

Bylaws

School of Communication Studies

University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Article I. GENERAL

The School of Communication Studies is a unit of the College of Communication and Information in the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. The administration of the School shall be consistent with the Bylaws of the College of Communication and Information and the *Faculty Handbook* of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Article II. COMMITTEES

Section A. A standing Committee on Curriculum shall conduct periodic reviews of curriculum and degree programs, shall consider proposals from faculty members for curriculum and program changes, and shall report its recommendations concerning curriculum and program change to the faculty.

Para. 1. The members of the Curriculum Committee shall be appointed by the Director at the first faculty meeting of each academic year and shall be subject to confirmation by the faculty. Prior to the formation of the Committee, the faculty shall be given an opportunity to indicate preferences for committee service.

Para. 2. The Chairperson of the Curriculum Committee shall be elected by the voting members of the committee.

Section B. The Director shall appoint other committees as are needed to assist with School activities.

Section C. The chairperson of each committee shall present a report of the committee's activities to the faculty at least once during each regular academic term, and at the end of each academic year shall present a written report that will be kept in the School office.

Section D. The Director shall be a non-voting member of the Curriculum Committee and of other committees.

Article III. CONDUCT OF SCHOOL BUSINESS

Section A. The Director shall schedule one meeting of the faculty at the beginning of each regular academic term. Additional meetings may be called by the Director or by a majority of the faculty.

Section B. A quorum shall exist when two-thirds of the full-time faculty are present at a scheduled School meeting.

Section C. Decisions concerning curriculum and program change are the responsibility of the faculty of the School. Ordinarily, proposals for curriculum or program change shall originate in the Curriculum Committee, be discussed at a scheduled meeting, and if approved by majority vote be submitted to the appropriate curriculum review bodies. A proposal for curriculum or program change that is not recommended by the Curriculum Committee may be submitted for faculty consideration at a School meeting by the Director or by a faculty member.

Section D. Decisions concerning matters other than curriculum and program revision that are of substantial import to the work of the faculty of the School-including such matters as allocation of operating funds and appointment of academic year or part-time or limited-term faculty-shall be made, whenever possible, in consultation with the faculty. Ordinarily, the decisions of the Director shall reflect the judgment of the faculty as expressed by majority vote in School meetings. Where a decision of the Director differs from the expressed judgment of the faculty, the Director shall explain that decision and provide an opportunity for the faculty to respond.

Section E. The Director shall give the faculty timely notice of each scheduled meeting, and shall invite the faculty to submit matters of interest for inclusion on the agenda. The Director shall present to the faculty at least five days before each scheduled meeting an agenda listing those matters to be presented for their consideration.

Article IV. ANNUAL REVIEW

Policies

Annual Reviews. Each faculty member will receive an annual review. In the tenure and promotion year, faculty members will not be eligible for evaluations other than those required by the tenure and promotion procedures.

Annual reviews will be based on three components:

Self-evaluation;

Peer-evaluation; and

Director evaluation.

Assessment of overall performance must reflect the faculty member's rank and assignments. Based on the results of the overall performance evaluation, faculty members will be placed in one of four categories: exceeds expectations for rank, meets expectations for rank, needs improvement, unsatisfactory.

Procedures

On an annual basis, the Director shall meet with each faculty member to establish goals and objectives for the following performance appraisal period (normally an academic year). The

goals and objectives agreed upon between the faculty member and the Director will be kept on file in the School office.

During the annual performance appraisal meeting, each faculty member will provide appropriate documentation (through self evaluation, peer evaluation, and other relevant sources) as to the extent to which his/her goals and objectives have been met. In addition, faculty members will bring to the attention of the Director any changes in assigned duties and responsibilities during the performance appraisal period. Following a review of the performance criteria, the Director will complete the evaluation document.

The completed evaluation document must be signed by the Director and the faculty member. The faculty member's signature does not constitute approval of the evaluation. Rather, it signifies notification of the results of the performance evaluation. Faculty members may attach rebuttals to the document.

Criteria for performance evaluations include research/creative activities, teaching, and service. This review will be based on the three evaluation components listed above.

The Dean will conduct an annual review of the Director's performance.

Definition of Categories

Faculty members will be reviewed in the categories of research, teaching, and service using the professional goals stated in the more recent annual review as a guide. While it is the faculty member's overall performance that is to be rated, the following serve as guidelines for evaluating teaching performance, research performance, and service performance:

Teaching Criteria. This area will be measured by peer review of teaching and/or course materials, University required teaching evaluation instruments, and self-evaluation. In judging the faculty member's performance in teaching, student evaluations may not be assigned greater weight than peer evaluations. The instructional activities of the faculty member will be reviewed using the following guidelines:

1. *Exceeds Expectations.* Course evaluations (i.e., University required student evaluations) are above the mean for the University, and course materials are thorough, clear, and useful to students. Peer evaluations are outstanding. Faculty member receives teaching or advising award.
2. *Meets Expectations.* Course evaluations (i.e., University required student evaluations) are near the mean of the University, and teaching materials are acceptable in quality. Peer reviews are satisfactory. Faculty member meets School expectations for advising.
3. *Needs Improvement.* Course evaluations (i.e., University required student evaluations) are consistently near the lowest range, and course materials are minimally acceptable. Peer reviews indicate that improvement is needed.

4. *Unsatisfactory*. Peer and course evaluations (i.e., University required student evaluations) are consistently in the lowest range. Course materials are of poor quality.

Research/Creative Activities Criteria. The scholarly activity of the faculty member will be reviewed using the following guidelines:

5. *Exceeds Expectations*. Has published and/or accepted for presentation more than two refereed items during the previous year in a national or international outlet. Grants, books, and book chapters will also be considered.

6. *Meets Expectations*. Has published and/or accepted for presentation two refereed items during the previous year in a national or international outlet. Faculty members engaged in writing scholarly books and making demonstrable progress are also considered to meet expectations.

7. *Needs Improvement*. Has on an on-going research/creative activity program but has failed to submit material for review by peers, to present at a conference, or to submit for publication with the past year.

8. *Unsatisfactory*. Consistent failure to engage in a program of on-going research/creative activity.

Service Criteria. The service activities of the faculty member will be reviewed using the following guidelines:

9. *Exceeds Expectations*. Has exceeded School and College committee obligations, and has completed at least one service activity outside the college in a leadership capacity.

10. *Meets Expectations*. Has met School and College committee obligations. Service outside the College will be considered in the evaluation.

11. *Needs Improvement*. Has not met School and/or College committee obligations.

12. *Unsatisfactory*. Has performed no service assignment at the School, College, or professional level.

Article V. RATIFICATION AND AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS

Section A. These Bylaws shall be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the faculty present and voting at a meeting called for this purpose.

Section B. These Bylaws may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the faculty present and voting. The text of the proposed amendment to the Bylaws shall be submitted to the faculty with the agenda for the meeting at which the amendment will be considered.

Ratified 08/25/03