

## **BYLAWS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT**

**Revised April \_\_, 2013**

Preamble: Administrative concerns of a University department are secondary to academic matters, but they are nevertheless important for a smooth-running and effective department. The purpose of the following is to formulate a scheme of organization and operating procedures for the Department of Management that will be in keeping with these academic and administrative needs. These bylaws supplement higher authorities such as Florida Statutes, the FSU Constitution, the General Faculty Bargaining Unit Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), and the Faculty Handbook (FH). There is no intent to contradict those authorities in these bylaws, and failure to incorporate their provisions here is intended to avoid excessive duplication and does not diminish the effect of those authorities.

### A. Faculty and Faculty Meetings:

1. The faculty of the Department of Management will be defined to include all persons holding tenured and tenure-track professorial rank positions, Instructor, Lecturer, Assistant In \_\_\_\_, Associate In \_\_\_\_, and Research Associate positions, and any other faculty positions within the General Faculty Bargaining Unit and assigned to the department. Also included are persons holding joint appointments in other departments, institutes, centers or divisions, provided that those persons are appointed at least 50% in the Department and receive an assignment of responsibilities (AOR) from the Department. Those who would qualify as faculty but for administrative duties will be considered faculty in the Department whenever possible.
2. All Department of Management faculty will be eligible to vote in departmental matters in which a vote is taken except as precluded by higher authority.
3. Faculty meetings will be held at least once each fall and spring semester. Additional meetings may be called by the Chair or on written request of five voting members.
4. A majority of the faculty will constitute a quorum. All faculty members will be notified of Departmental meetings and agenda for the meetings at least 48 hours in advance. Minutes will be kept and made available to all faculty as soon as possible.
5. When electronic voting (e-mail or web-based) is used, relevant materials will be e-mailed to faculty or posted on a web site accessible to faculty and announced by e-mail to faculty at least 48 hours before votes are tallied. If votes are received from a majority of the faculty, then a quorum will have been established.

B. Chair:

1. Appointment of the Chair will be made by the Dean of the College of Business with the advice of the faculty of the Department. Faculty preferences will be determined by secret ballot, with the numerical results reported to the Dean.
2. The Chair is appointed for a three-year renewable term, but also serves at the pleasure of the Dean, and the President of the University.
3. At the request of five or more faculty members, a secret ballot on the continuation of the Chair's service will be held. If a majority of eligible faculty vote "no" on the Chair's continuation, this will be conveyed to the Dean along with a recommendation that the Dean strongly consider immediately terminating the Chair's service as Chair and appointing an Acting Chair. The Dean, with the advice of the faculty, will be encouraged to consider appointing a new Chair for a three-year renewable term as soon as possible.
4. The Chair will be the chief executive officer of the Department, responsible to the University Administration and the faculty of the Department. The Chair will consult with the proper committees on such matters as appointments, promotion and tenure recommendations, salary adjustments, and curriculum, assignment of teaching and research assistantships, and general questions concerning allocation of departmental resources.
5. The Chair will be, ex-officio, a nonvoting member of all departmental committees, except that he/she may cast the deciding vote in the event of a tie.
6. The Chair will be evaluated by the Dean of the College of Business for purposes of annual evaluation. To ensure the accountability of the Chair to the faculty, the faculty will annually provide their views on the Chair's performance to the Dean via the Department Peer Evaluation Committee.

C. Associate Chair:

1. The Chair may appoint an Associate Chair to assist in the administration of the Department. If an Associate Chair is appointed, the choice must be ratified by a majority of the faculty and approved by the Dean.
2. The term of appointment of the Associate Chair will be at the discretion of the Chair and the consent of the Associate Chair.
3. The Associate Chair will be the representative of the Chair for those purposes and occasions assigned to him/her by the Chair.

#### D. Peer Evaluation Committee

1. The faculty will annually elect a Peer Evaluation Committee (PEC) consisting of at least four faculty members, all of whom are tenured, where the faculty pool makes this feasible. The Chair will designate one faculty member as the Chair of the PEC. The Committee will provide advice to the Chair for the performance evaluation and recognition of merit of all departmental faculty.
2. The Committee will annually solicit and summarize faculty views on the Chair's performance to provide advice to the Dean.

#### E. Promotion and Tenure Committee

1. The faculty will annually elect a Promotion and Tenure Committee consisting of at least three faculty members, all of whom are tenured, where the faculty pool makes this feasible. The Chair will designate one faculty member as the Chair of the Committee.
2. The Committee will be responsible for reviewing the records of all prospective tenure-track promotion or tenure candidates and recommending action on them.

#### F. Graduate Coordinator(s)

1. The Chair will appoint a Graduate Coordinator or Graduate Coordinators for doctoral programs. Graduate Coordinators are responsible for general administration of departmental graduate programs, including recruiting, admissions, assistantships, academic counseling, curriculum, and comprehensive examinations.
2. The Chair will designate the Graduate Coordinators to serve as the department's representatives to the College doctoral policy committee.

#### G. Undergraduate Committee:

1. The faculty will annually elect an Undergraduate Committee consisting of not less than three faculty members, with responsibility for the Department's undergraduate programs. The Chair will designate one faculty member as the Chair of the Committee.
2. The Chair of the Undergraduate Committee will serve as the department's representative on the College's Undergraduate Committee.

#### H. Bylaws Committee

1. The faculty will annually elect a Bylaws Committee consisting of at least three faculty members, a majority of whom are tenured, where the faculty pool makes

this feasible. The Chair will designate one faculty member as the Chair of the Committee.

2. The Committee will be responsible for annually reviewing the Department's Bylaws, including any appendices, and recommending modifications to the faculty, if such modifications are needed.

I. Other Committees and Appointments:

1. The Chair of the Department may appoint such other standing or ad hoc committees as circumstances will from time to time require.

2. The Chair may appoint department faculty to serve as department representatives on College and University committees except as otherwise noted in these Bylaws.

J. Faculty Assignment of Responsibilities (AOR)

1. Each faculty member will receive annually a written assignment of responsibilities (AOR) from the department Chair. This assignment will be developed by the department Chair in consultation with each faculty member. The completed assignment form will reflect the mix of teaching, research and service and/or administration assignments upon which the faculty member will be evaluated.

2. Because of changing needs of the department and the college, changes to the initial assignments may be necessary; however, faculty will be informed in writing of these changes if and when they occur prior to their occurrence and these changes will be reflected in an amended AOR.

K. Faculty Performance Report and Annual Evaluation

1. During the beginning of the spring semester, each faculty member will complete the College of Business Faculty Performance Report for the preceding calendar year. The various items of evidence relating to performance in teaching, scholarship, service, and administration described in the CBA, FH, and Appendix A, Management Department Criteria for Evaluation and Procedures for Merit Salary Increases will be included in this report, as well as other performance information that the faculty member deems to be important.

2. The set of Faculty Performance Reports for the department provides the basic information for evaluating departmental faculty.

L. Promotion and Tenure

1. University and College Requirements: Departmental recommendations for promotion and tenure recognize and follow University-wide policies detailed in

the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), the annual promotion and tenure memo from the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement, and the Faculty Handbook (FH). College of Business and Department of Management policies are made known to the faculty by the Dean of the College and by the Chair of the Department.

2. Departmental Criteria and Standards:

a. General Criteria and Standards of Faculty Performance: The Department will expect a faculty member to perform effectively in assigned areas of responsibility. In considering a faculty member for promotion or tenure, the Department will give due regard to the nature of the faculty member's assigned duties within the Department. Promotion and tenure criteria and standards are logically related to the criteria and standards for annual faculty evaluation. The Chair and the members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will evaluate faculty eligible for promotion. Every faculty member is invited to make available to the Chair and Committee whatever information that the faculty member believes is appropriate as supporting evidence to the quality and level of his or her teaching, research, and service activities, subject to the provisions of the CBA, the annual promotion and tenure memo from the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement, and FH.

b. Criteria and Standards for Tenure Track Promotions and Tenure: Recommendation for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or tenure is based upon recognition of demonstrated effectiveness in teaching, scholarly endeavor, and contribution to the college and to the discipline, and is normally associated with significant achievement and at least a clear potential for development of a national or international reputation as a scholar in one's field. Nominations for tenure will include the results of a secret ballot poll of tenured faculty. Promotion to Associate Professor must take place prior to or concurrent with tenure consideration. Tenure must take place within seven years, as no faculty member may hold the rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor for longer than that without having been awarded tenure. Assistant Professors who do not show potential for promotion to Associate Professor can be expected to be terminated by the Department prior to the expiration of the seven year limit. Recommendation for promotion to the rank of Professor is based on accomplishment of high order in scholarly endeavor, superior teaching, and intellectual leadership in the profession, and is normally associated with achievement of a national or international reputation as a scholar in one's field. Specific criteria for evaluation are provided in Appendix A, Management Department Criteria for Evaluation and Procedures for Merit Salary Increases.

- c. Criteria and Standards for Non-Tenure Track Promotions:  
Nominations for promotion of non-tenure track faculty will be made by the Chair, applying the criteria and standards specified by the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement and the CBA. Additional criteria and standards, if specified, are included in Appendix A, Management Department Criteria for Evaluation and Procedures for Merit Salary Increases.
- d. Standards and criteria for merit salary adjustments are included in Appendix A, Management Department Criteria for Evaluation and Procedures for Merit Salary Increases.

3. Annual Progress Evaluation: All faculty eligible for promotion or tenure will be appraised by the Chair annually in writing of their progress toward promotion or tenure. In assessing progress toward promotion or tenure, the chair will give substantial weight to the assessments of the Peer Evaluation Committee. Faculty members in their second and fourth year of tenure-earning appointments will prepare a binder for review that includes evidence on scholarship, teaching, and service. The Peer Evaluation Committee will solicit and consider assessments from all tenured faculty in developing its assessments of tenure-track faculty.

M. Appointment to the Graduate Faculty and Award of Graduate Faculty Status (GFS):

- 1. Normally all tenure-track Department faculty are appointed to the graduate faculty and teach at that level as well as at the undergraduate level. GFS may be awarded to tenure-track faculty. Non-tenure track faculty may be appointed to Graduate Teaching Status (GTS), co-Masters Directive Status (co-MDS), and co-Doctoral Directive Status (co-DDS).
- 2. Departmental policy is that tenure-track faculty members be recommended for GFS when they demonstrate proven scholarship. Appointment to GFS must be by affirmative super majority (2/3) vote of the GFS faculty of the Department and approval of the Chair, the Dean of the College, and the Dean of the Graduate School. GFS will be awardable upon arrival at FSU.
- 3. Department policy for non-tenure track (specialized) faculty members is that they be recommended for GTS, co-MDS, or co-DDS provided that they hold a Ph.D., demonstrate proven scholarship, and meet University and College requirements for these designations. Appointment to GTS, co-MDS, or co-DDS must be by affirmative super majority (2/3) vote of the GFS and GTS faculty of the Department, and approval of the Chair, the Dean of the College, and the Dean of the Graduate School.

N. Faculty Governance:

- 1. The Chair will ensure that faculty members will share significantly in governance responsibilities via regular or ad hoc committees, or secret ballots of the

faculty, as appropriate. Faculty members shall be involved in: recruitment of new faculty and other professionals; development of high quality programs; program review; department review; department reorganization; development of criteria for tenure, promotion and merit salary increases; and other matters of professional concern.

2. Faculty Senate: Eligible Department faculty members shall participate in the election of Faculty Senate representatives for the College of Business as provided in the College Bylaws.

O. Substantive Change Monitoring and Reporting Policy

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

P. Amendments:

Any five voting members of the Department may propose an amendment to the bylaws. A proposed amendment must be available to the voting membership at least two weeks prior to the Department meeting in which it will be considered. To be adopted, a proposed amendment must receive an affirmative vote by a two-thirds majority of those voting in a secret ballot of the faculty.

Q. Effective Date:

These Bylaws were revised and adopted by a 2/3 majority of the Management faculty on \_\_\_\_\_ and become effective on January 1, 2013.

**APPENDIX A**  
**MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION**  
**AND PROCEDURES FOR MERIT SALARY INCREASES**

**April \_\_, 2013**

Preamble: This Appendix describes the criteria to be used for performance evaluation and procedures to be used by the Department of Management for the distribution of salary increase funds available for the purpose of rewarding meritorious faculty performance. The criteria and procedures are consistent with the mission and goals of The Florida State University, the College of Business, and the Department of Management, and they comply with and supplement the provisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and the Faculty Handbook (FH). There is no intent to contradict such authorities in these criteria and procedures, and failure to incorporate their provisions here is intended to avoid excessive duplication and does not diminish the effect of those authorities.

**Section 1: Basic Principles, Requirements, and Assumptions**

The criteria and procedures are based on the following:

- 1.1. The criteria and procedures specified in this document or incorporated by reference (the CBA and FH) are the sole basis upon which the Department will award merit salary increases.
- 1.2. The criteria are consistent with the mission and goals of the University, the College of Business, and the Department of Management.
- 1.3. The criteria and evaluative procedures are logically related to the criteria and procedures pertaining to the annual faculty evaluation and the promotion and tenure processes.
- 1.4. The criteria afford each faculty member an equitable opportunity to achieve a merit raise in that the evaluation of each faculty member's performance is based upon each member's assignment of responsibilities (AOR).
- 1.5. The Peer Evaluation Committee will provide merit salary increase recommendations to the Chair and to the Dean regarding the performance of the department Chair and the faculty in the department.
- 1.6. The criteria include both qualitative and quantitative aspects of performance that may require judgment and interpretation by faculty peer committees and other evaluators.
- 1.7. The criteria and evaluative procedures may be changed by the faculty annually. Any changes in performance evaluation and criteria will become effective in the subsequent year.

**Section 2: Performance Criteria**

The Collective Bargaining Agreement and the Faculty Handbook present specific information and standards which will be used to evaluate teaching, scholarship/research,

service and/or administration. The following criteria are based on the above referenced provisions of those documents.

## 2.1 Criteria for Teaching

The purpose of teaching is to impart knowledge and critical thinking skills in the theoretical, practical, and ethical aspects of the management discipline. The following evidence, if provided, must be considered in the evaluation process. The listing of evidence is not in order of priority.

- 2.11 **Course Materials and Methodology:** The development of innovative course materials, media, and methodology.
- 2.12 **Special Teaching Responsibilities and Related Assignments:** Teaching workshops or seminars; honors courses; adult education courses; in-service courses; DIS, supervised research; membership on masters or doctoral committees; and number of masters or doctoral major professor responsibilities.
- 2.13 **Out-Of-Class Student Contact:** Academic advising -- number of students, and extent of accessibility to students.
- 2.14 **Awards of other Public Recognition:** Department, college and university awards and other recognition of teaching excellence.
- 2.15 **Student Evaluation:** Results of teaching evaluative instruments, and other independent student input.
- 2.16 **Peer Evaluation:** Include only reasonably objective evidence such as from visitation and video tapes.
- 2.17 **Other Evidence:** Statement of candidate; willingness to assume new teaching assignments and schedules; and other teaching activities which are important to the department or college.

The above evidence provides the underlying basis for evaluating teaching performance. In evaluating faculty teaching performance, consideration will be given to the quality and quantity of the set of teaching activities.

## 2.2 Criteria For Scholarship/Research

The purpose of scholarship/research is to discover and develop a deeper understanding of knowledge with direct or indirect applicability to the management discipline. Scholarship/research is developed through the communication of knowledge through a variety of publication media and oral presentations. The following evidence, if provided, must be considered in the evaluation process. The listing of evidence is not in priority order.

- 2.21 **Scholarly Books:** Monographs; textbooks; edited and/or translated books; bibliographical books; books of readings; casebooks. Consideration must be given to the reputation of the publisher; whether or not publications are refereed; stage of

completion of the book; book reviews; frequency of citation of the book by others; and number of copies printed.

- 2.22 **Articles in Journals:** Prestige of journal; whether or not the journal is refereed; single vs. multiple authorship; order of authorship (recognizing that order of authorship may have alternative meanings when current doctoral students are co-authors); importance and contribution of the article to the management discipline.
- 2.23 **Articles in Published Works:** Proceedings of conferences or symposia; technical reports; semi-popular articles; book and other reviews; and abstracts.
- 2.24 **Related Scholarship:** Papers read at meetings; discussant or chairperson roles at conferences and symposia; invited lectures; editorship for journals; professional scholarship awards; research grants; publication and research referees. Consideration must be given to the reputation of the meeting/activity; whether the publication process is regional, national, or international in scope; and the importance and contribution to the management discipline.
- 2.25 **Other Evidence:** Work in progress; working papers, and other scholarship/research activities which are important to the department and college.

The above evidence provides the underlying basis for evaluating scholarship/research performance. In evaluating faculty scholarship/research performance, consideration will be given to the quality and quantity of the set of scholarship/research activities. The evidence of scholarship/research performance must be interpreted in light of the research effort required, methodologies used, difficulty of the research process and the overall importance and contribution to the management discipline.

### 2.3 Criteria for Service

The purpose of service is to facilitate the accomplishment of departmental, college, university, community and professional goals. Service incorporates activities which are not considered strictly teaching or scholarship/research, but which enrich teaching and scholarship/research and benefit the university community, its publics, and the State of Florida. The following evidence, if provided, must be considered in the evaluation process. The listing of evidence is not in priority order.

- 2.31 **Recognized Service:** Membership on department, college and university committees essential to the operation of the respective

units; partial administrative duties to include serving as a center director and/or program coordinator; activity in professional groups (local, regional, national) such as officer, committee member, etc.; non-funded professional advisory service or presentations to community, civic, governmental or other external organizations; representative of department, college, or university at professional meetings; testimony on professional matters to legislative bodies; advisor for student organizations.

- 2.32 **Other Evidence:** Other service activities, such as external outreach and development, intra-departmental/university relations, and paid services which are important to the department or college.

The above evidence provides the underlying basis for evaluating service performance. In evaluating faculty service performance, consideration will be given to the quality and quantity of the set of service activities. The evidence of service performance must be interpreted in light of the importance of the service activities to the department, college and university. The department should not recognize service only in the area of committee work, as opportunities for such service vary among departments and faculty. Service performance should be evaluated in terms of leadership, time, effort and breadth of service.

## 2.4 Criteria for Administration

The purpose of administration is to facilitate faculty performance in teaching, research and service. Administration is deemed to be those activities, normally restricted to department chairs or persons whose major responsibilities are administrative rather than teaching or research. The following evidence (not in priority order) must be considered in evaluating administrative performance.

- 2.41 **External Outreach:** Fund raising; development of external relations with industry; development of alumni relations.
- 2.42 **Faculty Relations:** Fairness in dealing with faculty; faculty communications; motivating faculty performance; coordination of faculty activities; recruitment of faculty; accessibility to the faculty.
- 2.43 **Administrative Activities:** Scheduling course loads; timeliness in performing administrative tasks; effectiveness in allocating resources, and effectiveness in coordinating programs and related activities.
- 2.44 **Other Activities:** Ability to lead department toward achievement of its goals; effectiveness in representing the department to the dean and other constituencies.

The above evidence provides the underlying basis for evaluating administrative performance. The evidence of administrative performance must be

interpreted in light of the overall effectiveness of the department and the productivity of its faculty.

## **2.5 Special Merit Criteria**

A merit salary increase may be recommended by a departmental chair for an individual whose salary does not fairly reflect his/her value to the department or college based on market considerations, long-run contributions, or performance of special projects or activities. Such increases will not be provided from funds allocated for departmental merit.

## **Section 3: Procedures for Merit Evaluation and Annual Evaluation Ratings**

### **3.1 Annual Evaluation by Faculty Peer Evaluation Committee**

Each faculty member's performance will be evaluated based on her/his evidence of performance relative to his or her assigned duties. The Peer Evaluation Committee will rate each faculty member's performance by placing each faculty member in one of the following annual evaluation categories for each specific area of assigned duties (teaching, research, etc.) and overall ("Overall Performance"). No restrictions exist as to how many faculty members can be placed in a given category.

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

**2. 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, or 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.

**3. Meets FSU's High Expectations.** This describes an individual who demonstrates the requisite knowledge and skills in his/her field of specialty and complete assigned responsibilities in a manner that is both timely and consistent with the high expectations of the university.

4. **Official Concern.** This describes an individual who demonstrates the exquisite 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.

5. **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.

The ratings of the faculty Peer Evaluation Committee will be submitted as recommendations to the department Chair and the Dean.

### **3.2 Merit and Annual Evaluations by Department Chair**

Each faculty member's performance will be evaluated by the department Chair using the criteria described in Section 2, above, and the annual evaluation categories described in Section 3.1 above. The Peer Evaluation Committee's recommendations must be considered by the department Chair and the Dean, and will be given substantial weight in the Chair's and the Dean's evaluations. Upon completion of the evaluation of each faculty member, the department Chair will present and personally discuss each faculty member's evaluation with the respective faculty member. This discussion will include the Chair's perceptions of positive areas of performance, as well as the areas which need improvement. The Chair will provide to each faculty member a written narrative evaluation, as well as the Chair's summary rating.

After completing the discussions with all faculty, the Chair will submit the results of his/her evaluation to the Dean. No restrictions exist as to how many faculty can be placed in a given annual evaluation category.

Ratings of all faculty members by the Peer Evaluation Committee will be provided to all faculty members without the identification of individual faculty members.

A Performance Improvement Plan (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.

### **3.3 Merit Raise Distribution Guidelines**

3.31 All faculty members shall be reviewed for merit. In determining merit salary increases, the three most recent years' annual evaluations will be considered along with corresponding AORs to arrive at an overall assessment on the rating scale used for annual evaluations. For faculty with fewer than three years' annual evaluations, merit assessment will be based on the years available.

3.32 Merit raise distributions will be determined in dollar amounts, such that the annual evaluation categories of Official Concern and Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations, Meets FSU's High Expectations, Exceeds FSU's High Expectations, and Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations will be awarded raises of \$0, \$0, \$X, 2\*\$X, and 4\*\$X, respectively. The amount of X will be determined by dividing the total merit funds available by the sum of merit ratings across all faculty where "Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations"=0, "Official Concern"=0, "Meets FSU's High Expectations"=1, "Exceeds FSU's High Expectations"=2, and "Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations"=4. (Example: Assume there are five faculty members, one in each rating category, and \$2800 available. X is \$400, and raises will be in the amounts of \$0, \$0, \$400, \$800, and \$1600.)

#### **Section 4: Amendments**

The Department Chair or any five voting members of the Department may propose amendments to this document. Proposed amendments must be available to the voting membership at least two weeks prior to the Department meeting in which they will be considered. To be adopted, a proposed amendment must receive an affirmative vote by a majority of the voting faculty.

#### **Section 5: Effective Date**

This Appendix on Management Department Criteria for Evaluation and Procedures for Merit Salary Increases was adopted as part of the Department of Management's Bylaws by a majority vote of the Management faculty on \_\_\_\_\_ and becomes effective on January 1, 2013.