

BYLAWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

HISTORY DEPARTMENT BYLAWS REVISED October 2020 and approved through secret ballot by a two-thirds majority of department members as specified in Bylaws 29.1.

The department bylaws adhere to and are consistent with University policies found in the FSU Constitution, BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement, Faculty Handbook, and Annual Promotion and Tenure Letter.

1.0 Membership

Tenure-track and tenured faculty in the department have full membership in the department. They have the right to vote on all issues in department meetings, except where explicitly prohibited as in promotion decisions (see 6.1). Specialized faculty are non-voting members except where otherwise expressly indicated.

2.0 Chair

2.1. The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences shall appoint the chair on recommendation of an ad hoc departmental committee elected by the department and approved by the Dean. The committee will have three members, one for each rank, and the full professor will chair the committee. The dean will choose a faculty member from outside the department to serve on the committee. This committee will poll each departmental member for nominations, conduct an election by secret ballot, and forward the complete results of each ballot to the Dean. Balloting shall continue until a candidate receives a three-fourths vote of the members of the department. If no candidate receives a three-fourths vote, the results of the impasse will be forwarded to the Dean for resolution. The departmental full-time A&P and USPS staff combined are allowed one combined vote, and specialized faculty are allowed one combined vote, in the nomination process for a new departmental chair.

2.2 The chair is the chief executive agent of the department and acts with the advice and consent of the department in all matters of administrative and academic policy and procedure. The chief departmental duties of the chair are faculty development, curriculum development, program review, and budget matters, and in the performance of these duties the chair shall be responsible both to the members of the department and to the Dean. The chair represents the department in its relations with other departments and divisions of the University as well as with non-university organizations and individuals. The chair may delegate authority to other appropriate persons or committees in the department. Any delegation of authority shall be announced at departmental meetings or indicated in memoranda to the department.

2.3 The chair will prepare the Assignments of Responsibilities for all faculty members, including specialized faculty. The chair is responsible for writing all faculty "The Annual Evaluation Narrative" that is appended to their Annual Evaluation Summary Form. Additionally, there is to be a letter written for promotion and tenure progress for untenured assistant professors (except in those years where the candidate undergoes 2nd and 4th or 3rd year review by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, in those years the P&T review replaces the "progress" letter.) and a progress toward promotion letter for all regular faculty, tenure-track and specialized faculty, who have not attained the highest rank in their classification track.

2.4 The chair shall be appointed for a term of three years and may serve more than one term.

2.5 If the department wishes to reconsider the appointment of the chair during his or her term, a request to this effect may be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences with the

signatures of at least one-half of the members of the department. From this point the department should follow the process in section 2.1.

2.6 The chair may request to be relieved of administrative duties at any time. This resignation will become effective upon the appointment of a successor. If circumstances require that the resignation occur immediately, the department will petition the Dean to appoint an associate chair as acting chair until a new chair is selected by the normal process.

3.0 Associate Chairs

3.1 There are two associate chairs: associate chair for graduate studies and associate chair for undergraduate studies.

3.2 The associate chairs shall be appointed by the chair and approved by majority vote of the members of the department. The term of each appointment shall be at the discretion of the chair and the consent of the associate chairs.

3.3 The associate chair for graduate studies shall act as chair in the absence of the chair. If the associate chair for graduate studies is absent or unable to serve, the associate chair for undergraduate studies shall act as chair. If the departmental chair is to be absent for more than four consecutive weeks, he or she shall request that the dean appoint an acting chair until the regular chair returns. On all occasions both the regular departmental chair as well as the acting chair shall be bound by the advice and consent of the department.

3.4 The associate chairs shall be the representatives of the chair for those purposes assigned to them by the chair. The associate chair for graduate studies shall chair the graduate studies committee, and the associate chair for undergraduate studies shall oversee undergraduate matters and schedule departmental courses.

4.0 Committees

4.1 The department regularly has a number of permanent and ad hoc committees which assist in the administration of the business of the department. Each committee has rules of procedure which may change periodically. These procedures as well as the deliberations and conclusions of each committee are subject to review and evaluation by the department, except as qualified in section 4.3.

4.2 With the advice of the associate chairs, the chair shall appoint all committees (except the executive committee) at the commencement of the fall semester, or as needs for ad hoc committees arise. The chair may appoint students or members of the departmental professional staff to appropriate committees.

4.3 Actions of all committees (except personnel committees) shall be subject to departmental review and reconsideration at all times.

4.4 In departmental meetings as well as in departmental committee meetings, a majority is defined as those votes cast in favor of a resolution excluding abstentions. Where the Bylaws call for a two-thirds vote of the members of the department (i.e., Amendments to the Bylaws), a majority consists of two-thirds of the members of the department (not simply two-thirds of those present) who cast votes in favor of the resolution. Where the Bylaws call for a three-fourths vote of the members of the department (e.g., election of chair), a majority consists of three-fourths of those who cast votes.

5.0 Executive Committee

5.1 The executive committee shall be elected at the beginning of each academic year at the time of the first departmental meeting of the fall semester. It shall be composed of one full, one associate, and one assistant professor. Faculty will caucus independently by rank and elect representatives by secret ballot. An alternate will be elected for each representative. Members of the executive committee may serve no more than two consecutive terms.

5.2 The departmental chair shall be a non-voting member of the executive committee and shall serve as its chair. The associate chairs may attend executive committee meetings on a non-voting ex-officio basis.

5.3 The executive committee shall assist the departmental chair in determining departmental policy and procedure. It shall act as a body of primary initiative in those areas where there are no committees and as a review agency for all other committees when it considers this appropriate. The executive committee shall undertake computer laboratory, institute, center and program review on a rotating basis, according to Section 26.0. The executive committee shall normally meet at least once every month during the academic year. Its decisions shall be announced at the next departmental meeting.

5.4 While the Executive Committee will be involved in determining departmental policy and procedure, there may be major organizational decisions pertaining to the nature of the graduate or undergraduate programs. If such changes lead to a reorganization of the department, they must be approved by a two-thirds majority in a secret ballot vote of faculty as defined in 1.0 above.

6.0 Promotion and Tenure Committees

6.1 The Tenure committee comprises all tenured members of the department with the department chair serving as its chair. It makes recommendations to the chair concerning the tenure of tenure track department members. The Promotion committee comprises all full professors in the department with the department chair serving as its chair. It makes recommendations to the department chair concerning promotions for tenured or tenure track faculty. These recommendations are forwarded by the department chair to the Humanities Area Promotion and Tenure Committee.

6.2 The responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure committees include the review of the candidates' binders for promotion and tenure and recommendation to the dean regarding a candidate's retention, tenure, promotion, or termination.

6.3 The Promotion and Tenure committees will select one of their members to serve as the department representative on the humanities divisional promotion and tenure committee. It has been customary for this person to be the Department Chair.

6.4 The Promotion and Tenure Committees (as in section 6.1) will vote on the promotions of specialized faculty. Further specifics on the promotion of specialized faculty may be found in Appendix E.

6.5 Further specifics regarding the Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure and Information Regarding Promotion and Tenure may be found in Appendix A.

6.6 Specialized faculty members have separate standards for promotion which are detailed in Appendix E of the department bylaws.

7.0 Annual Review of Faculty in 2nd and 4th year or 3rd year: 2nd and 4th Year or 3rd Year Promotion and Tenure Committee Review shall be undertaken by a sub-committee of the combined Promotion and Tenure Committees.

7.1 The annual evaluation of faculty in the 2nd and 4th year or 3rd year will be undertaken by the chair after receiving the report from the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

7.2 The responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee for 2nd and 4th year or 3rd year review include review of the candidate by the procedures and standards set forth in the Department of History Guidelines for The Review of Faculty in the Second and Fourth Years (see Appendix C).

8.0 Salary Committee

8.1 The salary committee is comprised of approximately one third of the faculty. Insofar as is possible, faculty members should serve no more than once in any given three-year period. Each year the previous members are replaced by the next group at the top of a rotating list of all tenured and tenure-earning faculty members in the department. After that group has served it in turn goes to the bottom of the list and works its way back up. New faculty members begin at the bottom of the list.

8.2 The salary committee recommends to the chair the distribution of merit funds, consistent with the salary procedures departmentally approved. This applies to all tenure-track and tenured faculty, and to all fulltime non-tenure track faculty members—each according to their individual assignments of responsibility. (See Appendices B and D.)

8.3 Appendix B to the Bylaws, the Salary Procedures of the History Department, can be altered without a vote in the following minor ways: the due dates for submitted materials and; the dates covered by each annual review. That is, minor changes that do not alter the basic procedures as outlined in Appendix B. The reasoning is that the salary procedures are changed in these minor ways every year. The department does want to keep the salary procedures (Appendix B) part of the Bylaws, however, so it will not be able to be changed in any meaningful way without a quorum vote.

9.0 Graduate Studies Committee

9.1 This committee has primary responsibility, in consultation with the chair, for administering the departmental graduate program and the admission and retention of graduate students. The associate chair for graduate studies shall chair this committee. This committee awards graduate financial aid, including assistantships and fellowships, and maintains an updated graduate handbook.

10.0 Curriculum Committee:

10.1 The curriculum committee shall advise on planning course offerings and is responsible for recommending new courses as well as the modification or deletion of existing courses. The Committee will also advise on the requirements for the undergraduate History major, undergraduate recruitment and retention.

10.2 All substantial changes to the curriculum—including new courses, pre-requisites, substantial changes to Liberal Studies courses, etc., at both the graduate and undergraduate—must be approved by the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the Chair in consultation with the Curriculum Committee.

11.0 New Faculty Search Committees

11.1 The chair shall appoint search committees when appropriate to solicit and screen candidates for all vacant full-time positions and all new full-time positions. The deliberations of the search committees will be presented to the department, which will make the final decisions by majority vote.

11.2 The department as a whole, in a departmental meeting, preferably in the spring, should decide on the area (Europe, US, etc.) and field (political, social, etc.) and, if appropriate, additional subfields or specializations of all job searches anticipated for the following year. Early in the fall semester each search committee should meet to agree on the specific content of the job ad. The draft ad should then go to the department chair for approval. Ads should request that applications be addressed to the department chair. All applications should be processed by the office staff through OMNI and whatever other software portals might apply.

11.3 After the department has chosen a candidate by vote, the department will also by vote decide whether it wants to ask the college and university to promote and/or tenure the candidate on appointment. If the vote is yes, the department's promotion and/or tenure committees will deliberate and vote on the case. The Dean will make the binding offer to new faculty.

12.0 Public Relations Committee

12.1 The public relations committee shall announce departmental activities to the media. This committee assists the chair in preparing an annual newsletter for distribution to faculty, staff, and current and past students.

13.0 Faculty Travel Committee

13.1 The faculty travel committee recommends to the chair the disbursement of travel funds. At the commencement of each fall semester faculty members will indicate the meetings they anticipate attending as official representatives of the department.

14.0 Wright and Richardson Awards Committee

14.1 This committee administers the competitions for the Wright and Richardson prizes as stipulated in the graduate handbook.

15.0 Graduate Fellowship Committee

15.1 This committee shall award the Walbolt and Martin-Vegue Dissertation Fellowships as well as any other endowed fellowships for graduate students. The Committee shall solicit fellowship applications from graduate students in the spring and/or fall semester and shall announce awards for the following academic year before the final department meeting of said semester.

16.0 Reichelt Oral History Committee

16.1 This committee shall award grants to faculty and/or graduate students engaged in some aspect of oral history. The committee will solicit proposals in the spring and/or fall semester and shall announce awards for the following academic year before the final department meeting of said semester.

17.0 Colloquia and Visiting Lectures Committee

17.1 This committee arranges colloquia and lectures by invited speakers.

18.0 Computing and Technology Committee

18.1 A director of computing and technology shall be appointed by the chair and approved by a majority vote of the members of the department. The term of the director of computing and

technology shall be at the discretion of the chair and the consent of the appointee. The director of computing and technology shall be responsible for overseeing the day-to-day operations of the computer lab and of its staff and for implementing policy as determined by a Computing and Technology Committee. The director will also serve as chair of a Computing and Technology Committee to be appointed by the department chair. The committee's responsibilities will include formulating operating procedures for the departmental computer lab, establishing policy for the allocation of technology resources within the department, overseeing the distribution of those resources, and overseeing the staffing of the computer lab. The committee will consist of one tenured and one untenured faculty member. The department chair may attend committee meetings on an ex-officio basis.

18.2 Institutes and Computers Policy (adopted by Faculty). The department will try to buy a limited number of computers for each departmental institute or unit. All institutes in the department will be allowed to request computers, through the Computer Committee, to be purchased with OCO money. Based on the department's available OCO resources at the time (decided by Arts and Sciences), the Computer Committee and Department Chair will prioritize the requests using the following criteria:

- ✦ the age of the computers to be replaced
- ✦ the amount of outside funding each particular institute has to buy its own computers
- ✦ the need by the particular institute for an expanded number of computers.

Any computer that is bought by the department for an institute will be provided with software by the department. Any institute that buys a computer with its own money will be responsible for buying the software.

All institutes will need to abide by the department's rules on site licenses and other relevant policies, such as:

- Regardless of who purchased the machines or the software, the installation of software will be done by the Director of Computing Technology or by someone designated by him or her.
- Software will only be installed once the purchase of licenses has been verified and OCS has approved the installations.

19.0 Reviews and Assessments Committee

17.1 The process of internal and external assessment is crucial to the development of a high quality program in history, and should be viewed by all faculty as an opportunity to note areas of excellence as well as areas needing further development and additional resources. The review process permits the department to note benchmarks achieved and to set new goals for the future.

17.2 When any internal or external study is to be done of the History Department with respect to scholarship, productivity, or assessment (e.g., Quality Enhancement Review, SACS study), the chair shall appoint a committee to help gather and produce the department's reports. Care shall be taken to solicit materials and input from faculty in all ranks.

20.0 Annual Evaluation

20.1 As stated in the *Faculty Handbook*, "The chair of the department shall review and evaluate the teaching, research or creative activities, service, and other university duties of each member of that department during each academic year." This applies to all tenure-track and tenured faculty, and to all fulltime specialized faculty members—each according to their individual assignments of responsibilities.

20.2 Prior to undertaking the annual evaluation of the faculty, the chair will seek advice from the salary committee, together with the two associate chairs.

20.3 The annual review of faculty in the second and fourth years will be undertaken by the chair after receiving the report of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

20.4 Faculty Annual Evaluations will occur during the spring semester of each year and will take into account performance of assigned duties over the past three years. The evaluator reviews all documentation/data submitted by each faculty member as well as pertinent information from other sources as applicable, including peer review, and completes the Annual Evaluation Summary Form indicating one of the five performance rating categories below. All evaluations must contain a narrative explanation attached to the 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 demonstrating noted achievements in teaching, research, and service, which may include several of the following: high level of research/creative activity, professional recognitions, willingness to accept additional responsibilities, high level of commitment to serving students and the overall mission of the Department, involvement/leadership in professional associations, initiative in solving problems or developing new ideas.
- “Substantially Exceeds High Expectations” – This describes a faculty member who far exceeds performance expectations during the evaluation period and achieves an extraordinary accomplishment or recognition in teaching, research, and service, which may include several of the following: highly significant research or creative activities; demonstrated recognition of the individual by peers as an authority in his/her field; securing significant external funding; attaining significant national or international achievements, awards, and recognition.

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.

If an individual’s overall performance rating falls below “Meets FSU’s High Expectations,” specific suggestions for improvement should be provided to the employee.

20.5 Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) Provisions: A PIP is required when a non-tenured faculty member receives a “Does Not Meet FSU’s High Expectations” rating. Tenured faculty members may be placed on a PIP if they receive an overall performance rating of “Does Not Meet FSU’s High Expectations” on three or more of the previous six performance evaluations.

21.0 Departmental Meetings

21.1 The department shall customarily hold meetings once a month during the academic year. Decisions shall be reached by a majority vote of the members present (except in bylaws revision and election of departmental chair).

21.2 The chair shall preside at these meetings. In his or her absence, the associate chair for graduate studies or the associate chair for undergraduate studies shall preside.

21.3 An agenda shall be circulated prior to the meetings and a complete set of minutes shall be distributed to the department within a week. The chair will designate a faculty member to keep the meeting minutes.

21.4 The chair will solicit agenda items approximately one week prior to the monthly department meeting. Any faculty member may suggest agenda items.

21.5 If for some reason a faculty member would like to call a faculty meeting in addition to the normally scheduled meetings, she or he may make that request, in writing, to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee will confer with the chair and the three members of the Executive Committee will determine, through secret vote, whether or not the meeting is needed. If the Committee votes in the affirmative, the chair will call a department meeting within a month of the Committee’s affirmative vote.

22.0 Teaching Loads and Assignments to Research

22.1 Teaching loads and assignments to research shall be monitored by the chair, who will report decisions to the departmental members affected and, at the chair’s discretion, to the department.

22.2 The chair shall seek advice from a committee composed of the members of the executive committee plus the two associate chairs, all of whom will have voting privileges.

23.0 Summer Teaching

23.1 The chair will assign faculty to teach in summer terms consistent with available funding and a posted rotating list of eligible faculty.

24.0 Graduate Student Association

24.1 The Graduate Student Association represents student views to the faculty. The Graduate Student Association will be elected by graduate and undergraduate history majors annually. Phi Alpha Theta will conduct the elections and report the results to the department.

24.2 Members of this committee may attend departmental meetings and have one vote. The Graduate Student Association is allowed one vote in the nomination process for a new departmental chair.

24.3 The Graduate Student Association may send a representative to meetings of the Graduate Studies Committee, where this representative will have a vote unless the committee decides there is a potential conflict of interest, such as prioritizing and awarding financial aid. The Graduate Student Association may petition other departmental committees to present its views to these committees.

24.4 The Graduate Student Association shall elect a representative for each New Faculty Search Committee (as in section 11.0) to serve in an ex-officio capacity. The student representatives shall join the committee at the point when it begins its deliberations on applications.

25.0 Election of Departmental Representatives to Faculty Senate

25.1 The department will elect its faculty senator(s) and official alternate(s) as specified by the constitution of the faculty senate. The department senator(s) is/are responsible for attending faculty senate meetings and keeping the department apprised of developments affecting the department and its members.

26.0 Courtesy and Emeritus Appointments

24.1 The department may extend courtesy and emeritus appointments to individuals. Those who receive these appointments do not vote on departmental issues or receive funding from the history department, nor do they customarily attend its meetings.

27.0 Adjunct Appointments:

27.1 Professionals teaching for the Historical Administration and Public History (HAPH) program shall be appointed by the chair on the recommendation of the HAPH director.

27.2 Adjuncts do not vote on departmental issues, nor do they customarily attend departmental meetings.

27.3 Each year the Executive Committee will review the record of adjunct, instructors, or specialized faculty, according to their assignments of responsibility, and make recommendations to the department with respect to problems that are evident. Evaluation of syllabi, teaching, and student evaluation forms will be part of this assessment.

28.0 Computer Laboratory, Institute, Center, and Program Review

28.1 Each year, one-third of the department's units will be reviewed by the Executive Committee, so that in every three-year period all will have been reviewed. The head faculty member of each of the units to be reviewed will be responsible for preparing a report on how much money and other resources (equipment, graduate assistants, etc.) it has received and what output it has produced since the previous review. The head faculty member would also report to the committee the goals of the laboratory, institute, center or program and what had or had not been accomplished toward achieving those goals since the previous review. The Executive Committee shall make recommendations to the department chair about the further allocation of resources to each laboratory, institute, or center after it receives and reviews the material submitted.

29.0 Amendments:

29.1 These bylaws may be amended by secret vote of the members of the department provided that the proposed change has been circulated in writing at least one week prior to the voting. Two thirds of the members of the department (as opposed to two-thirds voting) must approve the proposed change. In order to facilitate this process and accommodate the quantity and rate of expected changes, the Chair may request a review and a vote without convening a department meeting. If, however, faculty members wish to discuss proposed changes, they may request that the Chair postpone the vote until adequate discussion has taken place. They may also request that the Chair convene a meeting to discuss proposed changes to the bylaws.

29.2 These bylaws are to be provided to all new members of the faculty upon hiring, and are to be placed on the department's website for continued ease of access by all department members.

29.3 For the purposes of computing a quorum that may revise the bylaws in 27.1, "two-thirds of the members of the department" will include all tenured or tenure-track faculty members who are in the department (not simply two-thirds of those present), but shall exclude those individuals who are currently on research leave.

Appendix A: Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

Appendix B: Salary **Procedures**

Appendix C: Guidelines For The Review of Faculty in the Third or Second and Fourth Years

Appendix D: Salary Committee Guidelines

Appendix E: Non-Tenure Track Faculty Criteria for Promotion

Appendix F: Annual Evaluation Summary Form

Appendix G: Mission Statement

Appendix H: SACS Substantive Change Policy

APPENDIX A
TO THE BYLAWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY:
PROMOTION & TENURE STANDARDS

The following are the approximate standards for tenure and for promotion to associate professor in the department of history.

RESEARCH CRITERIA:

- A book with a reputable press. This means one that is consistent with the department's ambition to be nationally recognized as a major research university. The book should at least be in page proofs by the beginning of the candidate's sixth year, when the department's vote on promotion and tenure is taken.
- Significant progress must be made toward the second project. Such progress should constitute a minimum of 3 units, which may be in some combination of published articles, submitted articles, chapters in edited books, chapters for the candidate's second book, conference papers, or grants (submitted or approved).
- There is no fixed number of years a candidate needs to wait in rank before being proposed by the department for promotion, although the dean should support the candidate. Early tenure is more difficult, but can sometimes be accomplished a year early with the support of the dean.
- In assessing an ongoing program of research for Public Historians as part of the "progress toward tenure" and "awarding tenure," the department recognizes scholarly production that is non-traditional as elaborated upon below and which may not result exclusively in a second monograph. The ongoing program of research as evidence of scholarly production beyond the first monograph should be noticeably different from the first. In the "Candidate's Statement on Research Activity" for tenure and promotion it is the responsibility of the applicant to explain the relative value of the research project. (i. e. 10 to 25 object/artifact museum exhibit may equate to a journal article).

The following are the approximate standards for promotion to full professor in the department of history.

- A second book with a reputable press. This means one that is consistent with the department's ambition to be nationally recognized as a major research university. The book should already be published and in the binder by the time the department's vote on promotion and tenure is taken.
- There is no fixed number of years a candidate needs to wait in rank before being proposed by the department for promotion, although the dean should support the candidate.
- In assessing promotion for Public Historians, the department

recognizes scholarly production that evidences continuing success in transferring historical knowledge that demonstrates development in quality, maturity, significance, and originality. If there is not a second monograph, it is the responsibility of the applicant for promotion to explain the equivalent value of non-traditional scholarship: article, several articles, or monograph.

 Protocol to Definition of "Traditional" Historical Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion, Yearly Review, and Merit Considerations

Why consider changes in widening the definition of historical scholarship?

Over the last decade or so, in conferences and through *Perspectives*, the issue of non-traditional scholarship (work that does not take the form of a standard monograph or journal article) has been raised numerous times, mainly because the Internet has become such a powerful informational force.¹ The AHA Ad Hoc Committee on Redefining Scholarly Work began the debate in 1993, contending that redefining scholarship would not and should not diminish historical research but "rather extend and enhance it."² The AHA formalized the principle in its 2000 statement on "Best Practices," encouraging department chairs and administrators "to think creatively about how research is evaluated and linked to faculty and graduate student rewards, and about how research techniques and presentation formats can be adapted to new forms of presentation (such as electronic presentations, documentaries, and museum exhibitions)."³ Later in the same article, the AHA further recommended that: "Procedures should be established for evaluating non-traditional research products, such as software, electronic publications, museum exhibitions, and documentary films."⁴

Second, other universities have begun to debate the issue, and to put into place policies regarding non-traditional (mainly digital) scholarship. As early as 2000, a response by history department chairs to a survey of attitudes and practices concerning digital scholarship revealed that over half the responding chairs "valued" publications in electronic peer-reviewed journals in the tenure, promotion, and review process.⁵

□
 □

¹ In the last decade, *Perspectives* has carried numerous articles on history and digital media. See Elizabeth Fairhead and Robert B. Townsend, "Before the Meeting: A Discussion about History's Electronic Future," 41 (April 2004), 25-27

² "Redefining Historical Scholarship," available at <http://www.historians.org/governance/tfph/TFPHreport.htm>.

³ AHA [authored by the Research Division of the AHA], "Best Practices," "Encouraging Research Excellence in Postsecondary History Education," *Perspectives*, 38 (October 2000).

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ American Association for History and Computing guidelines for "Evaluating Digital Media Activities in Tenure, Review, and Promotion." *JAHC* Vol. III, no. 3, (Nov. 2000) and "One or Two is Not a Problem or

What are the issues to be considered? Specifically, what are the forms of non-traditional scholarship to be considered? How should each form be evaluated for promotion, tenure and merit?

Forms of non-traditional scholarship: Digital/electronic scholarship

- e-journals
- e-books (e.g.Gutenberg-e)
- CD-ROMs:
 - A. Teaching CD-ROMS.** Example: "Who Built America" Part II: From the Great War of 1914 to the Dawn of the Atomic Age in 1946" by Roy Rosenzweig's The American Social History Project. This is an example of media for historians and teachers to use in the classroom. (It contains historical video clips, songs, speeches, recordings, images, as well as graphs, charts, games, interactive maps and thousands of pages of primary text documents.) www.whobuiltamerica.org.⁶
 - B. Research CD-ROMs** They contain data and resources for primary research—for example documents, diaries or databases. An example of the latter might be David Eltis' *Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade: A Database on CD-ROM* (Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Websites:

Websites vary widely. Some are used for teaching individual classes, others are for use in the classrooms ("The Valley of the Shadow"), still others are for research (IPUMS, contain samples of the U.S. censuses), and finally some combine the above.

 - A. Individual websites:** Clearly, those websites created by faculty for use by their classes are not research but belongs under teaching (and certainly should be considered in evaluating teaching.
 - B. Classroom websites:** These are websites created by faculty as teaching aids to be used on the Internet by other faculty's students. An example might be "The Valley of the Shadow," an early award-winning site or a soon-to-appear inter-active Internet project by Emory University making student-friendly David Eltis' *The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade* CD.
- Electronic databases:
 - A. Database meant solely for the individual historian's own use** should be considered under the annual evaluation, but not separately for promotion and tenure, because it is assumed that the database will lead to publications. (i. e. evidence of ongoing scholarly work for publication).
-
-

Technology in the Tenure, Promotion, and Review Process. A Survey of Current Practices in U.S. History Departments," *JAH*, IV, no. 1 (April 2001) both available at <http://mcel.pacificu.edu/JAHC>

⁶ There are many others, of course, among them "After the Fact Interactive: The Visible and Invisible Worlds of Salem (McGraw Hill, 2002), "Migration in Modern World History," Patrick Manning, Northeastern University's World History Center, 2001.

B. Database that is meant for use by other historians, available either on a website or CDROM (or archived as in the ICPSR archive) should be evaluated as research.

Forms of non-traditional scholarship: Public History

In December 2003, the AHA Task Force on Public History defined public historians as such: "Public historians are simply those who 'do history' outside the academy, whatever their primary locus of employment, whatever the specific nature of their historical work. What they do, as historians, constitutes public history." The task force worked under the supposition that public history is not "a distinct subset or constituency of the historical profession, but [viewed public history] in the broader sense of education for and engagement with the public and, as such, a legitimate dimension of the work of all professional historians." Yet, they also "recognize[d] that public history defines a specific kind of historical practice and that public historians have common interests."⁷ The general goal of public historians, as stated by the National Council for Public History, is to "make the public aware of the value, uses, and pleasures of history."⁸

What forms does it take? The production and presentation of knowledge for non-specialized audiences can take a variety of forms but most commonly as

- exhibits,
- oral histories,
- consultative reports,
- archival administration,
- audio and visual productions,
- magazine articles designed for broad audiences,
- publications designed specifically for classroom use,
- historical preservation and cultural resource management projects,
- digital presentations of history in the forms of cd-roms and websites
- and public programming in museums and other cultural and educational institutions

While non-traditional in form, these entities will be considered scholarly productions of historical knowledge when subject to external review.

Evaluations

Peer Review. Whatever the form, peer review is essential. Works should

- _____
-

⁷ "Public History, Public Historians, and the American Historical Association Report of the Task Force on Public History Submitted to the Council of the Association, December 2003" <http://www.historians.org/governance/tfph/Background.htm>

⁸ "NCPH Mission." <http://www.ncph.org/>

be blind, peer reviewed; juried; non-blind, peer reviewed; or invited.

E-publishing should have the same review process as hard copy publishing. It is expected that e-journals use a single or double "blind" peer review system.

Digital/Electronic Scholarship. The "Best Practices" statement of the Association of History and Computing (AAHC) recommends that persons who work in digital media should have their work evaluated by persons knowledgeable about the use of the media in the candidate's field (i. e. outside letters for Tenure and Promotion). The receipt of external grants and external review of digital/electronic scholarship, for instance, are measures of evidence of achievement appropriate to the discipline.

Public History. Given the variety of contexts within which public history is produced and presented, it may not always be subject to a "blind" peer review process. Yet, this does not mean that it is not subject to professional review for the purpose of assessing research accomplishments. The receipt of external grants and external review of exhibits, for instance, are measures of evidence of achievement appropriate to the discipline. This department recognizes the need to allow for diverse methods of peer review in keeping with university policy⁹

Annual performance review as part of "Progress Toward Tenure and Promotion". As part of the annual performance review in marking "Progress Toward Tenure" consideration will be given to non-traditional scholarship activities, as described above.

Responsibility of faculty who work in digital media or other non-traditional scholarship to document and explain their work. Faculty should be prepared to explain their work. The following is, in part, suggested by the AAHC Best Practices:

- They should be prepared to show the relevance of their work in research, teaching and service, just as do faculty in other fields.
- They should "make explicit the results, theoretical underpinnings, and intellectual rigor of their work."
- They should describe how the work might "overlap or redefine traditional categories."
- Describe the *process* underlying the creation of work. Explain if the creation of the *infrastructure* of the work required original and innovative procedures. (For example, the variable structure of a database may, in and of itself, be a contribution to the field, besides

-
-

⁹ "University Policy and Procedures" See Section 10.4.3 Procedures.
<http://dof.fsu.edu/facultyhandbook/Ch10/Ch10.4.html>

- the data it contains.)
- Negotiate their responsibilities and department roles in their work as regards to research, teaching and service. In return, the department chair or appropriate department members should provide them with a clear understanding of how their work should be evaluated.

Principle: That when institutions hire individuals whose primary research is in the fields of digital media or public history, or when such institutions encourage its faculty to apply for grants and funding that will be used in those fields, those institutions should give equal consideration in the fields of promotion, tenure, review and merit rewards as is given to faculty who work in other fields.

Teaching: Criteria

-
- The committee will assess the candidate's teaching according to the following criteria:
-
- (a) pedagogical skill: teaching ability; command of subject matter and ability to present it to students with clarity;
-
- (b) course structure;
-
- (c) high academic standards
-
-

Service: Criteria

-
- To receive a favorable recommendation in the area of service, the candidate shall meet the three following criteria:
-
- (a) the candidate should have willingly undertaken a reasonable academic-service assignment;
-
- (b) the candidate should have completed, in good standing, any university, college, or department service to which she or he was assigned or for which she or he volunteered, unless the candidate was relieved of this responsibility for reasons other than candidate's failure to perform adequately in that role;
-
-
- (c) evaluation of service shall consider the candidate's contributions to the orderly and effective functioning of the History Department, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Florida State University.

HISTORY DEPARTMENT BYLAWS (Appendix B) REVISED April 2017 and approved through secret ballot by a two-thirds majority of department members as specified in bylaws 29.1.

APPENDIX B
TO THE BYLAWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY:
(Materials for Annual Merit Review. For more details on departmental merit procedures, see Appendix D)

All faculty members are required to undergo evaluation for merit as per 10.4.a of the C.B.A.: “All faculty members will be reviewed for merit.” If you do not wish to be awarded a merit increase, please include a note to that effect with your completed salary materials. **THE DEPARTMENT HAS VOTED THAT INCOMPLETE FILES WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED FOR MERIT PURPOSES.** Newly hired faculty are required to be reviewed for merit but are not eligible for a merit increase until their second year. Also please note that the committee will be applying its annually agreed-upon metrics by rank. Fulls will be evaluated with Fulls; Associates with Associates; Assistants with Assistants.

Annual evaluations and annual evaluations for merit will be based on the following items:

1. Summary of AOR %'s for three-year period, Spring 2018--Fall, 2020
2. Three-year Summary of Accomplishments/Three Year Vita, Spring 2018--Fall, 2020 *
3. Three-year Teaching Summary, Spring 2018--Fall 2020*
4. SPOT/SUSSAI/SPCI Summary Report, Spring 2018--Fall 2020*
5. Grade Distribution (BI through MYFsu Portal)
6. Optional Narrative Statement (No more than 1000 words highlighting particular accomplishments you feel are relevant to the merit review process)
7. Optional Supplemental Materials: Include any teaching award nominations, additional teaching evals, or other evidence of performance not adequately highlighted in the above materials.
8. Seven-year Summary of Accomplishments/Seven Year Vita., Spring 2018--Fall 2020*

*Staff will assemble all items, except nos. 6 & 7. For inclusion in merit files, these should be sent to John Netter **by Friday, March 5.***

**FEAS (Faculty Expertise and Advancement System)*

Please Note: Faculty are responsible for maintaining and updating their individual FEAS vitae. This should be done annually before March 1.

APPENDIX C

TO THE BYLAWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY:

GUIDELINES FOR

THE REVIEW OF FACULTY IN THE THIRD or SECOND and FOURTH YEARS

In the Department the criteria for tenure are laid out in Appendix A.

The review is to ascertain whether an untenured faculty member in her or his **second year and fourth year/third year** at Florida State University has demonstrated both sufficient pedagogical ability and progress toward publication, which, if sustained, would likely result in a positive recommendation for tenure in her or his sixth or seventh year.

Faculty Hired After Spring of 2018: For the **third** year review the candidate will be assessed on her/his progress towards tenure and given advice on how to stay on track.

Faculty Hired Before Spring of 2018: For the **second** year review the candidate will be assessed on her/his progress towards tenure and given advice on how to stay on track.

Faculty Hired Before Spring of 2018: For the **fourth** year review the candidate will be assessed on her/his progress towards tenure and given advice on how to stay on track.

I. Procedures for Faculty Reviews in the Third/Second and Fourth years:

- (1) The candidate shall submit a current and comprehensive binder as outlined in the University Promotion and Tenure memo revised and issued annually through the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement. This binder should be received by the Promotion and Tenure Committee by February 1.
- (2) The Committee will study the binder, discuss the candidate's record, and vote by secret ballot.
- (3) The committee will provide a narrative that summarizes the results of the vote and assesses the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.

The required narrative from the P&T committee that summarizes the review (2nd or 4th, or 3rd as the case may be) should come from the department chair to the Dean. A suggested format, which may be modified or expanded, for such use is:

Summary of Meeting

The P&T committee reviewed the candidate_____for promotion (and/or tenure). A majority of the committee expressed that the candidate's binder provided evidence that the candidate (did not meet/met/exceeded/far exceeded) the norm for his or her discipline in the area of research (similar

sentences can be used for teaching and service). Comments were made regarding the candidate's strength/weakness in the area of ____, as evidenced by_____.

(4) The chair of the department will share the findings with the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

II. Teaching: Classroom Visitations

The chair of the department and two committee members appointed by the chair from the Promotion and Tenure Committee will visit the candidate's classroom and report their findings to the full committee. The candidate will receive at least fourteen days' notice before a visitation is made. The committee members shall visit different classes; the classes may be part of the same course, or they may sample several courses. Visitation should be completed in the fall semester unless the candidate has a fall research assignment.

III. Teaching: Criteria

The committee will assess the candidate's teaching according to the following criteria:

(a) pedagogical skill: teaching ability; command of subject matter and ability to present it to students with clarity;

In evaluating teaching effectiveness, substantial weight is accorded to SPCI. To receive a favorable recommendation in the area of teaching, the candidate's SPCI shall be broadly consistent with the average SPOCI scores in the History Department. The committee will take into account improvement, class size, and course level.

(b) course structure;

(c) high academic standards.

IV. Research: Material to Be Submitted to the Committee

The candidate shall submit a copy of each of her or his unpublished manuscripts and published works to the promotion & tenure committee by February 1.

V. Research: Criteria

To receive a favorable recommendation in the area of research, the candidate shall be making steady progress towards tenure requirements.

VI. Service: Criteria

To receive a favorable recommendation in the area of service, the candidate shall meet the three following criteria:

- (a) the candidate should have willingly undertaken a reasonable academic-service assignment;
- (b) the candidate should have completed, in good standing, any university, college, or department service to which she or he was assigned or for which she or he volunteered, unless the candidate was relieved of this responsibility for reasons other than candidate's failure to perform adequately in that role.
- (c) evaluation of service shall consider the candidate's contributions to the orderly and effective functioning of the History Department, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Florida State University.

HISTORY DEPARTMENT BYLAWS (Appendix D) REVISED November 2019 and approved through secret ballot by a two-thirds majority of department members as specified in Bylaws 27.3.

APPENDIX D

TO THE BYLAWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY:

Merit Procedures

The History Department evaluates merit based on teaching, research, service, and administration, where it applies. The procedures and criteria for this evaluation are described below. These procedures and criteria have been approved by majority vote of the faculty and provided to each faculty member.

I. Procedures

A. The History Department's merit-committee is comprised of approximately one third of the tenured and tenure-earning faculty members. Each year the previous members are replaced by the next group at the top of a rotating list of all tenured and tenure-earning faculty members. After that group has served it in turn goes to the bottom of the list and works its way back up. New faculty members begin at the bottom of the list. Faculty members will serve on the committee about once every three years. Faculty on sabbatical or fellowship will be excused from service. Faculty on a research semester (e.g., those with a 3/3/0 schedule) are required to serve.

B. The committee uses the following procedure:

- 1. FEAS Vitae and all other pertinent materials (see Appendix B) are assembled in electronic files; these are then posted on the department's secure SharePoint site. Each committee member individually examines the salary files of all department members (except herself or himself, spouse, partner, or others for whom there would be a possible conflict of interest).**
- 2. The Merit Committee will meet prior to any formal evaluation to discuss shared criteria for annual merit evaluation. The discussion will establish common norms for each level on the four-point scale, as well as valid reasons for deviating from those norms, given the diversity of ways individuals can contribute to the department. A deadline will be set at this meeting for the submission of the rankings by committee members.**

3. Each merit committee member who has examined the files records his or her evaluations of all faculty and returns the completed merit form to the department business manager. The committee members rate each faculty member on a four-point scale: (1) "Concern," (2) "Satisfactory," (3) "Very Good," and (4) "Outstanding." The department business manager will enter these ratings into a spread sheet which will average committee member ratings and total them for the year using the following percentage of merit formulas:

Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty: 40% Teaching, 40% Research, 20% Service

Specialized Faculty: 90% Teaching, 10% Service. Specialized Faculty with an administrative role: 75% Teaching, 15% Administration, 10% Service.

Faculty Administrators: 40% Teaching, 40% Research, 20% Administration/Service (split evenly) – or – 30% Teaching, 30% Research, 40% Administration/Service(split evenly). Faculty Administrators will choose which of these scales on which they wish to be evaluated and inform the department business manager.

Each faculty members' annual average will then be combined with the two prior years' averages (to insure that merit rankings reflect a three-year assessment period) for a total to be used in establishing the merit ranking.

4. The department manager will forward a spreadsheet indicating final annual merit rankings to the department chair.

5. The Chair will divide the rankings into three categories. All faculty members with a 3.2 or higher three-year average will be categorized as "Level 1." All faculty members with a 2.2 or higher three-year average will be categorized in "Level 2." Faculty with a three-year average below 2.2 will be ranked in "Level 3" and will not be eligible for merit increases. All annual merit raises are contingent on available funding. In years when funding allows, the chair will calculate level 1 raises such that they are twice the amount of Level 2 raises.

6. Each faculty member is notified in writing by the chair of her or his merit category: Level 1; Level 2; or Level 3.

7. Each department member may discuss her or his merit category with the department chair and salary committee.

8. The committee may meet at any time to discuss merit pay procedures and criteria; it may also recommend changes in those procedures and criteria to the department but any substantial changes will follow normal procedures for substantial changes to the department's bylaws.

9. The department chair presides over deliberations of the merit committee but does not rank department members. In the chair's end-of-the-year meeting with the dean, he or she presents the merit committee's rankings to the dean along with his or her own evaluation of departmental members.

II. Criteria

While the Merit Committee may establish shared evaluation criteria, as general guidelines, the department uses the following criteria in evaluating teaching, research, service, and administration.

A. The committee evaluates teaching using such factors as (in no particular order): student course evaluations; involvement in mentoring (membership on undergraduate honor's thesis, master's, and doctoral committees), duties as a major professor, DIS courses, service courses, academic advising and university and departmental teaching awards.

B. The committee evaluates research using such factors as: publications (examples in no particular order: books, articles, book chapters, edited collections, anthologies, exhibits, digital platforms, etc.), participation in professional conferences (examples: presenting papers, serving on professional committees, and chairing sessions), editorship of journals, and professional awards (examples in no particular order: book and article prizes; fellowships and grants).

C. The committee evaluates service using such factors as (in no particular order): substantive contribution on committees essential to the operation of the department, the college, and the university; administrative duties

for the same entities; activity beyond dues-paying status in professional groups; representation of the department or university at professional meetings; and advising student organizations.

D. Administration (See Part III, para. 3)

III. Evaluation of Chair

Following the merit committee's evaluation of the faculty, the chair is rated (1-4) on teaching, research, service, and administration by each member of the committee. The Director of Graduate Studies or other faculty member chosen by the committee compiles and averages the ratings of the chair and communicates the final ratings to the dean. The chair is only able to see the salary committee's final (not individual) rankings of him or her.

The criteria for evaluating the department chair's performance on teaching, research, and service are the same as those for department members. In the category of administration, the chair is evaluated on his or her accessibility to the department; ability to advocate the department; and equitable treatment of faculty in making assignments and personnel decisions. Others with administrative duties are evaluated on the success of their programs or assignments, their ability to work with peers and supervise staff, and the effort expended in their administrative roles.

HISTORY DEPARTMENT BYLAWS (Appendix E) REVISED January 2014 and approved through secret ballot by a two-thirds majority of department members as specified in Bylaws 27.3.

APPENDIX E
TO THE BYLAWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
Specialized Faculty, Criteria for Promotion

The procedure for the promotion of specialized faculty (formerly Non-Tenure Track Faculty) will follow the procedure as outlined in Article 14 (ps. 52-56) and Appendix J (ps. 148-154) of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and Associated Memoranda of Agreement: 2013-2016

Failure to achieve promotion for Specialized Faculty does not, in itself, constitute grounds for termination.

History Department Procedures:

- (1) The candidate shall submit a current and comprehensive Promotion Binder as outlined in the University Promotion and Tenure memo revised and issued annually through the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement. This binder should be received by the Promotion and Tenure Committee (all tenured faculty) by February 1.
- (2) The History Department Promotion and Tenure Committee (All tenured faculty) and one or more peers (i.e. non-tenure track and/or specialized faculty) will study the binder and vote by secret ballot. The votes shall either be in favor of or against promotion.
- (3) The chair of the department will provide a written narrative that summarizes the results of the vote and assesses the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.
- (4) The chair of the department will share the findings with the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Criteria for Promotion

According to the C.B.A. Appendix J.3: "All departments/units must have written promotion criteria and procedures for all applicable Specialized Faculty available in the department/unit, posted on a single publicly accessible University Web site, and on file in the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement."

Herein, those criteria, as specified in the C.B.A., J.2:

Promotion in the Specialized Faculty ranks is attained through meritorious performance of assigned duties in the faculty member's present position.

(1) Promotion to the second rank in each track shall be based on recognition of demonstrated effectiveness in the areas of assigned duties.

(2) Promotion to the third rank in each track shall be based on superior performance in the areas of assigned duties.

(3) Promotion decisions shall take into account the following:

- a. annual evaluations
- b. annual assignments
- c. fulfillment of the department/unit written promotion criteria in relation to the assignment
- d. evidence of sustained effectiveness relative to opportunity and according to assignment

At Present, the History Department has two Specialized Faculty on staff. These faculty members have different assignments. Accordingly, Teaching Faculty II, whose primary responsibilities are instructional, would receive promotion consistent with those in the Teaching Faculty Rank. As described in the C.B.A. J.2.b.3.e:

for the Teaching Faculty track:

- i. evidence of well-planned and delivered courses
- ii. summaries of data from Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPOT) questionnaires
- iii. letters from faculty members who have conducted peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching
- iv. ability to teach multiple courses within a discipline/major
- v. other teaching-related activities, such as instructional innovation, involvement in curriculum development, authorship of educational materials, and participation in professional organizations related to the area of instruction."

The Director of the Reichelt Oral History Program is appointed as Teaching Faculty II. She has the additional title of Program Director. This latter title reflects her role as director of the Reichelt Oral History Program. The Director's teaching contributions will be evaluated as per C.B.A. J.2.b.3.e, described above.

The Director's Role as director of the Reichelt Oral History Program shall be evaluated according to the criteria established for Research Support Faculty, C.B.A., J.2.b.3:

“h. for Research Support Faculty

- i. evidence of contributions in support of research, as attested to by internal letters from collaborators at FSU
- ii. other research-related activities, such as those described in 10.3(c) and in J.2(b)(3)g”

Honorific Working Titles

Specialized Faculty are also eligible for “Honorific Working Titles” containing the word “Professor.” The specific titles, relative to position codes, are described in C.B.A. Table J.5.

Criteria for Honorific Working Titles

As per the C.B.A. J.5:

(a) Such a title may only be granted with the recommendation of a majority vote of the tenured faculty of an academic department/unit offering a degree program, in recognition of scholarly accomplishments within the granting department/unit's academic field.

(b) The criteria and procedures for awarding such an honorific working title shall be the same as for promotion or initial appointment to the corresponding tenure-track rank (History Department Bylaws, Appendix A).

(2) The expectations in research, teaching, and service shall be scaled proportionally to the assignment of duties.

Appendix F
ANNUAL EVALUATION SUMMARY FORM

PERIOD OF REPORT
(if other than annual)

FROM: TO:

NAME

RANK AND POSITION

COLLEGE / UNIT

DEPARTMENT / UNIT

PERFORMANCE OF DUTIES

Indicate evaluation by placing an “x” in the appropriate column for each category below. In the “Overall Performance” section, rate the employee’s overall performance in fulfilling his or her responsibilities to the University. Average AOR percentage is based on the annual assignment of responsibilities (9-month assignment for 9-month faculty). The annual evaluation shall include evaluation of summer activities for 9-month faculty if there is a summer assignment.

Category	Average AOR Percentage	Substantially Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations	Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations	Meets FSU’s High Expectations	Official Concern	Does Not Meet FSU’s High Expectations	Not Observed
Teaching							
Research and Other Creative Activity							
Service							
Other							
Spoken English Competency*							
Overall Performance**							

The evaluator's narrative explanation of overall performance must be attached. The evaluator should receive input from both students and faculty in preparing this report. If for any reason such input is unavailable, the report should indicate why and what alternative methods have been used.

Has this rating been discussed with this employee? () Yes () No (attach explanation)

Signature of Evaluator_____

Date:_____

Signature of Employee_____

Date:_____

Number of pages attached to report _____

Signature of Academic Dean/Director_____

Date:_____

APPENDIX G

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Florida State University Department of History is to provide a liberal education to undergraduate and graduate students, with an emphasis on teaching them to be experts in historical analysis. While emphasizing the centrality of chronological thinking, the department's aim is to provide students with the skills to think systematically about politics and culture, to provide them with the ability to be leaders and participants in the world's civic culture, and to provide them with the tools for intellectual leadership in public affairs, the world of ideas, and the discipline of history.

APPENDIX H

SACS SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE POLICY

Faculty and Staff members are expected to be familiar with and follow the Florida State University Substantive Change Policy as found on then university web site <http://provost.fsu.edu/sacs>