

**DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND CULTURAL STUDIES
BYLAWS**

PREAMBLE

The Department of Humanities and Cultural Studies, as an administrative unit of the College of Arts and Sciences within the School of the Humanities, shall henceforth be governed by the following Bylaws which do not supersede the policy statements of the University of South Florida or the Bylaws of the College of Arts and Sciences and the UFF-UFF CBA. In addition, the Department of Humanities and Cultural Studies recognizes the principles of equity of assignment, resources and opportunities of faculty across a multi-campus university.

I. Faculty Membership

A. Eligibility

All faculty employed half-time or more within the Department of Humanities and Cultural Studies in a tenure earning rank or as a Continuing Instructor shall be a voting member of the Department. The Department Chair is specifically included in the above category, whereas professors emeriti are excluded.

B. Voting

Any faculty member as designated in the above paragraph shall have the privilege of voting on any issue submitted to the membership, provided he/she is present at that in person or virtually. Leave status is not germane, and no proxies are permissible. When an academic matter arises that ordinarily would be subject to faculty vote, but convening the full membership is impractical, ballots will be mailed or emailed to all accessible faculty.

C. Guests

Upon the invitation of the Chair or with the consent of a majority of the faculty, guests without voting privileges may be invited to Department meetings as appropriate.

D. Hiring Representation from Branch Campuses

Regional Chancellors or their designee will serve as a voting member on all search committees for faculty hiring on branch campuses.

II. Meetings

A. Regular Meetings

The Department shall meet at least once a month in September through November and January through April at a time when no departmental classes are scheduled; the date of such meetings shall be announced at least one week in advance. The calendar of such meetings shall be determined by the Chair in consultation with the Executive Committee and at the beginning of each semester. Continuations of meetings within a week of the scheduled date, as necessary, are permissible, provided there are no conflicts with regular department classes. Branch campus faculty may attend meetings virtually.

B. Special Meetings

The Chair may convene up to four additional meetings a year. The Chair may call further meetings at other times with the approval of the Executive Committee. Special meetings will also be convened upon the signed petition of at least half the faculty, as defined in the preceding section.

C. Agenda

Except for those meetings held at faculty behest, the Executive Committee shall distribute a written agenda at least three working days prior to the meeting. Faculty members wishing to include agenda items shall submit them through the Chair or the Executive Committee not later than five working days prior to the meeting. As time permits, these items will be included on the agenda for the regular or a continuation meeting. However, a deferred item must appear on the subsequent meeting agenda. When the Department convenes upon faculty petition, those calling

the meeting shall distribute an agenda at least three working days prior to its scheduled time.

D. Quorum & Voting

A simple majority of the faculty as defined in 1.A, exclusive of faculty on leave or teaching abroad, constitutes a quorum. An affirmative vote requires approval by a majority of the faculty membership, not merely those present.

E. Record of Decisions

A secretary pro tem shall record the decisions reached at each meeting, and he/she shall distribute a copy of those decisions to each faculty member. At the next meeting, this record will be reviewed by the faculty as the first order of business, and additions or corrections to which the body agrees will be made. Records of such decisions will be preserved for at least six years.

III. Administration/Departmental Offices

A. Department Chair

1. Selection

In the event of an impending vacancy, the Executive Committee shall supervise the selection of the Department Chair. The Department will consider either internal or external candidates.

A vote for the position of Chair will be by secret ballot after nominations and self-nominations are registered with the department Office Manager. A simple majority of the faculty will determine the outcome of the vote. Elections will take place in the spring semester of the appropriate year, with the term of office beginning and ending in August. Following the vote, the College Dean will be notified by the current Chair of the result, and in consultation with the Department, the College Dean will either confirm the designee as Chair or direct that a new election be held.

2. Term

The term of office shall be three years and renewable for no more than one additional term.

If the Chair position becomes unexpectedly vacant, the College Dean will, in consultation with the Department, appoint an Acting Chair.

The voting faculty may recommend, by a 2/3 vote, that the College Dean remove the Chair.

The Department faculty shall be consulted by the Dean before a Chair is reappointed.

3. Duties

The Chair is the chief administrative officer of the Department and is directly responsible to the College Dean and responsive to the faculty, staff, and students in the Department. As chief executive officer the Chair is charged with implementing University and College policies and procedures and with initiating internal policies and procedures consistent with them. The Chair serves as the primary link between the Department and other academic and administrative units on campus, acting as representative of the faculty, staff, and students at the same time he/she acts as representative of these other units. While the Chair has primary and final responsibility for all internal activities, that responsibility and its associated power and authority are conditioned by consultation with parties affected by his/her actions. In council with other Chairs and Directors and the College Dean, the Chair participates in the development and implementation of policy and procedures within the College.

The Chair

- a. nominates ad hoc committees in consultation with the Executive Committee or the faculty
- b. proposes semester course offerings and faculty assignments

- c. prepares budget requests and proposes distribution of allocations
- d. considers the recommendations of the Executive Committee when conducting faculty evaluations
- e. prepares and transmits Departmental recommendations for promotion or tenure
- f. proposes Department goals and coordinates strategic planning in the Department
- g. promotes and publicizes the academic mission and programs of the Department
- h. establishes departmental procedures for processing of paperwork
- i. in consultation with the graduate director and affected faculty, selects graduate teaching assistants and their assignments
- j. consults frequently and regularly with faculty members in regard to their recommendations for amendments and improvements to the Department's efforts; reports these findings to the Executive Committee and to the faculty.
- k. The HCS department will hold elections whenever the Faculty Senate seat for the department is vacant; the result will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Office.

4. Evaluation

The Chair is reviewed annually by the faculty and College Dean in accordance with the stipulated procedures.

B. Graduate Coordinator and Graduate Advisor

1. Selection

A Graduate Coordinator and a Graduate Advisor shall be appointed by the Chair, and with the approval of the faculty.

2. Duties:

Working with the Chair, each Graduate Director:

- a. routes and manages graduate applications, admissions, thesis proposal defenses and thesis defenses, and certification for graduation
- b. oversees recruitment of new graduate students
- c. appoints thesis directors and committees
- d. reviews the graduate curriculum, policies, and procedures and makes recommendations to the Executive Committee and the Chair
- e. reports regularly and at least once per year to the Department faculty on the state of the graduate programs and provides an annual written report to the Chair. ("Graduate Grand Rounds")

Working with the Chair, each Graduate Advisor:

- a. creates and conducts an orientation program for incoming graduate students
- b. advises all active graduate students and maintains the graduate files
- c. Organizes informational meetings for graduate students on topics of professional interest.

C. Undergraduate Director

1. Selection

An Undergraduate Director shall be appointed by the Chair and with the approval of the faculty.

2. Duties:

Working with the Chair, each Undergraduate Director:

- a. supervises the advising of declared and prospective undergraduate majors or minors
- b. coordinates undergraduate program assessment
- c. reviews undergraduate curriculum, policies, and procedures and makes recommendations to the Executive Committee and the Chair
- d. reports regularly and at least once per year to the Department faculty on the state of the undergraduate programs and provides an annual written report to the Chair. ("Undergraduate Grand Rounds")

D. Coordinator of HUM 1020

1. Selection

A Coordinator of HUM 1020 shall be appointed by the Chair and with the approval of the faculty.

2. Duties

Working with the Chair, the Coordinator:

- a. trains, supervises, and evaluates teaching assistants teaching HUM 1020, and trains and supervises adjunct faculty teaching HUM 1020 during their first two years of teaching HUM 1020 as adjuncts.
- b. helps assistants develop their teaching skills
- c. consults with and makes recommendations to the faculty on the selection of common course materials

IV. Standing Committees

A. Executive Committee

1. Membership and Selection

An Executive Committee composed of three voting members of the Department, excluding the Chair, shall be elected annually within the last regularly scheduled meeting of the spring semester. Alternate members will be elected to serve when circumstances warrant. A professor emeritus/a may be elected to serve as an alternate. All faculty members of the Department, including those on branch campuses, shall be eligible to vote for the members of the Executive Committee. Circumstances permitting, no more than one member of the committee may be non-tenured. This circumstance permitting, no member may serve more than two consecutive terms.

The committee shall select one of its members as chair. The chair will be responsible for scheduling committee meetings, facilitating communication with the committee as well as between the committee and the faculty and the department chair and will ensure that records of committee decisions be maintained and, as necessary, distributed.

2. Meetings

The Executive Committee shall meet with the Chair when any of its members or the Chair believes a meeting to be necessary and appropriate. Meetings will be scheduled at a time convenient for all and may be attended virtually, but not later than two weeks after they have been requested. Members of the faculty may submit material to the Executive Committee for consideration at its meetings.

The Executive Committee may meet at the request of any Department faculty member to consider any and all matters relevant to the activities of the Department.

3. Responsibilities

Working with the Chair, the Executive Committee shall set the agenda for regularly scheduled faculty

meetings. Any Department faculty member who wishes to submit an item for the agenda of a particular meeting should submit it to the Department secretary.

The Executive Committee may advise the Chair on all matters of Departmental operation (individual salaries excepted). Once a year, the Committee may review the operating budget of the Department with the Chair and prepare a report for the Department.

The Executive Committee may make recommendations to the Chair about the use of Department funds for support of research, including travel to conferences and assignment of student assistants to faculty members. Members of the Committee shall absent themselves from deliberations on their own requests for support.

The Executive Committee may advise the Chair on the appointment of new adjunct instructors.

The Executive Committee shall conduct the annual faculty review and make recommendations regarding tenure, promotion, and termination in accordance with the established Department criteria. Executive Committee members in their first 3 years of continuous full-time employment may not participate in these reviews. For branch campus faculty, regional chancellors will provide their own formal review prior to submission to the College Dean.

The Executive Committee may nominate faculty members for appropriate awards.

B. Awards Committee

1. Membership

The Scholarship Committee shall consist of faculty attending at the annual Undergraduate Grand Rounds.

2. Duties

The Scholarship Committee will create/review the

criteria for undergraduate awards; and decide the amounts of the awards.

The Scholarship Committee will select appropriate candidates for undergraduate awards.

C. Ad Hoc Committees

The Chair or the Executive Committee, with the consent of the Department, may form and charge other committees.

V. Assigned Faculty Duties

Subject to federal and Florida law and the rules and regulations of The Board of Regents of the State University System of Florida, the University of South Florida, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Department of Humanities and Cultural Studies, and in accordance with recognized professional practices and standards, each faculty member shall have the authority to design the syllabus for each course that he/she teaches, to select appropriate materials, to conduct assigned classes, to evaluate students enrolled in those classes, and to determine grades.

However, the academic content and integration of the courses of the Department's graduate and undergraduate programs shall be the collective responsibility of the Department faculty.

VI. Annual Evaluations of Faculty

In keeping with the departmental by-laws, USF-UFF CBA Articles 10 and 23.1A4, the senior members of the Executive Committee and the Chair conduct annual evaluations of faculty. Following USF policies on conflict of interest, spouses/partners may not evaluate each other. In those cases, the reviewer with the conflict must recuse themselves. Both reviews are based on faculty members' assigned duties. Each year, performance in each category of assigned duties is rated on the following scale: "outstanding" (5), "strong" (4), "satisfactory" (3), "unsatisfactory" (2), or "unacceptable" (1). Finer distinctions may be made, using combinations such as "satisfactory/strong" to indicate a rating higher than

"satisfactory" but lower than "strong."

These evaluations are used for two purposes: to determine qualifications for merit salary increases; and to establish the career patterns and cumulative accomplishments of faculty in preparation for tenure and promotion. Faculty members submit materials for review. The Executive Committee and the Chair conduct their reviews independently, and their ratings are averaged in the Annual Report through the FAIR system. Faculty members may include a self-evaluation, and there is an Appeals Procedure (see below). After the evaluations are completed in the Faculty Information System, the chair will meet with faculty to discuss goals for the upcoming for the year. A summary of this discussion will be posted in FIS.[]

Typically, ratings are determined within three broad categories of assigned duties: teaching, research, and service. Separate evaluations are made for subcategories of assigned duties within these three broad areas, most notably for undergraduate and graduate teaching. The Graduate Director and Undergraduate Director are also evaluated in the category of Administrative duties.

The Executive Committee and Chair will use the following guidelines in determining their evaluations.

A. Teaching

The evaluation of teaching assesses the faculty member's effectiveness in imparting knowledge and skills, in stimulating students' critical thinking and research abilities, and in meeting accepted standards of professional behavior when relating to students. The following items are taken into account in assessing effective teaching:

- Student evaluations: written student comments and quantitative averages on the required end-of-semester student evaluations are considered. The latter are assessed as raw scores and in relation to college and departmental means for similar courses.

- Course materials: these will include the design of syllabi and assignments; the quality of course websites and of other materials provided to students may also be considered.

-Other materials provided by the faculty member: the narrative on teaching submitted for annual review carries weight as evidence of reflective teaching practices and a means of contextualizing teaching within a faculty member's overall effort and contribution to the curriculum.

Materials documenting other aspects of a faculty member's assigned instructional duties beyond regular classes (e.g., directed studies, thesis advising, development of materials for future courses, other work with students) are also relevant. Faculty members may also invite class visitation.

-Assessment of students: in classes of over 25 students, grading patterns that are significantly above or below the mean GPA of the enrolled students may affect the interpretation of student evaluations and/or the faculty member's effectiveness.

Outstanding will be awarded to faculty who achieve a consistently high level of success in designing and teaching courses that challenge students intellectually, stimulate their interest, and develop their skills in critical thinking, writing, and expression. Typically, a faculty member rated "outstanding" will have high numerical student surveys (consistently above departmental means or above 4.5), taking into account the level, size, and type of class. Major consideration will also be given for teaching awards, the development of new courses or major revisions of existing ones, innovative pedagogy, and web site developments of qualitative importance. For graduate theses and dissertations, a substantial, qualitative contribution will be expected, and this may be documented by the successful progress of students, the quality of their work, and/or the extent of the supervision provided.

Strong will be awarded to faculty who demonstrate a consistent effort to design and teach courses that challenge students intellectually, stimulate their interest, and develop their skills in critical thinking, writing, and expression, and who earn good numerical student surveys (near departmental means or above 4.0, taking into account the level, size, and type of class). Major consideration will also be given for nominations for teaching awards, web site innovations, and significant revision of courses and assignments. For graduate theses

and dissertations, the nature of the contribution is taken into account.

Satisfactory will be awarded to faculty with only adequate numerical student surveys (consistently below departmental and college means, taking into account the level, size, and type of class) or with notable but acknowledged lapses of quality in the design of syllabi and assignments.

Weak will be awarded to faculty with numerical student surveys consistently and significantly below departmental and college means (taking into account the level, size, and type of class), or with significant and repeated lapses of quality in the design of syllabi and assignments.

Unsatisfactory will be awarded to faculty who fall short of the standards for a higher rating and demonstrate significant professional lapses or misconduct.

B. Research/Creative Activity

The annual evaluation of research and publication will be qualitative and quantitative, balancing short-term productivity with evidence for the successful implementation of a long-term research program that will meet university, college, and departmental expectations for tenure and promotion.

A qualitative assessment will take into account the scope, significance, and originality of publications and their contributions to relevant fields. The department will also consider the effort involved in successfully developing a new line of research, or in successfully completing research that requires unusual effort, expenditure of time, or technical skills. We recognize that publication, especially if refereed or invited, implies a qualitative judgment by those peers best equipped to evaluate the work. Consequently the quality of the publishing venue will also be taken into account. Contributions to the field may also be demonstrated by major external prizes, grants, and awards.

Over an extended period of time, the typical pace of publication for an "outstanding" rating would be one new, original, single-authored article of substantive length and quality per year, or demonstrated progress towards the publication of a book within the time frame consistent with

departmental, college, and university standards for tenure and promotion. For major, multi-year projects, the department will give weight to the documented stages of completion and the reception of the work (reviews, awards, invitations) in subsequent years. The faculty member's narrative and documentation -- including research materials, drafted texts, responses from colleagues -- will carry considerable weight in the assessment of the progress and impact of long-term projects.

The following measures of productivity may be modified somewhat for faculty members whose research assignments are significantly above or below departmental means.

Outstanding will be awarded for publication, acceptance, or submission of two or more well-placed articles, including major review articles, with additional evidence of an ongoing research program. "Outstanding" will also be awarded for significant benchmarks in the preparation and publication of a longer manuscript or an edited collection with a substantial scholarly contribution by the editor. Such benchmarks would include the circulation or presentation of completed chapters, the submission of a completed manuscript for review, the submission of a manuscript with recommended revisions, the acceptance of a manuscript, its publication, and subsequent evidence for its quality and significance through reviews, prizes, or invitations to present related material. The award of a major grant or fellowship for research (e.g., NEH, ACLS, Guggenheim...) would also warrant an "outstanding" evaluation. Conference papers delivered would usually be rated at a ratio of about two or three -- on different subjects -- to one published article, although a faculty member would not earn an "outstanding" rating only for conference presentations. Organizing panels and conferences and publishing book reviews may be counted as either research or professional service depending on the nature of the documented activity that is. Books intended primarily for classroom use will be judged according to how much original scholarly and critical effort went into their creation.

Strong will be awarded to faculty members who have one article or book chapter published or accepted for publication, but with a definite sense that publication is proceeding at a slower pace than the equivalent of one article per year. Faculty may also receive a strong evaluation for multiple articles, chapters, and/or sections of a book manuscript that

are demonstrably in varying stages of active development, coupled with evidence of other research activity (e.g., conference presentations, grant proposals, substantive professional service in the writing of book reviews or organization of panels and conferences).

Satisfactory will be awarded for evidence of submission or of significant progress on a single article or a book chapter, without a well-defined outcome or other significant evidence of ongoing research activity.

Weak should be awarded to faculty whose record does not meet the departmental standard for Satisfactory, but who show minimal evidence (e.g., submission of grant proposals or conference papers) of effort on a research program.

Unsatisfactory will be awarded to faculty who fall short of the standards for a higher rating.

C. Service

Service falls into three general categories: to the University (including the department, the college and the university at large), to the profession, and to the community.

The following guidelines may be modified somewhat for faculty members whose service assignments are significantly above or below the departmental means.

Outstanding: Faculty must maintain a consistent record of good departmental service and hold key positions in important international, national, or regional professional organizations; or edit, co-edit, or serve as book review editor for a journal in their area; or organize conferences; or publish book reviews in prominent publications; or participate prominently in important university or college committees or organizations; or perform departmental service well beyond the standard assignment. Leadership in community service activities (including service to public schools, art councils, community colleges, public lecture series and panel discussions, contributions to TV, radio, and newsprint, and other forms of community education) in addition to a consistent record of departmental service may earn Outstanding merit.

Strong: Faculty must maintain a consistent record of good departmental service and participate on a departmental committee requiring considerable work, such as a search committee, curriculum committee, or evaluation committee; or serve without special responsibilities on two or three university or college committees; or participate notably in international, national, and regional professional organizations; or work for journals, organize conference panels, or publish book reviews in lesser venues; or perform notable community service.

Satisfactory will be awarded to faculty who adequately perform minor departmental service activity.

Weak will be awarded to faculty whose service is limited to the departmental activities (meetings, surveys etc.) routinely expected of all members.

Unsatisfactory will be awarded to faculty who do not meet the criteria for any higher rating, and who are negligent in their performance of basic departmental responsibilities.

D. Appeals Procedure

In instances where a faculty member disputes the evaluation of the Committee and/or Chair, the faculty member should first inform the department Chair of this in writing. The normal response will be for the Chair and/or Committee to meet with the faculty member to explain the basis of the evaluation, and to give him or her an opportunity to present material which would justify a change to the evaluation.

If a colleague then wishes further review of the Chair's and/or Committee's evaluation, the colleague should inform both the Executive Committee chair and the department Chair in writing. If the issue is not then resolved to the faculty member's satisfaction within one week, the faculty member has recourse in an appeal to the College's Associate Dean of Faculty.

All faculty members have the right to enter a self-evaluation or a written response to the evaluation of the Committee and/or Chair into the Archivum FIS system. Also, any faculty member can file a grievance through the USF-UFF if there is a

violation of the CBA.

VII. Tenure and Promotion

These criteria and procedures for tenure and promotion in the Department of Humanities and Cultural Studies are consistent with Board of Trustees regulations, the USF-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement, and relevant university and college documents. The Department recognizes the principles of equity of assignment, resources and opportunities of faculty across a multi-campus university.

For Promotion to Associate Professor:

A. CRITERIA

Departmental recommendations concerning tenure and promotion are based on: excellencet in:

- 1) research/creative/scholarly work;
- 2) teaching (including advising and mentoring);
- 3) service to the university, profession, and community.

The department expects high competenceexcellence in all three areas. Excellence in research is a requirement for tenure and promotion.

B. RESEARCH/CREATIVE/SCHOLARLY WORK

1) Quality is paramount for a rating of "Excellent" in Research/Creative/Scholarly work for tenure and promotion. Excellence in research will be achieved through a balance of quality and quantity of work. It should be recognized that quantitative measures of quality, such as acceptance ratios and citation counts, are imperfect in the humanities. In-field faculty (as represented by readers' reports, letters from external reviewers, and tenure and promotion committees) are in the best position to judge quality, to invoke established markers that facilitate evaluation of quality, and to assess an appropriate balance of quality and quantity.

2) In keeping with the disciplinary standards in our fields

at peer and aspirational peer institutions, candidates in the humanities are expected to publish or have final acceptance during the tenure-earning years of a high quality, refereed scholarly monograph plus 2 or more high quality book chapters or articles. Alternatively, the candidate should have approximately 8 high quality, predominantly refereed publications. For collaborative work, the candidate's contribution should be accounted for. Overall, the body of work should represent a coherent and well-rounded program of research, creative, and/or scholarly work. Work published prior to the tenure-earning years can be considered evidence of such a program but does not substitute for the record indicated above. Details of publications are listed below.

- a. Refereed works are preferable, especially refereed journal articles and refereed book chapters. The refereed venue is one important indicator of the vetting of the quality of the research.
- b. Publication in top-tier journals is an indication of high quality work. High quality research/scholarly/creative work can however appear in a variety of echelons and types of publications (from area specific journals to journals on pedagogy, from the oldest journal in the field to new online journals, from practitioner journals to regional/state journals).
- c. This record of work can also include published works that are non-refereed but have been solicited. Solicited publications sometimes provide evidence of the candidate's prominence in the field or of his or her specialized expertise. In addition, solicited publications sometimes have a high impact, for example if they are published by high quality, high-impact presses and publishers.
- d. Online and digital production is increasingly becoming a reality in many fields. Databases, substantive scholarly blogs, and managed websites, online journals and forums (to name a few) are welcome parts of a record. The weight and impact of this work must be made clear within the record and ideally be addressed by external reviewers and by the department

chair and department tenure and promotion committee.

e. Non-refereed, non-solicited works can be part of a well-rounded research record, but these works alone do not constitute "evidence of excellence" in scholarship.

f. Many humanities scholars engage in work that straddles conventional boundaries between scholarly and creative work. The weight and impact of this work must be made clear within the record and ideally be addressed by external reviewers and by the department chair and department tenure and promotion committee.

g. Encyclopedia entries and reviews provide evidence of productivity, visibility, and impact. However, they are not normally included in the publication count unless they are lengthy entries or review essays.

3) Publication of a work in two places with no, little, or some revision is both inevitable and acceptable, e.g. a journal article is published and later included in a book or collection. Sometimes, such duplicate publication is an indicator of impact on the field. When the research record is sparse, however, careful scrutiny will be given to this practice.

4) Work in press counts, assuming that the candidate has a letter of final acceptance stating that all required revisions have been satisfactorily completed and the work slated for production. Work "in press," should be part of a timely rhythm of publication and productivity across the tenure-earning years. The candidate's record should represent a pattern indicative of a lifetime of accomplishment and productivity with potential for high impact on the field or society.

5) In addition to the necessary record of publication indicated above, productivity should be demonstrated on a continuing basis by such activities as presentation at and participation in the organization of conferences, workshops, and colloquia at various levels nationally and internationally; participation on editorial boards; external and internal funding for research; invited scholarly presentation; readings; requests to review

articles, book manuscripts, and grant proposals; professional offices; publicly engaged scholarship, such as museum exhibits, films, public events, and websites; and the receipt of national or international fellowships, residencies, awards, prizes, and other honors.

B. TEACHING

Successful candidates for tenure must demonstrate excellence in teaching. Assessment of teaching quality occurs primarily at the departmental level, and should draw on documentation generated throughout the candidate's tenure-earning years. Because teaching is a multifaceted activity involving work inside and outside scheduled class meetings, the departmental T&P committee will evaluate applicants based on their work in the following categories. Excellence is about balance and sustained activity across the following categories. [Evidence of excellence can be demonstrated by achievement in the following areas.]

- 1) Evidence of curricular and pedagogical innovation may include:
 - a. a willingness to take responsible educational risks, such as introducing new courses, controversial topics, and innovative teaching techniques
 - b. work with faculty outside the department to develop curricula
 - c. integration of contemporary and multidisciplinary scholarship

- 2) Evidence of curricular and pedagogical maintenance may include:
 - a. the reevaluation and refinement of teaching, including but not limited to the design and revision of courses to reflect new developments in the discipline
 - b. continuing research in a content area related to teaching

- 3) Evidence of excellence in instructional techniques may include:
 - a. effective presentation of course material and communication with students
 - b. accessibility and helpful advising to students

regarding their classwork

- c. provision of substantive and detailed response to students on their work
- d. presentation of courses which are demanding, thoughtful, and clearly organized
- e. an emphasis on analysis and interpretation instead of primary reliance on narration and description
- f. the fostering of students' skills in critical thinking and verbal and written communication
- g. student and peer evaluations. In assessing a faculty member's performance as an instructor, department reviewers will carefully note the patterns in these evaluations in the context of an individual's assigned duties. Department reviewers will also consider the number, range, level, and workload of courses taught

4) Evidence of teaching outside the classroom or scheduled course may include:

- a. The direction of students engaged in independent study, supervision of internship
- b. Membership in graduate comprehensive examination and thesis/dissertation committees within and outside the department; and
- c. teaching for other departments/programs within the university as appropriate.

C. SERVICE

Substantive service by all faculty is essential and must be at more than a pro forma level; qualitative evaluations of service will be made. Candidates are expected to serve on some department committees. Service to the college, university, profession, and community is strongly encouraged. The department looks for service in the form of activities such as the following (not listed in order of priority):

- 1) consistent efforts to further the department's goals and programs;
- 2) department committee work and other assignments (e.g. undergraduate advisor, graduate advisor, library liaison);

- 3) contributions to information-related services, such as departmental fliers and brochures;
- 4) contributions to student-faculty dialogue;
- 5) membership in and meaningful contributions to college and university committees and working groups (e.g. Faculty Senate, College of Arts & Sciences Advisory Council, Status of Women Committee, search committees outside the department);
- 6) holding office in a professional association or serving on a committee within a professional association;
- 7) voluntary or paid consulting on educational matters for governmental agencies, educational institutions, or private corporations concerned with educational or professional issues;
- 8) membership in and attendance at meetings of professional associations;
- 9) critique of manuscripts and other materials intended for publication;
- 10) service on editorial boards of professional publications;
- 11) participation in the organization of professional conferences; and
- 12) community service (e.g. public lectures, interviews with the news media)

For Promotion to Full Professor the above criteria are used with the understanding that the evaluated materials represent work since tenure:

1) A record of excellence in teaching. Candidates are expected to have made substantial high-quality contributions to the Department's teaching mission in accordance with their assigned duties, including, where applicable, a record of successful participation on thesis and/or dissertation committees.

2) A record of excellence in research/creative/scholarly

work as evidenced by a productive, continuing research program that has achieved national and/or international recognition.

The Department will judge excellence primarily on a faculty member's overall contribution to their field. As such, while candidates for promotion to Full Professor should have published at least as much research since tenure as candidates for Promotion to Associate Professor are expected to publish before tenure, the sum quantity of a candidate's publications post-tenure will not be the deciding factor. Likewise, while candidates should be productive over time, emphasis will be placed on the quality and significance of the candidate's accumulated body of research and publication, as evidenced by the judgments of outside referees, book reviews, citations, invited talks, and other measures of national (and perhaps international) visibility. Records that demonstrate such significance will be judged excellent.

3) A record of substantial service to the University and profession, including where applicable, engagement with the community as it relates to the mission of the Department, the College, and the University.

II. PROCEDURES

A. REVIEW OF PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE

Mid-tenure review follows the tenure evaluation process with the exception that no external letters are required. At the mid-tenure review, candidates should be prepared to present their book manuscripts along with their original dissertations if revising the dissertation for publication, all drafts and research notes, manuscripts for shorter works as yet unpublished, and any correspondence with editors, journals, and presses. Careful consideration must be given both to the equitability of the candidate's assignment and opportunities in relation to others in the department (especially when a department spans multiple campuses), and to the candidate's ability and willingness to work cooperatively within the department, college, and/or campus.

B. APPLICATION FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

1) External Review Letters. Approved external

reviewers as determined by the College Tenure and Promotion Procedures should be contacted by the chair before the end of the spring semester in order to determine their willingness to serve. The Chair will add the external review letters, once they are received, to the candidate's tenure and promotion application file, as provided in the College Tenure and Promotion Procedures.

2) Departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee. The departmental Faculty Committee for the purposes of tenure and promotion will be appointed by the department Chair in accordance with departmental by-laws after consultation with the voting members of the faculty, no later than the first departmental meeting of the fall semester. The committee members will make evaluations and recommendations in favor or against the candidate's tenure and promotion, and will submit narratives in support of these evaluations and recommendations, to be included in the tenure file. The committee members do not record a vote for the applicants file.

3) Tenured Faculty Vote. Following the completion of the review by the departmental committee, the tenured members of the voting faculty as defined by the department's by-laws, exclusive of the chair, will vote in favor or against the candidate's tenure. Faculty will have the opportunity to review the candidate's complete tenure file before voting. Votes will be either to "approve," "deny," or "abstain." The vote will be by secret ballot, with provisions made for electronic voting. Voting will take place over a multi-day period specified by the Chair. The results of the vote will be included in the tenure file before the Chair's evaluation is completed.

Following the vote of the tenured faculty, the Chair will make evaluations and recommendations in favor or against the candidate's tenure and promotion, and will submit narratives in support of these evaluations and recommendations, to be included in the tenure file. Regional Chancellors will provide a formal review in promotion and tenure cases for faculty members on branch campuses "prior to a College Dean completing and forwarding a recommendation to the Provost" (USF Consolidation

Handbook).

Recommended materials to be submitted by a candidate in a supplementary binderto FIS (Archivum) include the following:

- a) Course syllabi and teaching materials including lecture outlines or other handouts, quizzes and tests, and other graded assignments; evidence of substantive and detailed response to students on their work; evidence of refinement of teaching, including but not limited to the design and revision of courses; evidence of contributions to curriculum and program development;
- b) Copies of all scholarly work published, in press, or under consideration for publication;
- c) Evidence of departmental, college, university, community, and/or professional service.

IV. AMENDMENDING THE T&P DOCUMENT

A. This governance document may be amended at any faculty meeting with a quorum as defined by the bylaws. Proposed amendments, should be distributed at least 1 week prior to the meeting.

B. A majority vote of the faculty shall be required to amend this document. This document may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the department's tenured and tenure-earning faculty.

Approved by department faculty vote 28 August 2015

Approved by Dean's Office, April 4, 2016

VIII. INSTRUCTOR PROMOTION

GENERAL PROMOTION INFORMATION

Applicants who meet the minimum criteria established by the University for eligibility to apply for Instructor promotion (see 2010 Career Path for Instructors: Promotion Guidelines) must initiate the process by requesting the academic unit responsible for providing personnel evaluations evaluate the applicant for promotion. Thus, applicants in the Department of

Humanities and Cultural Studies (HCS) must initiate the promotion process by notifying the department chair in writing of their intention to apply for promotion. The decision to apply for promotion rests with the individual, and there is no penalty for one's choice not to apply or specifically for failure to be granted promotion.

According to the University, judgments regarding Instructor career paths must be based on the individual's primary FTE assignment. In addition, HCS requires evaluation be considered in relation to the candidates' primary materials and be framed in the context of the Instructor's primary FTE. Secondary FTE assignments may be considered in the Instructor's overall evaluation, but should not function as criterion for denial of departmental support.

DEPARTMENT MISSION & PROMOTION CRITERIA

The Department of Humanities and Cultural Studies is a place for adventurous scholars and students who want to understand the complex interconnections between the arts, social structures, and history. As scholars and teachers, we use art as a way to understand history and social life. Interdisciplinary and global in scope, our courses provide students with opportunities for detailed cultural analysis in a broad historical and philosophical context. We welcome students and scholars who are dedicated, open-minded, and willing to challenge conventional intellectual boundaries.

EXPECTATIONS FOR INSTRUCTORS

Instructors in HCS are typically assigned teaching as their primary FTE assignment. Teaching is here defined as classroom activities as well as other instructional duties that may include, but are not limited to:

Individuals applying for promotion will supply the following primary materials for evaluation: Teaching Philosophy, Statement of Instructional Activities and Methods, and an updated CV. A Committee of department faculty (Instructor Promotion Committee), including at least one Instructor Level II or III, if practicable, will assess these materials and rate the candidate as Outstanding, Strong, or Satisfactory, indicating either departmental support to proceed or recommendation to delay application for promotion.

PRIMARY MATERIALS

Candidates will supply the Committee with a portfolio that consists of a Teaching Philosophy, a statement of Instructional Activities and Methods, as well as an updated CV. Candidates may supplement these required materials with an Appendix containing evidence of a commitment to teaching excellence. Additional materials may include, but are not limited to, course syllabi, representative media aids and lecture materials, assignments, student surveys, peer observations, and online platforms (i.e., Canvas course sites).

TEACHING PHILOSOPHY

The candidate will provide a short, reflective statement offering an overall characterization of their teaching, describing why they approach teaching in a particular manner, and identifying beliefs about teaching and how those beliefs inform instructional practices. The Teaching Philosophy will highlight principles, goals and objectives integral to the applicant's pedagogy, and demonstrate the individual's commitment to improvement as a teacher (professional development). The Teaching Philosophy should create a "vivid portrait of a faculty member who is intentional about teaching practices, objectives, values, and strategies." The Teaching Philosophy should not typically exceed 1,000 words in length.

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES AND METHODS

The candidate will provide a statement describing how the Teaching Philosophy is translated into action through the use of specific teaching methods that match the applicant's philosophy of teaching. This statement will include specific details regarding how the candidate facilitates learning and examples of the practices employed. Details may include, but are not limited to, descriptions of the classroom environment (traditional, hybrid, and online), mechanisms employed to cultivate a classroom climate, strategies for implementing and improving student learning outcomes, development of instructional resources, approach to assessment, descriptions of content delivery, supervision of undergraduate and graduate research experiences, and attention to pedagogical concerns identified in student evaluations. Importantly, this statement should address evidence of student success. This statement should not typically exceed 2,000 words in length.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Candidates will submit an updated curriculum vitae that lists significant academic, pedagogical, and scholarly efforts, as

well as requisite information of the Instructor's educational background and other service efforts. Instructors seeking promotion from Level II to Level III should provide an abbreviated CV covering the period after promotion to Instructor Level II.

Criteria for Promotion

LEVEL I TO LEVEL II

The applicant will be appointed as a full-time Instructor in HCS for a period ranging from three to five or more years. This period may be a mixture of Visiting and Continuing appointments so long as employment is continuous and full-time throughout the applicant's employment. Departmental support for applicants with five or more years will be awarded based on a comprehensive review in which the candidate is rated Outstanding in their primary FTE assignment and Strong in any secondary assignments. Candidates who meet minimum University requirements may apply after three years. Departmental support for applicants with fewer than five years (which constitutes early consideration) will be awarded based on a comprehensive review in which the candidate is rated Outstanding in their primary FTE assignment and Outstanding in any secondary assignments. In addition to these requirements, applicants for Instructor Level II must also meet the criteria for promotion within the Department of Humanities and Cultural Studies.

Department Criteria

In addition to the requirements for eligibility established by the university, department support will be predicated on the applicant's attention to the HCS Fundamentals of Teaching Performance (see below).

LEVEL II TO LEVEL III

The applicant will be appointed for a period ranging from three to five or more years in the Instructor Level II position to be eligible for promotion. Departmental support for applicants with five or more years will be awarded based on a comprehensive review in which the candidate is rated Outstanding in their primary FTE assignment and Strong in any secondary assignments. Departmental support for applicants with fewer than five years (which constitutes early consideration) will be awarded based on a comprehensive review in which the candidate is rated

Outstanding in their primary FTE assignment and Outstanding in any secondary assignments. In addition to these requirements, applicants for Instructor Level III must also meet the criteria for promotion within the Department of Humanities and Cultural Studies.

Department Criteria

In addition to university guidelines and department criteria for promotion to Level II, applicants must demonstrate meritorious performance as measured by:

- a) demonstration of further accomplishments in their primary FTE assignment extending those considered at the Level II review. These accomplishments may include, but are not limited to curriculum development, innovative teaching strategies, department/university leadership roles, awards related to assigned duties, publications related to assigned duties, and activities that promote the mission of the university.
- b) demonstration of commitment to improvement through participation in professional development activities. These activities may include, but are not limited to conferences, workshops, professional development leave, lectures, webinars, consultations with relevant offices, organizations, and personnel, peer observations, and activities that demonstrably contribute to the candidate's success in her/his assigned duties.

FUNDAMENTALS OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE

The department of Humanities and Cultural Studies defines success in teaching based on the following fundamental components of sound pedagogy:

Course Design & Curriculum

- a) development and design courses that express the department's mission
 - b) presentation syllabi that are pedagogically sound and substantive
 - c) thoughtful selection of content, attention to accessibility and organization, or other measures characteristic of a learning-centered approach
 - d) creation of substantive and original teaching materials
 - e) demonstration of scholarly depth in course presentation
- Teaching, Classroom, Online, & Hybrid
- f) instructional activities and methods that are appropriate to and further the mission of the department

- g) demonstration of effective teaching as measured by reviews of primary materials, syllabi, course materials, and/or peer observation;
- h) demonstration of a learning-focused approach to teaching as measured by reviews of primary materials, course materials, assignments and assessment tools, exercises, and/or peer observation;
- i) development of student intellectual growth through well-organized, intentional practices and course infrastructure
- j) engaging practices that contribute to learning-centered environments
- k) implementation of measures that support student success as identified in the university's strategic objectives (i.e., high-impact practices like undergraduate research, internships, service-learning, community engagement, Global Citizens Project certification, etc.)
- l) assessment and implementation of legitimate pedagogical concerns expressed in qualitative and/or quantitative sections of student course evaluations and annual reviews, as shown by means such as: self-evaluation, including self-reflexivity, seeking peer and student feedback, and exploring alternative teaching methods resulting in teaching improvement over time

Evaluation, Assignments, Grading

- a) creation of course objectives, student learning outcomes, and assignments that are level-appropriate and in line with the department's mission
- b) articulation of grading philosophy and procedures that are appropriate to the course and the department (including grade distributions)

Advising and Departmental Responsibilities

- a) appropriate guidance and advising of teaching assistants in line with the department mission
- b) service on MA thesis committees and mentoring graduate student research
- c) collegial participation in shaping the trajectory of department mission, objectives, and program curriculum (i.e., attendance to faculty meetings, department leadership roles, etc.)
- d) contributions to the department's and university's teaching mission through diversity of course offerings, advising, large-section courses, and/or graduate student mentorship

Student Success

additional criteria for assessing student success includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- a) supervision of undergraduate and graduate research experiences
- b) supervision of graduate teaching
- c) student mentorship/advising
- d) curriculum development and course design
- e) continued professional development
- f) internship supervision
- g) holistic contributions to a learning-centered department culture.

REVIEW & EVALUATION

The HCS Instructor Promotion Committee will conduct a comprehensive review of the applicant's primary materials and appendices (if included) to determine the Overall Ranking of the applicant's primary and secondary FTEs, and to recommend department support of the applicant's candidacy.

The applying Instructor will demonstrate a commitment to excellence in teaching as measured by the applicant's attention to the HCS Fundamentals of Teaching Performance. An applicant rated Outstanding will offer a portfolio of teaching that demonstrates holistic success by evidencing competency in the majority of Fundamentals of Teaching Performance, with no significant deficiencies in a given area. A rating of Strong will be assigned to a portfolio that demonstrates competency in a majority, but with notable deficiencies in some of the Fundamentals of Teaching Performance. A rating of Satisfactory will demarcate limited success and indicate notable problems in a majority of the listed Fundamentals of Teaching Performance.

DEPARTMENT INSTRUCTOR PROMOTION PROCEDURES

The individual is responsible for initiating the promotion process in conjunction with the college's timetable. Applicants will follow the procedures outlined below.

- 1) The Instructor initiates the promotion process by consulting with the department chair.
- 2) If the Instructor meets eligibility criteria and decides to proceed with the application, the Instructor submits a formal CAS application for promotion to the department along with required primary materials as established in the Department Guidelines.
- 3) The department's Instructor Promotion Committee will conduct a comprehensive review of the Instructor's

application, including primary materials and Appendices (if provided), and subsequently assigns overall ratings for each relevant area of assigned duties. The Committee will then make a written recommendation concerning promotion. A narrative is to be provided by the review committee that justifies the assigned rankings and will be included in the applicant's promotion package as it moves forward. The narrative should specify the reasons for the committee's decision and make suggestions for improvement that might result in a positive decision at a later date.

4) The head of the department (typically the chair) provides a separate review, ranking, narrative, and recommendation that will be included in the applicant's promotion package as it moves forward. The deadline for the Chair's review is subject to the CAS timetable.

5) If the department denies support of the candidate's application, the candidate may still advance their application to the College for review. Applicants must consult the CAS Promotion to Instructor Timetable for deadlines.

6) The department Committee's and chair's recommendations are sent to the office of the College Dean. At the discretion of the College, and in consultation with the appropriate faculty governance group, a College designated faculty committee may provide a separate review. The committee may be used to review all cases or to serve as consultant to the Dean on selected cases. If this level of review is employed, the faculty committee must provide a narrative only if it elects to recommend against promotion. The narrative should specify the reasons for that decision. The Dean reviews all materials and provides a final decision. A narrative need only be provided in cases where promotion is not recommended.

7) At the College's discretion, Instructor promotion reviews may be conducted as part of the regular tenure and promotion cycle, or may be conducted at a separate time. However, final decisions regarding promotion must be completed before the end of the spring semester each academic year.

8) A listing of Instructor promotional decisions is to be provided by Colleges to the Office of the Provost.

IX. Amendment of Bylaws

A. This governance document may be amended at any meeting of the Department or by electronic ballot, provided the specific amendment (in writing) shall have been distributed at least 1 week prior to the meeting.

B. a 2/3 vote of the Department faculty shall be required to amend this document.

Approved by HCS Faculty 4/18/2022

Approved by the Provost's Office 10/5/2022