appendix I.2 (“The Evaluation Process”)

C. Criteria for Evaluation of Specialized Faculty. See Appendix IV.1 (“Annual Evaluations”)

VI. Promotion and Tenure

A. Progress Toward Promotion Letter. Each year, every faculty member who is not yet at the highest rank for their position will receive a letter that outlines progress toward promotion and/or tenure.

B. Third Year Review for Tenure-track Faculty. Tenure-track faculty in their third year of service will receive an evaluation of their progress in meeting the department’s expectations for promotion and tenure.

C. Peer Involvement in Evaluation of Promotion and Tenure of Faculty. See Appendix II (“Promotion and Tenure in the Department of Religion”).

D. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure of Tenure-track Faculty. See Appendix II. (“Promotion and Tenure in the Department of Religion”).

E. Criteria for Promotion of Specialized Faculty. see Appendix IV.2 (“Procedures for Promotion”).

Appendix I

FSU DEPARTMENT OF RELIGION PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL PEER REVIEW FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

In accord with the Faculty Handbook, on or about April 1, faculty in the Department of Religion at Florida State University will be evaluated each year in accordance with their assignment of responsibilities, on their performance in the preceding calendar year. Ultimately, evaluation of department faculty is a responsibility of the chair, who reports to (and is evaluated by) the Dean of the College. As a means of assisting the chair in the annual evaluation, members of the Department will take an active role (1) by developing and submitting a Professional Activities Report (PAR) 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 (PAR)

Each member of the Department shall submit, in a timely fashion, a report of their 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 chair, 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 required 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.

REL2000 Introduction to Religion	65
----------------------------------	----

REL4190 Religion and Culture	10
------------------------------	----

REL5195 Religion and Culture	7)
------------------------------	----

C. Evaluations (Results from SPCI 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 their 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. 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.)
- 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. NB: This assumes a distinction between popular talks of this type and invited talks listed under II.C. In addition, the service in question should be connected with one’s capacity as a university professor.)
- D. Additional comments (Anything that doesn’t fit, etc.)

(2) The Evaluation Process

As noted above, evaluations of department faculty are ultimately a responsibility of the chair, who reports to the Dean. The chair must indicate at least the following: whether the performance of a faculty member in research, teaching, and service either “substantially exceeds FSU’s high expectations,” “exceeds FSU’s high expectations,” “meets FSU’s high expectations,” is a matter for “official concern,” or “does not meet

FSU's high expectations." It will also be the responsibility of the chair to report to the Dean the collective sense of members of the Department, and of members of the FEC concerning these judgments.

The following indicates the general sense of the aforementioned categories of evaluation.

"Meets FSU's High Expectations": This describes an individual who demonstrates the requisite knowledge and skills in their field of specialty and completes assigned responsibilities in a manner that is both timely and consistent with the high expectations of the university.

"Exceeds FSU's High Expectations": This describes an individual who exceeds expectations during the evaluation period by virtue of demonstrating noted achievements in teaching, research, and service, which may include several of the following: high level of research/creative activity, professional recognitions, willingness to accept additional responsibilities, high level of commitment to serving students and the overall mission of the Department, involvement/leadership in professional associations, initiative in solving problems or developing new ideas.

"Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations": This describes a faculty member who far exceeds performance expectations during the evaluation period and achieves an extraordinary accomplishment or recognition in teaching, research, and service, which

may include several of the following: highly significant research or creative activities, demonstrated recognition of the individual by peers as an authority in their field, securing significant external funding, attaining significant national or international achievements, awards, and recognition.

"Official Concern": This describes an individual who demonstrates the requisite knowledge and skills in their field of specialty but is not completing assigned responsibilities in a manner that is consistent with the high standards of the university.

"Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations": This describes an individual who fails to demonstrate with consistency the knowledge, skills, or abilities required in their field of specialty and /or in completing assigned responsibilities.

Ratings of "official concern" and "does not meet FSU's High Expectations" should be accompanied by specific suggestions for improvement.

In the Department of Religion, the process by which these ratings of performance are established is as follows.

On or about March 1, the chair will call upon members of the Department to prepare and submit their annual reports by a date they designate. (Unless special conditions arise, the "call" should involve two weeks 'notice.) Once reports are submitted, the chair

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 chair. The chair 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 chair 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 chair. The chair will then meet individually with each member of the department to discuss their annual report. Each faculty member may then also request an additional meeting with the Faculty Evaluation Committee together with the chair. Following these meetings, the chair will report the results of these collective meetings, as well as their own judgments, to the Dean.

In the process of evaluating performance in accordance with the faculty member's assignment of responsibilities during the evaluation period, the following criteria shall be utilized.

For teaching: Did the candidate meet their obligations, in terms of the assignment of responsibilities negotiated with the chair 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? What do peer evaluations, if any exist 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, designing new courses, substantially revising existing courses, etc.)?

For research: Did the candidate meet their obligations, in terms of the assignment of responsibilities in the area of research negotiated with the chair 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 chair 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 their 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 "meets FSU's high expectations" or higher): For teaching and service, this will usually mean that one has met their 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 chair must consider a rating of "does not meet FSU's high expectations". 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 chair must again consider a rating of "does not meet FSU's high expectations". 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 chair.

In order to safeguard the chair's role in the evaluation procedure, as well as to recognize the distinctive assignment of responsibilities of the chair, they will be evaluated through a different process than the one described above. The chair will provide members of the Department with their PAR during the same time period as the regular evaluation. It will be the task of the Evaluation Committee to gather information about the sense of department faculty concerning the chair's performance in teaching, research, and service, and specifically in their role as chair. The latter role, in particular, involves discussion of what the chair has accomplished in their leadership role: For example, have they helped to facilitate the teaching, research, and service of members of the Department? Following this gathering of information, members of the Evaluation Committee will meet and form an initial judgment concerning the chair's performance in each and all of the areas of teaching, research, and service: Does the performance suggest that the chair "substantially exceeds," "exceeds," "meets," "does not meet" FSU's high expectations, or provide reason for official concern? They will then meet with the chair 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 chair's performance to the Dean. Should the chair wish to express dissent from the Committee's evaluation, their 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 **Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement**. 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. While publication is preferred, in some cases the press's circulation of galley proofs to the candidate may be acceptable. The publication (or acceptance for publication) of a number of articles may substitute for a book in some cases, 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 publication of articles, so that it is clear the candidate's program of research and publication is ongoing; in some cases, the awarding of one or more external grants may also demonstrate this progress.

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. In most cases, this will involve the publication of a scholarly book with an academic press beyond that presented by the candidate at the time of promotion to associate professor or associate professor with tenure. While publication is preferred, in some cases the press's circulation of galley proofs to the candidate may be acceptable. The publication of a number of articles, beyond those presented by the candidate at the time of promotion to associate professor or associate professor with tenure, may substitute for the book in some cases, provided the articles are of sufficient quality.

In those cases where a candidate for full professor does not already hold tenure at Florida State University, recommendation of promotion to full professor will ordinarily involve simultaneous recommendation that tenure be granted.

- 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.
- F. For information about promotion for specialized faculty, see Appendix IV.2 ("Procedures for Promotion").

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. Recommendations for promotion and/or tenure will be based on an evaluation of performance in teaching, service, and research.
- B. Each member of the Department will read the reports of their colleagues. Based on this reading, each member will submit a written recommendation to the chair indicating which of their 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 chair will submit the members' recommendations to the Faculty Evaluation Committee which will arrive at a decision regarding the distribution of merit pay allocated for the Department's use. At the appropriate time, the chair will report this decision as a recommendation to the Dean of the College. Should the chair disagree with the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee, they will inform the committee, as well as submit both lists to the Dean and the Provost.
- D. Following a period of one or more years in which no funding for merit increases has been available, the consultation of the chair with the Faculty Evaluation Committee previously described may take into account the merit rankings for more than one year.

Appendix IV

SPECIALIZED TEACHING FACULTY

(1) Annual Evaluations

The evaluation of specialized faculty in the Department of Religion is ultimately a responsibility of the chair, who reports to the Dean. The chair must indicate at least the following that the performance of a specialized faculty member in the areas that correlate to the faculty member's Assignment of Responsibilities in teaching and service either "substantially exceeds FSU's high expectations," "exceeds FSU's high expectations," "meets FSU's high expectations," is a matter for "official concern," or "does not meet FSU's high expectations." It will also be the responsibility of the chair to report to the Dean the collective sense of members of the Department, and of members of the [evaluation] committee including a separate evaluation conducted by another specialized faculty member (who may be outside of the Department of Religion) concerning these judgments.

The following indicates the general sense of the aforementioned categories of evaluation.

"Meets FSU's High Expectations": This describes an individual who demonstrates the requisite knowledge and skills in their field of specialty and completes assigned responsibilities in a manner that is both timely and consistent with the high expectations of the university.

"Exceeds FSU's High Expectations": This describes an individual who exceeds expectations during the evaluation period by virtue of demonstrating noted achievements in teaching and service, which may include several of the following: professional recognitions, willingness to accept additional responsibilities, high level of commitment to serving students and the overall mission of the Department, involvement/leadership in professional associations, initiative in solving problems or developing new ideas.

"Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations": This describes a faculty member who far exceeds performance expectations during the evaluation period and achieves an extraordinary accomplishment or recognition in teaching and service, which may include several of the following demonstrated recognition of the individual by peers in the area of pedagogy such as a teaching award by a national or international organization, securing significant external funding to advance pedagogy in the department, receiving a university-wide teaching or advising award, or publishing a number of articles or a monograph on the topic of religious studies pedagogy.

"Official Concern": This describes an individual who demonstrates the requisite knowledge and skills in their field of specialty but is not completing assigned responsibilities in a manner that is consistent with the high standards of the

university.

“Does Not Meet FSU’s High Expectations”: This describes an individual who fails to demonstrate with consistency the knowledge, skills, or abilities required in their field of specialty and /or in completing assigned responsibilities.

Ratings of “Official Concern” and “Does Not Meet FSU’s High Expectations” should be accompanied by specific suggestions for improvement.

In the process of evaluating performance in accordance with the faculty member’s assignment of responsibilities during the evaluation period, the following criteria shall be utilized, alongside the faculty member’s Professional Activities Report, which all specialized faculty shall submit every year in accordance with the process outlined in Appendix I.

For teaching: Did the candidate meet their obligations, in terms of the assignment of responsibilities negotiated with the chair 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? What do peer evaluations, if any exist indicate about the candidate’s performance? Did the candidate contribute to the teaching mission of the department by helping to review and build our curricular offerings? 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, designing new courses, substantially revising existing courses, etc.)?

For Service: As with teaching, the first question will be whether the candidate has met their obligations as indicated by the assignment of responsibilities. Excellence in meeting these obligations would entail efficiency and accuracy in course scheduling, expertise and availability to advise undergrads as needed, development of effective means to recruit majors, and willingness to assist the Director of Undergraduate Studies as needed. 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 “meets FSU’s high expectations” or higher): For teaching and service, this will usually mean that one has met their obligations under the assignment of responsibilities.

(2) Procedures for Promotion

Specialized faculty may be promoted through three levels based on meritorious performance of assigned duties. Promotion decisions shall take into account the following considerations, in accord with the Collective Bargaining Agreement between

the FSU board of trustees and the FSU branch of the United Faculty of Florida (see Appendix I):

- I. Annual evaluations
- II. Annual Assignment of Responsibilities
- III. Evidence of sustained effectiveness
 - A. Evidence of well-planned and delivered courses
 - B. Summaries of data from Student Perception of Courses and Instructors (SPCI) questionnaires
 - C. Letters from faculty members who have conducted peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching
 - D. Ability to teach multiple courses within a discipline/major
 - E. Other teaching-related activities, such as instructional innovation, involvement in curriculum development, authorship of educational materials, and participation in professional organizations related to the area of instruction
 - F. Non-teaching service such as advising, planning the course schedule for the department and supervising and training graduate student instructors
 - G. Formal input from a specialized teaching faculty either in the department or from another department in the Humanities Area of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Although the period of time in a given rank is normally five years, demonstrated merit, not years of service, shall be the guiding factor. Promotion shall not be automatic, nor may it be regarded as guaranteed upon completion of a given term of service. Early promotion is possible where there is sufficient justification, including but not limited to curricular design, nomination for a teaching award, activity in university-wide teaching initiatives, and the production of research pertaining to teaching (including conference presentations).

(3) Standards for promotion

For promotion from teaching faculty I to II, the candidate must show demonstrated effectiveness in teaching and in the areas of assigned duties. This includes but is not limited to:

1. Well-planned and delivered courses
2. Consistently positive responses from students in the Student Perceptions of

Teaching (SPCI) questionnaires

3. Strong assessments from faculty members who have conducted peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching
4. Effectiveness in teaching multiple courses in the major
5. Instructional innovation, involvement in curriculum development, authorship of educational materials, and participation in professional organizations related to the study of religion.

For promotion from teaching faculty II-III, the candidate must show superior performance in the areas of assigned duties. In addition to 1-5 listed above, this could also include

1. University teaching awards
2. Presentations and publications about pedagogy related to the discipline of religion
3. Letters from external reviewers indicating the candidate's contribution to pedagogy
4. Innovative contributions to the department's undergraduate teaching mission

Appendix V

OTHER DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES

A. Assignment of Faculty Responsibilities

1. It is the responsibility of the department chair 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. **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 tenure-track and tenured faculty member would be four courses per academic year. For specialized faculty, ten would be the maximum number of courses for the calendar year. The chair, in consultation with a faculty member, may alter this normal assignment in terms of substantial administrative responsibilities, service assignments, or research commitments.

C. **Teaching Appointments Outside the Regular Academic Year.** The chair 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:

1. curricular requirements;
2. availability of financial resources;
3. availability of faculty;
4. an equitable rotation of such appointments in accordance with the previously stated criteria.

D. **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.

E. **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.

- F. **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 advisor.