

**Bylaws of the Department of Philosophy
Florida State University**

Approved by the Department on October 25th, 2019

Approved by the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement on December 6th, 2019

Effective December 6th, 2019

These bylaws, to the best of the department's knowledge, are consistent with, the university policies found in the FSU Constitution, the BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Faculty Handbook, and the annual Promotion and Tenure letter.

I. DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATION

A. Composition and Department Meetings

The department comprises both its ranked (i.e., tenured faculty and untenured tenure-track assistant professors) and specialized faculty. Setting the teaching and supervision of graduate students aside, specialized faculty shall have the same rights and responsibilities as ranked members of the department insofar as university regulations permit. Regarding the teaching and supervision of graduate students by specialized faculty, see the department's Graduate Handbook.

Department meetings are ordinarily called by the department chairperson, but any other member of the department may call a department meeting by making a request to the chairperson, who shall then schedule a meeting within a reasonable time frame (two weeks if the request is made with sufficient time remaining in a fall or spring semester).

(Note: for the purpose of these bylaws, visiting faculty and post docs are not considered to be department members.)

B. Chairperson (chair)

1. Term and Selection Procedure

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, minus the current chair if s/he is a candidate, holds a meeting chaired by the associate chair to elect a chair search advisory committee (CSAC) comprising at least 20% of the ranked faculty (but with a minimum of three members, and not to include any candidates for the position). The dean then appoints an outside member. The CSAC is responsible for producing a written report assessing the merits of the candidate(s). The CSAC may recommend a candidate but is not required to do so unless given this task by the dean. The report is to be submitted to the department, minus the candidate(s). This group then votes on the candidate(s). The CSAC reports the results of this vote to the dean, and furnishes her/him with a copy of its report should s/he wish to see it. Finally, the CSAC meets with the newly appointed chair to discuss its findings.

2. Responsibilities

The chair is the chief administrative officer of the department. As such, s/he 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;
- 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. make an annual evaluation of the performance (see I.D.1);
- f. recommend to the dean annual salary adjustments in light of the peer evaluations made by the faculty evaluation committee (see II.B.5);
- g. propose, for approval by majority vote of the department, a slate of department officers (this process is to take place each May after consultation with the faculty members being asked to serve);
- 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;
- k. serve on various department committees, as detailed below.

C. Department Officers

(Terms of service: August 8 – August 7)

1. Associate Chair and Alternate

The main responsibility of the associate chair is to take on the role of chair should the latter be unavailable for a period of longer than five days. If both the chair and associate chair are unavailable for such a period, then the alternate associate chair shall take on the role of chair.

2. Director of Graduate Studies (DGS)

The DGS is responsible for counseling and advising graduate students, administering the academic details of graduate registration, examinations, and clearance of graduate students for receiving degrees. The DGS serves on the curriculum and graduate admissions committees (see under 'Committees' below) and s/he is the departmental liaison officer for consultations regarding graduate offerings in cognate departments and programs.

3. Director of Graduate Admissions (DGA)

The DGA is responsible for coordinating the annual recruitment of new graduate students and answering inquiries from potential applicants concerning the graduate program. Provided circumstances permit, the department will typically employ at least one graduate student to serve as a **graduate recruitment coordinator**, to be supervised by the DGA. The DGA serves on the graduate admissions committee.

4. Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUS)

The DUS is responsible for advising undergraduate majors and minors and serves on the curriculum committee. Provided circumstances permit, the department will typically employ at least one graduate student to serve as an **undergraduate advisor**, to be supervised by the DUS.

5. Library Liaison

The library liaison is responsible for promoting and coordinating the department's efforts to improve the Strozier library's philosophy holdings. This involves, but is not limited to, overseeing the department's book requests.

6. Honors Liaison

The honors liaison liaises with students interested in, or working on, Honors in the Major in philosophy.

7. Recording Secretary

The recording secretary is responsible for taking minutes at department meetings and submitting them to the voting members of the department for their approval.

D. Committees

(Terms of service: August 8 – August 7)

1. Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)

The FEC, which is elected each May by majority vote of the department, comprises at least 10% of the department (but with a minimum of three members), not all at the same rank, and including at least one full professor and two tenured members. The FEC advises the chair on proposals to the dean regarding merit pay increases (see under 'Departmental Procedures' below).

2. Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC)

(See **Appendix I** for Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure.)

In the case of tenure track assistant professors, the PTC comprises all tenured members of the department, with the department chair serving as its chair.

In the case of specialized faculty at the first rank, the PTC comprises all tenured members of the department, and all specialized faculty above the first rank, with the department chair serving as its chair.

In the case of associate professors, the PTC comprises all full professors in the department, with the department chair serving as its chair.

In the case of specialized faculty at the second rank, the PTC comprises all full professors in the department, and all specialized faculty at the third rank, with the department chair serving as its chair.

The chair does not vote as a member of the PTC on promotion and tenure decisions since, in accord with university policy, the chair has a separate vote on these matters.

(Regarding the appointment of new incoming faculty to tenured positions, see 'Hiring' below under 'Departmental Procedures'.)

The responsibilities of the PTC may include advising the chair on the annual review and evaluation of all ranked and non-ranked faculty.

The PTC will select one of its members to serve as the departmental representative on the humanities divisional promotion and tenure committee. This representative will normally be a full professor.

All deliberations of the PTC will be in accord with the relevant procedures and stipulations in the *Faculty Handbook*.

3. Graduate Admissions Committee (GAC)

This committee comprises the DGA, the DGS, and at least one other department member of the department.

4. Placement Committee

The placement committee is responsible for advising our graduating Ph.D. students concerning their applications for employment, and overseeing their employment application process.

5. Colloquium Committee

This committee is appointed annually by the chair and is responsible for organizing the department's schedule of visiting colloquium speakers for the year.

6. Curriculum Committee (Undergraduate and Graduate)

This committee, which comprises the chair, DGS and DUS, and any other volunteers from the department, will regularly review the undergraduate and graduate curricula and recommend to the department such changes as it deems appropriate.

7. Third Year Review Committees

In their third year of service, the annual review of untenured tenure-track assistant professors is particularly thorough: see II.B.2 and Appendix II. Each such review is to be initiated by a review committee comprising the reviewee's mentors (see I.E) and the chair. The review then proceeds as per Appendix II.

8. Chair Search Advisory Committee (CSAC)

See I.B.1

9. Other

The chair may appoint additional *ad hoc* committees as circumstances may demand.

E. Mentors for assistant professors

Two tenured mentors (one for research, one for teaching) are appointed for each untenured tenure-track assistant professor within their first semester. These mentors are charged with advising the mentee in the areas of teaching, research (including publication venues: see Appendix I(2.1)), and service, and advocating on the mentee's behalf when appropriate. The mentors should also meet with their mentee prior to each annual evaluation (see II.B.2), and, with the exception of the mentee's third year, the mentor then consults with the chair concerning the writing of the annual letter (see II.B.4) for submission to the PTC. In the third year matters proceed as per Appendix II. The mentors serve on the mentee's third year review committee (see I.D.6). (Concerning teaching assessment, the teaching mentor should ensure that the mentee's teaching is observed at least once a year by a tenured member of the department: see II.B.4.)

F. Mentors for specialized faculty

Each new specialized faculty appointed at the first rank shall have a mentor appointed in their first year. The mentor is responsible for, among things, advising the mentee concerning the path to promotion.

II. DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES

A. Assignment of Faculty Responsibilities

An annual assignment of responsibilities is required by the university. These written assignments are agreed on between the chair and the individual concerned. Evaluation of the faculty member will be made on the basis of these mutually agreed upon assignments.

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

B. Faculty Evaluation

(See appendices I and II for the criteria and procedures for, respectively, **promotion and tenure**, and the **third year review of untenured tenure-track assistant professors**.)

1. Faculty Activities Report (FAR)

Each faculty member prepares a FAR (a departmental form is provided) in March of each year covering activities in the areas of teaching, research and service undertaken during the preceding **calendar** year (this calendar year requirement is university policy). The FAR is then submitted to the chair for use by her/him in performing the annual evaluation.

2. Annual Faculty Evaluation

Each department member other than the chair (who is evaluated by the dean) will be evaluated annually by the chair, who may be advised in this by the PTC (with the proviso that members not evaluate themselves or their spouses/partners).

One purpose of the annual evaluation is to serve as the basis for completing the university's Annual Evaluation Summary Form. This summary form is filled out by the chair and discussed with the faculty member in accordance with university policy. It is then submitted to the dean, with its accompanying narrative (see below), and, after the

dean's review, the completed form and the narrative become a part of the faculty member's permanent departmental evaluation file.

The evaluation will be conducted in the spring semester, after the submission deadline for the FAR, and will be based upon performance over the prior **calendar** year (January 1st to December 31st). Research, service and teaching will be evaluated separately, and their relative contributions to the overall assessment will be weighted in accord with the faculty member's assignment of responsibilities. Teaching will be evaluated as detailed under 'Teaching Evaluation' below. Research will be evaluated in accord with the current standards in the profession, which are reflected in the promotion and tenure guidelines in appendix I. Service will be evaluated in accord with the degree and efficacy of its performance.

In accordance with the Annual Evaluation Summary Form (a copy of which is available upon request), each faculty member will be ranked in each of the three areas of responsibility noted in the previous paragraph. The rankings comprise five levels, as given in the next paragraph, and AOR percentages are included on the form. The 'Overall Performance' evaluation will be weighted in accord with these percentages. A narrative explaining each faculty member's rankings will accompany each completed Annual Evaluation Summary Form.

For faculty who are meeting expectations, there are three categories:

- Meets FSU's High Expectations – This describes an individual who demonstrates the requisite knowledge and skills in his/her 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 her/his achievements in teaching, research, and/or service, which may include several of the following: high level of research or creative activity; professional recognition; willingness to accept additional responsibilities; high level of commitment to serving students and the overall mission of the department; involvement or leadership in professional associations; initiative in solving problems or developing new ideas.
- Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations – This describes an individual who substantially exceeds expectations during the evaluation period by virtue of his/her significant achievements in teaching, research, and/or service, which may include several of the following: notable research or creative activities; recognition of the individual by peers as an authority in his/her field; securing significant external funding; national or international recognition; willingness to go well beyond the norm in accepting additional responsibilities; exceptional level of commitment to serving students and the overall mission of the department; significant involvement or leadership in professional associations; noteworthy initiative in solving problems or developing new ideas.

If an individual's overall performance rating falls below "Meets FSU's High Expectations," specific suggestions for improvement should be provided to the employee. There are two performance rating categories for individuals who are not meeting expectations:

- Official Concern – This describes an individual who demonstrates the requisite knowledge and skills in his/her 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 his/her field of specialty and/or in completing assigned responsibilities.

Untenured faculty (this includes specialized faculty) may be placed on a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) if they receive an overall performance rating in the last-mentioned category. Non-reappointment is also an option. A tenured faculty member whose overall performance is rated in this category in three or more of the previous six evaluations is to be placed on a PIP.

3. Teaching Evaluation

Untenured faculty will have their teaching observed annually by a tenured member of the department. Tenured faculty can request that their teaching be observed by another tenured faculty member at any time. In cases where there is evidence (such as poor student evaluations) that a tenured member is encountering problems with his/her teaching, the chair can require that his/her teaching be observed by another tenured member. In accordance with university policy, any member being observed must be given at least two weeks notice of the upcoming observation, and a report of the observation must be submitted to the faculty member within ten working days of its occurrence. Performance on teaching will be evaluated annually by the chair, who may seek advice from the PTC, based upon reports of such observation, results of student evaluations, and review of syllabi and teaching materials.

4. Annual Letters pertaining to Progress toward Promotion and/or Tenure

Each April, the chair, in consultation with the PTC, writes letters apprising all faculty below the rank of full professor of their progress toward promotion and/or tenure (see Appendix I (1.2)). In the case of the third year of service of untenured tenure-track assistant professors a particularly thorough review is conducted (see Appendix II), and the third year review letter replaces the annual progress letter.

5. Merit Pay Increases

The chair has the responsibility of advising the dean concerning merit pay increases for members of the department. This advice will be compiled according to the following procedure. The chair, in consultation with the FEC, determines a rank ordering of the faculty by reference to the overall assessment discussed in II.B.2, with the proviso that overall performance since the previous round of merit pay increases should be considered in determining the ordering. This ordering is then to be followed in determining the advice forwarded to the dean. In the event of an unresolved disagreement between the chair and the FEC over the advice to be forwarded to the dean, both sets of advice shall be forwarded.

C. Teaching Load

The normal teaching load in the department for a ranked faculty member actively engaged in research and service is four regularly organized courses per year. The chair, in consultation with a faculty member, may alter this normal assignment in recognition of special circumstances. The teaching loads of non-ranked faculty are to be determined by the chair on a case-by-case basis.

D. Supplemental Summer Appointments

The chair shall be responsible for making supplemental summer appointments. In accordance with university policy, by the end of each March s/he will request each member of the department to state in writing whether s/he is interested in receiving a supplemental summer appointment, and if so to give a list of course preferences. Insofar as curricular requirements and financial resources allow, the chair will endeavor to ensure that as many faculty as possible teach their preferred courses, subject to the following proviso: priority will be given to those faculty who requested supplemental summer assignments in previous years but did not receive one in any of those years – the greater that number of years, the higher the priority.

E. Department Research Leaves

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

F. Academic Policies

With respect to such matters as grading practices, posting and keeping of office hours, and the University Honor Code, etc., the department follows the procedures in the *Faculty Handbook*.

G. Faculty Senator

The department will elect its faculty senator and official alternate at such times as specified by the constitution of the faculty senate. S/he is responsible for attending faculty senate meetings and keeping the department apprised of developments affecting the department or its members.

H. Hiring

There are two stages in the hiring process. First, the chair is responsible for responding to the dean's request for hiring proposals. S/he will solicit the views of all the members of the department and take due account of these views in responding to the dean. Second, should the dean authorize the department to hire, the decision about whom to interview is made by a majority vote of the department, as is the decision about whether to recommend to the university a particular candidate's appointment, and at what rank. If the candidate is seeking tenure upon appointment, the tenured members of the department vote as the PTC on the matter of whether to recommend the candidate's appointment with tenure.

I. Graduate Admissions

The GAC provides rankings of the graduate applicants to the chair, who is then responsible for compiling an overall ranking of the applicants, and making offers of funding and admission in accord with this ranking, taking into account budgetary limitations.

III. STUDENT PARTICIPATION

There is a philosophy graduate student association (PGSA), the president of which is selected by departmental graduate students in a manner determined by them. The president of the PGSA is charged with soliciting, and conveying to the chair, the views of the graduate students on departmental issues of concern to them (such as hiring decisions). At the discretion of the chair, the president of the PGSA may be invited to attend (a) certain department meetings (or parts of them) and (b) certain interviews of potential hires.

IV SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE POLICY

Faculty and staff 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/>

V REVISION OF THESE BYLAWS

Any voting member of the department may propose revisions to these bylaws. Revisions must be approved by a 2/3 majority of the members of the department in a secret ballot.

Appendix I

Department of Philosophy
Florida State University
Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

1. Procedure

1.1 Faculty Evaluation File

For each faculty member there is a faculty evaluation file containing (see the relevant sections of the department's bylaws): Assignments of Responsibilities, Faculty Activities Reports, Annual Evaluation Summaries, and Annual Letters pertaining to Progress toward Promotion and/or Tenure. There may also be additional material, such as student and/or peer evaluations of teaching, book reviews, and unsolicited, signed letters pertaining to teaching, research, or service.

1.2 Recommendation for Promotion and/or Tenure

The department's promotion and tenure committee (PTC) conducts an annual review (see II.B.2, II.B.5) of all faculty members eligible for promotion and/or tenure the following year and makes a preliminary determination, based on the material in the evaluation file, as to whether the candidate has met the university, College of Arts and Sciences (if applicable), and department standards for promotion and/or tenure. The candidate is informed in writing of the result of this preliminary review, and may withdraw from consideration within five working days of receipt of this notification. If the candidate does not withdraw from consideration, the preparation of the binder begins and, in the case of ranked faculty, the requisite letters from external referees are sought. In this latter case the PTC and the candidate each compile lists of potential external referees, and the chair then solicits letters from a suitable number of referees, some from each list.

Matters then proceed in accord with the *Faculty Handbook* (the PTC serves as a promotion committee in the case of both ranked faculty and specialized faculty being considered for promotion) and the annual promotion and tenure memorandum from the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement.

Faculty members being appraised for promotion and/or tenure are kept informed at each step in the process and may withdraw from consideration at any level.

2. Criteria

2.1 Ranked Faculty

The evaluation of **research** has both qualitative and quantitative components. Concerning quality, whatever articles, books, or units (see below) are presented as evidence of research must be substantial contributions of high quality, as judged by the department with the help of external referees. Indeed, fewer pieces of very high quality will count for more than a larger number of low quality pieces.

Articles should be published in reputable journals, and books by reputable publishers. The department maintains a list of such journals and publishers (available in the philosophy main office), which is updated periodically. The department recognizes, however, that certain important specialist journals and publishers may not appear on this list. Such venues will be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Untenured ranked faculty should consult with their research mentors before preparing submissions to such venues.

Concerning quantity, while the department cannot lay down hard and fast rules given the considerations of quality, something on the order of five refereed articles (a chapter in a refereed edited volume may count as equivalent to a refereed article) published or accepted for publication plus two further units (see below), or a published book plus two further units, will ordinarily be considered adequate for the granting of tenure and promotion to associate professor, provided the work is of sufficient quality and goes well beyond the candidate's Ph.D. dissertation. A unit for these purposes is a book chapter or an article that, whether published or not, is of publishable standard.

For promotion to full professor, continued publication is expected.

In the area of **teaching**, the most weight is to be placed on peer evaluation, although due consideration is also given to student evaluations.

In the area of **service**, duties for an untenured faculty member should ideally be kept to a minimum, but any duties or offices that are undertaken will certainly be given due weight in promotion and tenure considerations.

2.2 Specialized Faculty

Specialized faculty will be assessed for promotion in accord with their annual evaluations, as reflected in their Annual Letters pertaining to Progress toward Promotion. These in turn depend upon their weighted performances in their areas of responsibility (as per their annual assignments). A record of excellence over a period of years that accords with the policies of the College of Arts and Sciences and the University normally suffices for promotion.

Appendix II

Department of Philosophy
Florida State University
Criteria and Procedures for Third-year Review of Untenured Tenure-Track Assistant Professors

Background

The background and purpose of the third-year review are best summed up by a statement from a former Provost:

The process of earning tenure generally lasts six years, during which the candidate's teaching, research, and service are evaluated by faculty peers. Annual evaluations are required and should be taken very seriously. There is also the expectation at Florida State University that a careful and detailed evaluation will occur at the end of the third year, specifically to serve as the basis for advice to the candidate on the progress being made toward a positive tenure evaluation.

(Note that the third-year review will be based on the first two and one half years of work at Florida State University: see below.)

Procedure

The review is initiated by the candidate's third-year review committee (see I.D.6). This committee evaluates all the available evidence of the teaching, research, and service achievements of the candidate, up through December 31 of the third year of service. The committee then recommends appropriate action concerning retention to the promotion and tenure committee (PTC) of the department, and produces a draft of a letter to the candidate. This third-year letter should give reasons for the committee's recommendation, and include in addition, if applicable, further goals to be achieved by the candidate by May of the candidate's fifth year of service (which is when the process of assembling the binder for tenure and promotion to associate professor typically begins). The PTC then meets to discuss the third-year review committee's findings, to vote on whether to retain the candidate, and to finalize the third-year letter.

The third-year letter, signed by the chair on behalf of the PTC, is to be given to the candidate by the end of April in the third year of service.

The following materials, for the period from the candidate's date of hire at the Florida State University up through December 31 of the third year of service, should be assembled by the end of March in that year:

Evidence Regarding Teaching

- (1) A list of teaching responsibilities.
- (2) Syllabi, tests, quizzes, examinations, other teaching materials, and student evaluations for all classes.
- (3) Faculty reports of classroom observations.
- (4) A description of the faculty member's role in supervising graduate students.

Evidence Regarding Research

(1) Copies of publications, works accepted for publication, and any other works that the faculty member would like considered (such as papers or books submitted for publication, papers delivered at professional meetings, or works in progress).

(2) Documentation of research grants awarded or copies of proposals for such grants.

Evidence Regarding Service

(1) A list of any committee memberships at any level of the university, or outside it, that the faculty member considers relevant, with descriptions of the faculty member's role where this is not obvious.

(2) Descriptions of any other relevant service activities.

Criteria

As teaching, research, and, often, service, are mutually interdependent activities in a department that has both major undergraduate teaching responsibilities and a graduate program, the department seeks faculty who will make significant and innovative contributions at all levels and in all areas. However, faculty who are new to the profession are normally expected to devote their major efforts to teaching and research, saving service responsibilities for a time when they have become better established in the profession.

In the area of official **service**, then, some service on committees at any level of the university is normally considered sufficient. Unofficially, of course, there is the expectation that the faculty member will play a role in completing all the tasks that are the duty of all department members.

In the area of **teaching**, the most weight is to be placed on peer evaluation, although due consideration is also given to student evaluations. The peer evaluators will be looking for:

- energetic teachers using imaginative methods in presenting, with clarity, philosophical problems and materials to students;
- challenging and high expectations for student performance;
- coverage of pertinent materials and, where relevant, recent research results (including those of the faculty member);
- the cultivation of the intellectual growth and independent philosophical maturity of the students, both undergraduate and graduate.

In the area of **research**, given the criteria for the granting of tenure and promotion to associate professor (see Appendix I(2.1)), the department would expect to see **one** of the following completed by December 31 of the third year of service and written since employment at the Florida State University:

(1) something on the order of one or two articles published or accepted for publication in reputable journals, plus one or two further units (as defined in Appendix I(2.1));

(2) book chapters sufficient to give the PTC good reason to expect that the proposed book will be published by May of the candidate's fifth year with a reputable publisher.

The department maintains a list of reputable journals and publishers, which is updated periodically and is available in the philosophy main office.

(In general, in the interests of spreading risk, untenured faculty are advised to focus upon articles rather than a book.)

Since it is expected that for the granting of tenure and promotion to associate professor the candidate's research will go well beyond the Ph.D., the third-year review committee will compare the work presented for the third-year review with the candidate's Ph.D. dissertation in order to ensure that this requirement will be met. The expectation is that although the candidate's early work may be based upon the Ph.D., there should be evidence of progress beyond it by the time of the third-year review.